

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 September 1985

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

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 124 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on pre-school education were presented by the Hons B.C. Eastick and Michael Wilson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: SERVICE STATIONS

A petition signed by 716 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant unrestricted trading hours to service stations within the inner Adelaide metropolitan area was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: POORAKA LAND

A petition signed by 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure that the tract of land at South Terrace, Pooraka, be retained as open space was presented by Mr Trainer.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid land botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 14, 16, 24, 34 to 38, 45, 84, 86, 90, 97, 101, 105, 106, 119, 121, 124, 126, 128 to 131, 133, 153, 155, 162, 163, 165, 168, and 171; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

LIVESTOCK LOADING

In reply to the **Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (1 August).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: The introduction of a transport policy of volume loading of livestock trucks rather than there being a weight limit had received previous consideration by the Commercial Transport Advisory Committee and also the Road Traffic Board. Both authorities have considered detailed reports on this matter and have recommended that, while appreciating the problems of the livestock industry, the adoption of the concept of volume loading is not appropriate. Particular concern has been expressed in respect to the effects of overloaded axles on road pavements and the resultant increased community costs.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year 1984-85.

Ordered that report be printed.

MOBILONG MEDIUM SECURITY PRISON

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Mobilong Medium Security Male Prison.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Beverage Container Act, 1975—Regulations—Milk Containers.

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Report by S.A.

Planning Commission on proposed—

Development, Beachport.

Duplication of Happy Valley-Panorama 66kV

Transmission Line.

Erection of concrete water storage tank, Hackham.

Erection of concrete water storage tank, Morphett

Vale East.

Development, Electricity Trust of South Australia.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—Western Zone Abalone Quotas.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—Number Plates.

Public Parks Act, 1943—Disposal of Park Lands, Beechan Park Reserve, Victor Harbor.

Radiation Protection and Control Act, 1982—Regulations—Ionizing Radiation (Amendment).

Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—

Bicycles Lanes.

Traffic Prohibition (Window Gardens—Amendment.)

South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975—Regulations—The Adelaide Children's Hospital Amendments.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Community Welfare Act, 1972—Regulations—Revocation.

Rules of Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—Local Court—Appearances.

Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—Regulations—Attempted Service Fee.
Trustee Act, 1936—Regulations—Export Finance and Insurance Corporation.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)

Pursuant to Statute—
Building Act, 1970—Regulations—Stormwater Drainage.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OPPOSITION LEADER'S STAFF

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have received a memorandum from the Acting Commissioner of Police which in my mind raises serious questions about the propriety of the conduct of the Opposition Leader, a member of his front bench, and a member of his personal staff. Mr M.D. Symons, Press Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition, has abused his position as a seconded police officer in soliciting confidential information from operational units of the South Australian Police Force.

The information sought in this way has, on at least two occasions, been the subject of questions asked in this House by the member for Coles. Because the information was used in the House, the Leader of the Opposition must accept total responsibility for the actions of his staff and the conduct of his front bench. In seeking the information, Mr Symons has clearly breached the agreed terms and conditions of his secondment—terms and conditions drawn up to protect the integrity of the police.

An honourable member: Can we have a copy?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have given them to the Attendant. Specifically, Mr Symons agreed (and I quote):

During his period of secondment, the member's access to departmental information shall be limited to the extent of a holder of the office of a Press Secretary who is not a member of the Police Force.

All official communications from the member to the Police Department shall be directed in the first instance through the Staff Officer to the Commissioner of Police.

The Acting Commissioner has drawn my attention to two instances where a breach of the agreement has occurred. Mr Symons directly approached operational units of the police seeking confidential information, and information was unwittingly passed on to Mr Symons because the police personnel concerned believed that Mr Symons was still a Media Officer with the Police Department. In other words—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am quoting from the Acting Commissioner's statement. I am not sure whether honourable members opposite are laughing at me or at the Acting Police Commissioner, but I will proceed. Mr Symons failed to identify himself as a member of the Opposition Leader's personal staff. I refer members to two questions raised in this House by the member for Coles—questions raised on the very days the information was sought by Mr Symons.

The first, on 21 August, concerns the arrest of a man on charges of indecent assault on a child. The second, on 28 August, concerns the arrest of a fireman on charges of possession of Indian hemp. The conclusion is obvious: the Leader of the Opposition directed his Press Secretary to undertake a course of action which could have risked the excellent reputation of the South Australian police. The Leader has placed Party political interests ahead of the duties and responsibilities of the South Australian police.

In doing so, the Leader could have jeopardised criminal investigations and frustrated the police in their inquiries.

The Leader of the Opposition has also directed his Press Secretary to undertake a role that ultimately could have jeopardised Mr Symons' career. It is the Leader of the Opposition who is culpable—not his staff. While the Opposition has a legitimate right to raise matters of public importance in this House, it has a paramount responsibility to obtain and use the information in a proper manner—a manner that protects the integrity of the Police Force, does not prejudice ongoing investigations and does not infringe the civil liberties of innocent individuals.

Members will recall the concerns and doubts that were raised following Mr Symons' appointment to the Opposition Leader's personal staff. His role is no longer in any doubt. The Leader of the Opposition has employed and used a member of the Police Force to obtain confidential information for use in a purely political way. The public assurances given by the Leader of the Opposition as to Mr Symons' role have proved meaningless. The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, stands condemned before this House for his actions in this matter.

I have written to the Leader of the Opposition expressing my serious concerns. I have sought from him an unqualified assurance that the terms and conditions of the secondment agreement are immediately adhered to. Sir, I table the Acting Police Commissioner's memorandum, relevant excerpts from *Hansard*, and the document outlining the terms and conditions of Mr Symons' secondment as Press Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MULTISPORT COMPLEX

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: On Thursday 29 August the member for Hanson asked a series of questions about a proposed multisport complex that this Government plans to build at North Glenelg. Before giving the appropriate answers, I wish to make the observation that these were not merely questions but yet another attempt by the Opposition to create obstacles in the path of a positive and constructive project to benefit South Australia's sporting community. After the three disastrous years of the Tonkin Government, this State Government is getting on with the job of providing badly needed sporting facilities to rank with the best available in Australia. Yet within 24 hours—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted to the honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yet within 24 hours of the announcement for this centre, we once again hear the familiar negative tactics of this Opposition, which is hellbent on trying to undermine every worthwhile project that this Government has undertaken. Let me put the facts on record. The proposed \$4.4 million multisport complex for Glenelg North was formally approved at last week's Cabinet meeting. After the project is completed, it will cater for hockey, lacrosse, small bore rifle shooting and weightlifting. The project, which is currently in the feasibility stage, will offer numerous advantages, especially in reduced capital and recurrent costs through the sharing of common social facilities.

Department of Aviation: Initial advice received from the Department of Aviation indicates that there will be no objection to the sports complex being located as proposed. The proposed buildings are well within the safety limits of

obstacles and the height and glare factors of the lighting towers will be designed to comply with the department's safety requirements. A formal response from the department will be sought after detailed designs have been completed.

Noise Pollution: Noise pollution is not considered to be a problem. Sporting activities, which generally are of short duration, will not be affected in the same way as, say, residential or commercial developments would be if they were built in the same area.

Odour Pollution: So far, investigations have shown that odours will not be a problem at the site. The occasional minor problem may arise when unusually large amounts of specific industrial chemicals enter the Glenelg sewage treatment works. Prevailing winds in the area are either westerly or south-westerly, and the proposed complex has been sited to avoid odours being blown towards it by the prevailing winds. In support of this case, the management of Marine-land and the West Beach Trust, located due north of the proposed site, have indicated that they have no problems with odours from the treatment works.

Generally, consultation with the appropriate authorities is being established so that during the design stage all the required approvals and inputs can be obtained. Finally, I refer to the closing comment of the member for Hanson:

Minister, I do not want a repeat of the aquatic centre saga.

As Minister of Recreation and Sport, I would like to see many more such projects undertaken and completed for the benefit of South Australians. While initial estimates for the aquatic centre were not accurate, the final cost of about \$8 million is fully justified and will be worth every cent that has been spent. This is especially the case when one considers that the estimated cost of the Hindley Street proposal of the Tonkin Government had escalated to over \$12 million before the first tender was called.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. I call the honourable member for Bragg to order and remind all members of the consequences that follow from there. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I suggest that Opposition members try to learn the secret of success when they go on an inspection tour of the aquatic centre on 20 September. I also suggest that they seek the views of some of the users of the complex. After they have done this, I suggest they redeem some of their credibility by voicing an accurate assessment of what will be one of the best sporting projects in Australia.

QUESTION TIME

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier agree that further statements by the former external auditor to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Mr D.J. Venn, about the extent of the Health Commission's knowledge of financial mismanagement at the hospital show that the Minister of Health has misled Parliament and, if so, what action does he intend to take?

Yesterday, Mr Venn delivered a 10 page letter to the Government and to the Opposition. In that letter, Mr Venn has the following to say about the Health Commission's knowledge of financial mismanagement at the hospital:

It is our opinion that the Health Commission would have been aware of falsified returns for the months of April, May and June 1983, as well as the true purpose of the lodgment of two returns for the month of June 1983.

He also stated:

Verbal responses from a senior health service officer at the time of the audit . . . were to effect that the Health Commission was aware of all the falsified monthly expenditure returns, both when they were prepared and subsequently lodged.

Mr Venn's statements directly contradict information given to this Parliament by the Minister of Health. On 29 August the Minister told another place:

Neither the commission nor the external auditor were aware of some of the most serious aspects of the financial mismanagement until some time after commission officers began their investigation, and certainly some weeks after he had signed the cash reconciliation letter, dated 1 August 1983.

A Health Commission minute which the Minister tabled on 29 August claimed that the commission was not aware of the falsification of returns until October 1983. The information that Mr Venn has now provided shows that the commission not only knew about, but also attempted to cover up, this financial mismanagement and falsification of records involving taxpayers funds in excess of \$250 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not seen the statement to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. However, I will certainly follow up the matter and obtain a report on it. Having said that, let me make the point that in this matter there is absolutely no interest in the Government's or the Minister's attempting to conceal the facts or do anything other than place before Parliament, as has been done since this matter was raised, the full facts of the matter as they are known to us. There is absolutely no reason or motive for it.

On the contrary, let me repeat again what has been said in previous debates on this topic when it has been raised. If we wanted to do that, in many ways all we would be seen to be doing was protecting the record of the previous Government and the previous Minister of Health, who incidentally has been conspicuously silent in any of the questions or statements that have been made, and we know why. Although we are a generous Government and we do not want to embarrass those opposite too much on their record of administration, our generosity does not extend to covering up on their behalf.

So, we have absolutely no motive or interest in it. I have said many times, and repeat again here, that if reports are received which indicate that there are problems in financing or that matters are not being properly accounted for—if the Auditor-General reports in various ways—such matters will be pursued with vigour, as it is in all our interests, and particularly in the Government's interest, that we see efficient accountable expenditure of public moneys.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INSTANT MINI BINGO

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport, through his department, give consideration to the possible disallowance of the current regulations governing the operation and control of the small lottery commonly called Instant Mini Bingo? The Minister would know that for some time I have been personally opposed to the way in which this lottery is conducted. Grave doubts exist as to the ability of charitable organisations or sporting clubs to have the lotteries honestly operated; therefore, each series sold is subject to some degree of manipulation—so much so that I am now receiving reports that private persons are selling these lotteries on their own behalf. We all know that this is illegal and that prosecutions could follow, but that would set up ordinary people as investigators. I suppose I could simply allow the matter to stand, say that charity begins at home, and leave it at that. However, the whole

operation of this type of lottery needs a great amount of overhaul.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not think I should suggest to the member for Whyalla or anybody else that, because of the proposed dishonesty of a few, the regulations governing instant bingo should be disallowed, as it has been an opportunity for sporting, cultural, charitable and other groups, which obtain a licence legally, to obtain this form of fundraising, which has been extremely beneficial to them.

I hear from time to time certain allegations, such as the member for Whyalla has raised today, regarding the perhaps fraudulent use of instant bingo tickets. I suggest that if the member for Whyalla, or any other member who has raised this issue on previous occasions, has specific instances of misappropriation or fraudulent activity he advise me. After all, this is designed specifically to provide an opportunity for fundraising for such groups and not for specific individuals. If a licence is issued for that purpose to specific groups and not to individuals, and this sort of thing occurs, we have the opportunity through the Racing and Gaming Division of the Department of Recreation and Sport for officers to investigate those procedures.

It would be cutting off one's nose to spite one's face if we were to discontinue or disallow the use of instant bingo tickets for fundraising purposes. It has played a significant part in many social, cultural and sporting groups activities to raise funds for their purpose. However, an opportunity is presented to individuals or groups to utilise the system for their own benefit. Certainly, I do not agree with that. If members have specific examples, I ask them to refer them to me, and I will certainly have them investigated.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier accept that statements by the former external auditor to the Lyell McEwin Hospital (Mr Venn), about information supplied to Mr Venn by the Health Commission, directly contradict information provided to Parliament by the Minister of Health and, if so, what action does he intend to take? In a statement in another place on 27 August, the Minister claimed it had been the Health Commission which had revealed falsification of financial records by the hospital, after Mr Venn had failed to do so. The Minister said, in relation to the Health Commission's investigation:

It was their work which revealed that bank reconciliations had been fabricated over at least the two previous years.

However, in his letter dated yesterday, Mr Venn states:

At no stage was there any indication whatsoever from any officer of the Health Commission relating to the falsification of the outstanding cheque list of the bank reconciliation or the falsification of monthly expenditure returns lodged by the Health Service to the Health Commission.

This is another example of the Minister's version of the facts being totally at odds with documented evidence provided by Mr Venn.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only refer the Deputy Leader to the answer that I gave a moment ago to the Leader of the Opposition. I will certainly undertake to investigate these matters.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING DIVISION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister responsible for services and supply say what surplus was generated in the State Printing Division for the financial year just ended? I understand that changes made at the Government Printing Office in the late 1970s have resulted in greater efficiency and that

by the 1984-85 financial year the figures had moved well and truly into the black. Also, I should be grateful if the Minister could provide information on the quantity of work completed by the Document Reproduction Centre at the Government Printing Office.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for alerting me to the fact that he intended to ask this question because, obviously, I would not have the figures with me otherwise. I acknowledge the long and honourable service given by the honourable member to the printing industry in South Australia over many years, a record that explains his continued interest in the betterment not only of the Government Printing Office but also of the printing industry generally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Bragg.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The information I have been able to ascertain for the honourable member on the operation and performance of the Government Printing Office is good news, although I am a little hesitant to announce it to the House for reasons that I will explain presently. In 1984-85, the Government Printing Division made a surplus after allowance had been made for an extraordinary one-off item, the inclusion of which would be unfair if one wanted to judge the year in terms of economic results. On a total income of \$17 million, the financial surplus was \$386 000.

I should now say why I hesitated in being the bearer of good news concerning a Government enterprise: the extraordinary or abnormal item in last year's figure was the one-off provision for all long service leave entitlements, amounting to over \$1 million, which was included in that single year entirely for audit purposes. Therefore, in giving this figure to the House I have ignored that item. Before going into the matter of hesitancy, I will inform the House that the Document Reproduction Centre at the Government Printing Office carried out work to the total sales value of \$2 043 000. I hesitate in revealing profit results, as it can now be seen as sudden death for any Government enterprise to be making money because, when it does, according to the dry political philosophy that has become more acceptable on the other side of the House since a certain ballot last week, in such circumstances we must run the risk (if members opposite are ever in government) of having a profitable instrumentality such as the Government Printing Office sold off to private enterprise—privatised.

That would mean that, if any Government enterprise was so rash as to make a profit, it would run the risk of being sold off to private enterprise. What a position in which to put workers in the Public Service! I mention this because the members for Davenport and Mitcham might be interested in what I have to say. A profitable instrumentality is, almost by definition, ready to be sold out (perhaps 'sold off' is how members opposite would describe it) or privatised. I would not be doing the dedicated staff at the Government Printing Division any service by putting them under such an ideological threat.

One further item of information which I think is relevant to the performance of the division which is that Cabinet has agreed to a major organisational restructure, involving the abolition of nine positions, now to be made redundant, and the creation of eight new positions in the division. The idea is to be able to delegate authority and responsibility to appropriate levels. Great emphasis will be placed on marketing, with the creation of a separate marketing division. I make a final point, and this is relevant to the current community debate on public and private ownership. Again, the members for Davenport and Mitcham might be interested in hearing this, because I understand that all their

working experience has been as public servants. The former Chairman of the New South Wales Public Service Board, Wallace Wurth, in a standard textbook entitled *Public Administration in Australia*, wrote:

Individually, public servants are respected in the community. The teacher at the local school, the court officer, the postmaster, the agricultural adviser—each is accepted as performing an essential function and as being a good and worthy citizen. Collectively they are described by the press as 'bureaucrats' and are pilloried unmercifully. The press, unfortunately, is prepared to misrepresent the role of the public servant. All are loosely classified as non-producers. In other words, a compositor in the Government Printing Office engaged in setting up in print a valuable scientific work is a non-producer. His counterpart in industry who is engaged on the printing of a race book is regarded, oddly enough, as a producer.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Premier agree that the statement made by the former external auditor of the Lyell McEwin Hospital concerning information given to the Chairman of the Hospital Board by the Health Commission totally contradicts information given to Parliament by the Minister of Health and, if so, what action does the Premier intend to take?

On 28 August the Minister of Health told the other place that when the Health Commission became aware of the financial mismanagement at the Lyell McEwin Hospital it informed the Chairman of the hospital board. The Minister said, 'The facts were reported to the Chairman of the board of management.' However, in his letter, dated yesterday, the external auditor, Mr Venn, revealed that this did not occur. Referring to a meeting that he had had with the Chairman of the board on 27 October 1983 to discuss falsification of financial records to cover up mismanagement, Mr Venn has written, 'The board Chairman stated that he was not aware of any of the matters that were advised.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have nothing to add to the previous answers that I have given to members of the Opposition, who are displaying incredible flexibility. Obviously they had a plethora of issues about which they want to ask questions. Having answered the Leader of the Opposition's question on this matter I have indicated what I will do. However, virtually identical questions have been asked subsequently, and there are probably one or two more. That is fine.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Listen to members opposite shout. That is interesting. Rather than members opposite wasting the time of the Parliament by repeatedly and needlessly asking questions to which they know the answers, I would be quite happy for them to pass over their typed sheets, and I will take the matters raised into consideration in the course of the inquiries I make.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I warn the member for Mawson and the honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In the meantime, there might perhaps be one or two other matters of urgent public interest that the Opposition could consider, thus save them wasting the time of the House in this way.

EMERGENCY RESCUE APPARATUS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Chief Secretary, advise as to the likelihood of the Government purchasing emergency multiple person rescue

apparatus similar to that currently in use in Canada? An article appearing in *Canada Today* volume 4 No. 5 under the heading 'Rescue craft' states:

Seventy-eight people died when a commercial jet crashed into the icy Potomac in Washington, D.C., in 1982, and the tragedy started Jim Bradley thinking. Conventional helicopters use a single winch or net to rescue people one at a time. Bradley designed a single, sturdy, collapsible raft which can lift as many as twenty. The device, EMPRA (for emergency multiple person rescue apparatus), is an open ring net that can be slung from a helicopter or a ship's crane. When lowered, the top flotation ring settles down almost flush with the water and weakened survivors can roll or be rolled aboard.

The raft comes in three models capable of lifting six, twelve or twenty people. They cost \$6 900, \$8 900 and \$10 200, and have already been bought by ten major oil companies and the Canadian Department of National Defence.

It has been suggested to me that this equipment may have application in times of bushfire rescues, use along our vast South Australian coastline for helicopter rescue operations involving intrastate and overseas shipping and overseas aircraft and, also, recreational fishing craft.

Earlier this year I wrote to the Deputy Premier's predecessor and my letter stated:

It would seem to me that this equipment is worthy of further investigation for use by our State Wales helicopter should the necessity arise to rescue not only small craft that may get into difficulties off the vast coastline of this State, but could also be of assistance should interstate or overseas trading vessels' crews require rescuing in any kind of seas. Trusting that this information is worthy of practical application for our Emergency Services and/or worthy of being brought to the attention of your federal counterparts.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am aware of the honourable member's interest in this matter and also that, as a result of his approaches to my predecessor, work has been undertaken regarding the possibility of the acquisition of this equipment. At this stage I do not have anything specific to give to the House. I will take this matter up with the Police Department and bring down a report.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Even though he does not seem to like receiving these questions today, will the Premier take immediate action to protect the professional reputation of the former external auditor to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Mr D.J. Venn? In his letter delivered yesterday to the Government and the Opposition, Mr Venn has stated (and I quote):

That my professional reputation has been unfairly tarnished as a result of certain memorandums tabled in Parliament together with numerous statements made under parliamentary privilege. It is the view of my legal advisers that certain of the statements made under the protection of parliamentary privilege would otherwise constitute formal action for slander.

These are references to allegations by the Minister of Health that it was the work of Health Commission officers which finally uncovered financial mismanagement at the hospital after Mr Venn had failed to do so. This is just the latest of many examples that we all know about in which the Minister of Health has been prepared to malign the reputations of people who have no adequate opportunity to defend themselves. A most serious allegation has been made against an auditor who acted in good faith for an agency of the government. In view of the evidence that Mr Venn has now provided, the Premier must take immediate action—

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I have said in answer to other questions on this topic, I will certainly look into the matter. I must admit that I am staggered by the member for Davenport's new found concern about what the use of

parliamentary privilege may or may not do to somebody's reputation. I would have thought that a quick scan of *Hansard* over the years that the honourable member has been here would reveal very many matters raised in this Chamber by that same member under the protection of parliamentary privilege, one as recently as a couple of weeks ago. It is quite extraordinary, but I guess that he got the question down the line, so he cannot be blamed for that. If there are other questions in relation to this matter, please give them to me and do not waste the time of this House.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Children's Services provide a report to the House on the staffing and operations of the Children's Services Office, which came into effect on 1 July? Concern has been expressed to me that staffing numbers in the Children's Services Office should reflect the needs of the kindergarten sector. Concern has also been similarly expressed by the child-care sector. Can the Minister allay these concerns?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I certainly can allay the concerns that the honourable member has heard about, and will do so in a few moments. First, I will give the House an updated account of what has been happening in relation to staffing of the Children's Services Office. In so doing, I take this opportunity to give my personal commendation to the staff of that office who have done such a magnificent job in a short time in getting that office operational, getting the spirit of the legislation put into place, and starting to work on the kinds of projects and developments that we believe are so important in the children's services arena. This is done against a backdrop of a number of possible problems, one being some carping from certain quarters over recent months designed to undermine the spirit of the children's services legislation. The Opposition had its part to play in that.

Then, of course, there have been the financial problems facing the Government as a result of the cutbacks in preschool funding from the Federal Government which this State Government has made up. Although it is a significant sum of money, all it really does is maintain the line. It would have been nice to have that money to expand into new initiatives. These are some of the problems that this office has had to cope with.

Members will know that the Director of the Children's Services Office, Mr Brenton Wright, has been appointed and is working well in that position. Ten senior positions were filled before the opening day of that office on 1 July. Those positions consist of a Director, three Assistant Directors, and six Regional Managers.

In addition, all the administrative and project staff from the former Kindergarten Union and the relevant sections of the Department for Community Welfare have been relocated on the second floor of the Education Centre at 31 Flinders Street, where they are working well. The further positions that have been progressively filled have been senior positions (consultants and project officer positions and regional adviser positions) within the central office—and the various regional offices of the Children's Services Office.

There has been concern expressed by the child-care and preschool community about the balance of appointments made. I can advise the House that, of the 10 appointments so far in the regional adviser position, seven have preschool training and the others have various categories of training, including child-care experience. I believe that that has taken account of the diversity of needs within the Children's Services Office. It looks at this stage as though we will be expanding by one the number of regional advisers, with

particular attention to the child-care arena, to take further account of that important area of work of the Children's Services Office.

As to the regional officer of the CSO, I can advise what has happened there. We have already resolved the location of the offices. The northern metropolitan region is based at Salisbury; the southern metropolitan region is based at Morphett Vale; the northern country region is based at Port Augusta; and the southern country region is based at Mount Gambier. We expect to finalise the eastern metropolitan and the western metropolitan (based in the Woodville area) regions reasonably soon. Significant progress is being made in getting the Children's Services Office up and running. It is an exciting time for preschool, child-care and other early childhood services in this State.

The officers of the CSO have taken the matter up in a spirit of enthusiasm about the work ahead. I am sure that the South Australian community would wish the office well in what it is doing. As a result, we will see the sound lead that we in South Australia have established in so many of these areas right around the nation not only maintained, but advanced quite significantly.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier take action to bring to the attention of the Auditor-General the letter dated yesterday from the former external auditor to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which shows a cover-up of financial mismanagement at the hospital, and will he in the mean time also stand down the Minister of Health?

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule this question out of order on two grounds: first, it is repeating in substance questions that have already been asked—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader. I disallow it on two grounds: first, it is repeating in substance questions already asked; and, secondly, it is a slight variation on questions on the same point.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I am not sure who rose first. I think it was the Deputy.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must bring up his reasons in writing.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Double cover-up.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On what basis, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable gentleman is taking a point of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, I asked on what basis I was warned.

The SPEAKER: I warned the honourable member because the implication of his remark was that the Chair was somehow implicated in a cover-up.

I now have before me a disagreement with a ruling, signed by the honourable Deputy, which states:

I move disagreement to your ruling, as it is a quite different question to others as have been asked by the Opposition Party.

Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, I move this resolution in view of the fact that you could not have grasped what was the

subject matter of the questions asked by the Opposition today. Let us start with your ruling out of order the question by the member for Light. The record will indicate that the member for Light was asking whether the Premier would take action to bring to the Auditor-General's notice the letter, dated yesterday, received by the Opposition and by the Government. That question is a clear request to the Premier, as Leader of this Government, to draw to the Auditor-General's attention the letter, the subject on which the member for Light was questioning.

I had all the other questions before me, and the record in due course will indicate precisely that the questions asked were along the lines of whether the Premier would agree with the obvious contradiction in the answers given to Parliament by the Minister of Health in relation to this question and the facts as outlined quite clearly and extensively by Mr Venn, who has been the subject of a vicious attack and adds to the lengthening list of public spirited citizens in this State who have been attacked by that vicious Minister of Health.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to resume his seat. The Deputy Leader is disagreeing with a ruling: that does not give him a licence to commence a debate on the rights or wrongs of what the auditor in question did. He must direct his disagreement to the questions at issue and to the final ruling given.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: However, not by the wildest stretch of the imagination or the most intricate of mental gymnastics could one ever come to the conclusion which you, Mr Speaker, have come to today, namely, that the question asked by the member for Light as to whether the Premier would bring to the attention of the Auditor-General the contents of the letter is the same question as, slightly similar to or even a variation of a series of questions asked by Opposition members, which questions have been to the obvious discomfiture of the Premier. The first question asked by Opposition members:

Will the Premier agree that these statements by the former external auditor about the extent of the Health Commission's knowledge of financial management of the hospital show that the Minister of Health misled Parliament?

How can one ever come to the conclusion that that is the same question as, 'Will the Premier ask the Auditor-General to examine the letter?'

Mr Olsen: The Auditor-General hadn't been mentioned before.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he had not. Another question, and by the member for Torrens, was:

Does the Premier agree that a statement by the former auditor of the Lyell McEwin Hospital concerning information given to the Chairman of the hospital board by the Health Commission totally contradicts the information given to Parliament by the Minister of Health?

That is another statement indicating a complete contradiction between the statements of Mr Venn and the Minister of Health (whom, according to the ruling, Mr Speaker, I cannot further discuss). The member for Davenport asked:

Will the Premier take immediate action to protect the professional reputation of Mr Venn?

That is a completely separate topic. So, we have the question whether the Premier agrees that there is an obvious disparity between what the Minister of Health has said and what Mr Venn has said in defence of his reputation—a question asked by me in relation to conflicting statements by Mr Venn and the Minister of Health. The obvious contradiction was referred to in a question asked by the member for Torrens. Finally, in the last of a series of questions, the member for Light, having got no satisfactory response at all from the obviously nonplussed Premier, rightly rose in his place and asked the Premier to do something about it.

The honourable member asked the Premier whether he would bring the letter to the attention of the Auditor-General whom, I understand, the Minister sought to suggest was involved. He asked that proper question, which was completely different in all respects from the earlier questions: whether he would draw it to the attention of the Auditor-General with a view to getting at the facts of the matter. Is Mr Venn or the Minister telling untruths? That is what it is all about. That is the nub of the issue. In his own defence, Mr Venn, as any Australian citizen has the right to do, has written a lengthy response to the statements which he obviously read in *Hansard* or in press reports, following an earlier debate in that place where he was maligned. That has frequently happened to numerous other citizens of this State. Mr Venn's reputation has been impugned. He sent a letter to the Government, I believe last evening, but whether or not it has got bogged down in the Minister's office I do not know. However, he sent it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to get back to the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am just filling in the picture so that we can see the context of the questions and to indicate even more clearly that one could not get anything more different on the topic than was the question asked by the member for Light.

Therefore, in this context we have asked a series of questions. I suggest that, if there were any similarity between any two of those questions, one might, by some stretch of the imagination, have been able to see some connection between my question and that of the member for Torrens. They contained different quotations but, in essence, both my question and that of the member for Torrens indicated a grave disparity between the information given to the Parliament by the Minister of Health and the lengthy, detailed, logical statement, setting out the sequence of events, which was given by Mr Venn in his own defence.

By some stretch of the imagination, one may have seen some connection between my question and that of the member for Torrens but, by no stretch of the imagination could one ever imagine that the question of the member for Light asking for the material to be given to the Auditor-General could be construed—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Just like the aquatic centre.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is consistent with questions on other topics that have been embarrassing to the Government, for instance, questions asked on the aquatic centre. In that regard, unsatisfactory answers were given by the Government, and we asked that the matter be referred to the Auditor-General. It was so referred, and in due course the Auditor-General indicated that there had been an enormous escalation of costs and wastage of money on that project.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, to reconsider your ruling, because by no stretch of the imagination could one agree with your ruling that the question asked by the member for Light could in any way be construed as the same as or even similar to the questions asked previously. If the House were to uphold your ruling, it would be impossible to pursue any subject in this place with more than one question. That would be the logical consequence of such a ruling. If an Opposition, or a Government for that matter, wished to pursue, with a series of questions in this place, any topic, and a ruling such as you have just given—

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): It is traditional for Oppositions to regard Question Time as an important part of the parliamentary program which they treasure highly, because it gives Opposition members an

opportunity to question the Government on its program and on matters of the day. Having just listened to the splitting of semantic hairs by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and to his genius for prolixity, I can only assume that the value that is traditionally placed on Question Time by the Opposition has been given up by honourable gentlemen opposite. Members on this side want to ask questions, but I can only assume, from the way in which the honourable member took up the whole of his time on this matter, that there are people on the other side who are not very much interested in having questions answered.

I draw to the attention of the House a circular which you, Mr Speaker, sent to all members on 15 October last year and in which you listed those questions that, according to Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* (20th Edition), pages 337-344, are regarded as inadmissible questions, including questions which repeat in substance questions already answered or to which an answer has been refused, and questions multiplied with slight variations on the same point.

I ask the House to set aside this splitting of semantic hairs and to apply the test of reasonableness: what would a reasonable person say about the series of questions that have been asked this afternoon? There is little doubt that there has been a high degree of repetition such as would place them within the verbiage that I have just quoted. I believe that the Chair was perfectly fair in allowing the questions up to that point and that we had reached the stage where clearly repetition was all too obvious. I therefore ask the House to reject the motion.

The SPEAKER: If I may make a 20 second observation: it will be obvious, when *Hansard* is read, that this will be seen as a series of questions multiplied with slight variations on the one point.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Blacker and Mathwin, Noes—Messrs Mayes, Peterson, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

QUESTION TIME RESUMED

SERVICES TO PROPERTIES

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Acting Attorney-General give consideration to requiring vendors of residential land to provide the purchaser of land with a statement relating to the availability of mains water and electricity supplies in cases where these services are not connected to a property at the time of sale? Over the past few months a number of cases have been drawn to my attention where prospective purchasers of land have been assured that water and/or electricity services will be available to service a property, but following purchase the buyers have discovered that these services either are not available or will be provided only after long delays. It would be of considerable benefit to people in this situation if the Land and Business Agents Act required that a vendor must include a statement from the relevant authorities concerning the availability of water

and power to properties where these basic services are not connected to the property at the time of sale.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which concerns a matter of importance in the community, particularly at present with the unprecedented demand for blocks of land on which to build houses, resulting from the incredibly effective incentives that have been provided by both the current State and Federal Governments to first home builders. Because many allotments are unserviced, services must be provided urgently, and this has caused some backlog and delays in providing them. Whether the appropriate method of advising consumers is to expand the requirements for providing information in section 90 statements under the Land and Business Agents Act, or whether it should be by some other means, that will need to be the subject of investigation. However, I will be pleased to have this matter looked at by the relevant authorities, first by the Land and Business Agents Board and by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

I shall also refer the matter to the Attorney-General for his consideration, in order to determine an appropriate vehicle whereby consumers can be advised when necessary services can be provided to their allotments. They can then make decisions in relation to building a home and also make other important arrangements with respect to leaving their existing premises, and so on, in accordance with the knowledge made available to them at the most appropriate time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: OPPOSITION LEADER'S STAFF

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

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: In his ministerial statement this afternoon the Deputy Premier accused the Opposition of using confidential information from the Police Force—which it has not done—and of jeopardising criminal investigations and frustrating police inquiries—which it has not done. Neither suggestion is made in the minute from the Acting Commissioner of Police, although the Deputy Premier has chosen to exaggerate the contents of that minute, for what can only be described as Party political reasons, and nothing more.

The incident mentioned by the Deputy Premier was the subject of a question asked by the Opposition on 21 August. It was the Minister of Community Welfare who had revealed the day before that a man had been arrested—so there was no breach of confidentiality and no investigation was jeopardised as a result of the Opposition's raising that matter.

The question asked on 28 August related to a person who had been charged and dealt with by the courts. That information was provided to the member for Coles not by Mr Symons: it came from sources not connected with the Police Force. I invite the Deputy Premier to check the veracity of that statement by means of a phone call to the member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to resume his seat. All honourable members now know where they stand under the new guidelines. If this behaviour continues, I will take the appropriate steps, regardless of which side of the House it involves. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: In the second case to which I referred, again there was no use of confidential information and certainly no investigation was put in jeopardy, because the relevant investigations had already been completed. Given those facts, I reject entirely the Deputy Premier's conclusion that

I directed not a press secretary but a liaison officer of my staff to undertake a course of action which could have risked the excellent reputation of the South Australian Police Force.

Regarding the agreement to the secondment of Mr Symons, this is the first time that I have been made aware of any problems with implementing that agreement so far as the Police Force is concerned. While the Acting Commissioner suggested in his minute that this matter should be taken up with me and Mr Symons, the Deputy Premier has rejected that advice and instead has chosen to raise the matter in this House in a way which completely misrepresented the facts. As far as I am concerned, Mr Symons has been directing inquiries officially to, first, the Commissioner's office, and he will continue to do so. In fact, Mr Symons last had contact with the Commissioner's office a fortnight ago, and he was able to provide some information which I believe was of assistance to the Police Force.

I want to say one further thing about the way in which the Deputy Premier has attempted to malign Mr Symons today. Honourable members, and you in particular, Mr Speaker, will recall an incident in the public gallery earlier this year which was a potential threat to members of this place—and which, by the action he took at the time, was prevented by Mr Symons from developing into an ugly situation. But did we hear any praise from the Government in relation to that matter? Of course we did not, and yet the Government is now prepared to attack Mr Symons on completely unfounded grounds. We are becoming used to this type of behaviour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the honourable Leader a fair opportunity to defend his staff member, but he is now clearly debating the issue. I ask the Leader to heed Standing Orders and get back to the matter before the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: It is not the reputation of Mr Symons being put on the line by the Deputy Premier's statement today but, in fact, the Deputy Premier's reputation. We are becoming used to this type of behaviour from an increasingly desperate Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank you, Sir, and also the House for its indulgence. I wish to make a couple of points relating to what the Leader of the Opposition has just said to the House. First, it is not clear to me whether the commitment which I seek and which, by inference, the Acting Police Commissioner seeks, has in fact been given, because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in effect contradicts what the Acting Police Commissioner has put to me. He has not made it clear that what the Acting Police Commissioner identifies as an inappropriate way of contacting police officers will discontinue; in effect, he has said that that has not happened. Members must decide whether they will believe the Acting Police Commissioner or whether they will believe the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: His statement makes perfectly clear that inappropriate contact has occurred with police officers—contact which is in breach of the agreement that was reached with the Opposition when Mr Symons was employed. The second point about this whole muddy area as to the nature of his employment is that it is quite clear that Mr Symons is employed as a press secretary. The papers which I tabled in this House this afternoon include a witnessed document of 30 January 1985 in which it states:

I, Michael Douglas Symons, acknowledge and accept the above terms and conditions of my secondment from the South Australia Police Department to the position of Press Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

I simply ask, in the light of the information which has been placed before me by the Acting Commissioner of Police, that Mr Symons, at the instruction of his boss, operates in a way which was clearly understood when he first undertook that position.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish principles governing management and employment in the public sector; to provide for the proper supervision and review of management structures and practices in the public sector; to provide for and regulate employment in the Public Service; to repeal the Public Service Act 1967; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It establishes principles governing management and employment in the public sector. It provides for the proper supervision and review of management structures and practices in the public sector; regulates employment in the Public Service; and repeals the Public Service Act 1967. The Government sees the public sector as an important partner in the development of the South Australian economy and in providing vital services to the community as a whole. It is clear that the overall health and performance of the public sector are of fundamental importance in maintaining the well-being of the community.

The South Australian Public Service has by any standards served all Governments and the South Australian community well. It has consistently been viewed across Australia as of the highest professional quality. Over the years, the Public Service has had to adapt and respond to changing pressures put on it. Since 1967, when the current Public Service Act came into force, the community has demanded a greater range of Government assistance and services, and the complexity of government has increased. Government priorities and community concerns have increasingly placed a premium on the ability of the Public Service to respond quickly and sensitively to such changing demands. At the same time, the Government and the community have clearly indicated to public sector managers that value for money must be a prime measuring stick for Government performance. In this context, the 1967 Act and the institutions and procedures that it created require an overhaul.

Acknowledgement of the need for reform does not denigrate the fine work of the Public Service Board and departments and the advances in personnel and other key facets of management that they have instigated. Indeed, the South Australian Public Service Board has led the way in a number of areas of personnel management. Nevertheless, an examination of legislative requirements for a more modern and vigorous Public Service points to a number of specific deficiencies. There are currently no overriding directions for the management of public sector operations. Present arrangements have generated a clutter of procedures that have invited avoidance by departments. Departments have, until recently, had limited personnel and related powers to pursue their responsibilities effectively. The provisions of the Bill have been framed in the interests of streamlining and making far more effective the management of Govern-

ment operations. They also seek to eliminate obstacles to performance. The provisions are directed at meeting the interests of efficient, effective and responsible government. They will form a basis for firm directions in government, opportunities for greater initiative by departments, continuous improvements in performance, career challenges for public servants, enhancing the job satisfaction of employees and engendering a greater sense of responsibility to the community.

The new legislation will bring South Australia back to the forefront of administrative reform. In formulating the Bill, the Government has drawn substantially on the findings and recommendations of the Review of Public Service Management. The review was established in July 1983 and reported finally in February this year. In conducting its activities, the review consulted extensively and tested successfully a number of its recommendations with pilot operations in a range of departments. The committee which conducted that review was unanimous in its proposals for change, and an important feature of those proposals was the support given to them in many quarters—senior management, staff, and members of the community. The essential message that can be derived from this support is that the reforms are well-based, they address the right issues, they are well-balanced, they are long overdue, and they will provide a positive framework for the future operations of the public sector.

The major features of the Bill that I wish to bring to the attention of the House are as follows. The Bill incorporates for the first time in such legislation in this State general principles of public administration, personnel management and conduct of public sector employees. These principles provide a set of general standards which will be required to be observed by virtually all publicly owned bodies. They will provide a clear context for the management and operations of Government. It is intended that the only bodies that will be excluded are Government-owned commercial enterprises operating on a competitive basis in the marketplace. The principles emphasise responsiveness to changes in Government policy, streamlined decision-making, delegation of powers down organisational hierarchies, continuous improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations, and proper standards of financial management. They also provide for modern personnel practices, appointment on merit, equal employment opportunity, prohibition of unlawful discrimination, and a right to worthwhile and constructive employment and to health and safety in employment.

The Government is making a concerted effort to improve the accountability and reporting standards of Government agencies, which will all be required to report promptly to Parliament each year. Substantial changes have been made to the structure and organisation of the Public Service's central management and personnel functions. A Government management board will be established to provide effective support to Cabinet and to implement Government-wide management policies and standards. It will provide advice on major management issues and co-ordinate a sustained program of management improvement. The board will report to the Premier. The membership of the board will consist of the Commissioner for Public Employment, a nominee of the United Trades and Labour Council and other persons with appropriate knowledge and experience in public sector management. There will be scope for membership from the private sector. The board's key role involves oversight of the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations. It will conduct investigations (either at the request of Ministers or in its own right) and devise and implement programs of management improvement. The scope of the board's activities extends to the whole public sector.

The Bill establishes an office of Commissioner for Public Employment. The Commissioner will be appointed for a renewable term of five years and will be supported by a Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations. The Commissioner will have statutory responsibilities for supervising the integrity, equity and quality of personnel practices and for promoting a range of improvements in personnel management. These personnel initiatives will include provision of assistance to chief executive officers in making the most effective use of staff within departments and occupational groups, appointment and reassignment of senior managers, development of management training programs, and development and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs. The Commissioner will have clear reporting lines to the Parliament on any misuse of personnel powers within Government departments.

A significant change to present arrangements for exercising personnel management powers involves the devolution of responsibility and authority to chief executive officers. The legislation also makes it clear that, except where specific powers are vested in a chief executive officer by a separate statute they will be responsible to the appropriate Minister for the effective and efficient management of their organisations within the context of Government policy. Human resources are the most important ingredient of sound administration and the devolution of powers to chief executive officers will promote greater flexibility in exercising personnel decisions, thus diminishing the present time-consuming and expensive arrangements involving the Public Service Board, Cabinet and the Governor in Executive Council.

The Bill provides for chief executive officers to be appointed for a term not exceeding five years (with eligibility for reappointment) either under Public Service terms and conditions or on negotiated conditions. Existing chief executive officers will retain their present classification levels and associated remuneration but will lose tenure on their existing positions, starting five year terms from the date of proclamation of the legislation. Chief executive officers who are not reappointed at the end of their terms will be reassigned to other positions in the public service.

While it is expected that chief executive officers will manage their responsibilities properly, there is a provision in the Bill for the Governor to withdraw the powers of a chief executive officer, partly or wholly, on the recommendation of the Commissioner for Public Employment, should circumstances warrant it. The present permanent and temporary categories of employment will remain. There will also be provision for appointments to be made on negotiated conditions, allowing some flexibility in overall employment packages. It is not intended that this provision will be used extensively but it will provide flexibility, particularly where specialist expertise is required for urgent work or limited term projects.

The Bill provides that employees will be appointed to the Public Service at a classification level and initially assigned to a position within an administrative unit. Employees will then move from one position to another by a process of reassignment. The majority of reassignments will occur following normal promotion processes of application and selection on merit, although there is provision for reassignments to be made without application to enhance mobility and to make the deployment and redeployment processes more flexible. These more flexible provisions will apply especially to senior officers who should be considered to be a resource available to the Public Service as a whole.

The provisions for the appointment, classification and reassignment of employees within the Public Service seek to overcome the many rigidities in present procedures. The process of creating and abolishing positions will involve less

formality than at present. Chief Executive Officers will be empowered to create and abolish positions below senior management level and to make appointments or reassignments to them. The Commissioner for Public Employment will exercise such powers in relation to senior managers, except chief executive officers who will be appointed by the Governor. Appointment and reassignment procedures will involve broadened and strengthened merit criteria enabling applicants' potential and relevant community experience to be taken into account. Appointments made on merit after seeking and considering applications will remain the normal selection process.

Express provision has been made relating to the conduct of employees, declaration and resolution of conflicts of interest (particularly pecuniary), and discipline. Government employees and the community will be assisted by a clearer delineation of appropriate standards of conduct and the legislation will be supported by a prescribed code for public servants.

Changes to appeals procedures are consistent with streamlined personnel processes while maintaining adequate protection for employees. Classification appeals will be heard by a new Classification Review Panel chaired by the Commissioner for Public Employment or delegate. An independent Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal will be established and disciplinary appeals matters will be heard by a separate Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal headed by a judicial officer. The review panel and the tribunals all have provision for the membership of nominees from recognised industrial organisations.

Finally, the Bill enables the coverage of its detailed personnel provisions to be extended wholly or partly to employees of statutory authorities. No such authorities have yet been identified and it is intended that any future moves will only be made after consultation between interested parties.

Mr Speaker, this is historic reforming legislation in public administration, and I would like to pay a tribute to the Review of Public Service Management headed by the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Bruce Guerin, and his team for their work, which has enabled this legislation to be presented to the Parliament. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clause of the bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the Public Service Act, 1967. Clause 4—Attention of honourable members is drawn to following definitions -

“administrative unit” is defined as an administrative structure in which persons are employed and established or continued in existence under the proposed Act as a department or other administrative unit;

“public employee” is described as a person appointed to the Public Service or employed by the Crown or a State instrumentality—this definition and the definitions of “public sector” and “public sector operations” are principally relevant to the provisions of Division I of Part II of the Bill which establish general principles governing management and employment in the public sector:

“public sector” is defined as all government agencies (that is, administrative units and State instrumentalities) and public employees and the operations and activities carried on by government agencies and public employees;

“State instrumentality” is described as an agency or instrumentality of the Crown and includes any body corporate established by or under an Act which is

comprised of persons appointed by the Governor, a Minister or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown and is subject to control or direction by a Minister; holds its property on behalf of the Crown; or is declared by proclamation to be a State instrumentality. The term does not include an administrative unit; the State Bank of South Australia; the State Government Insurance Commission; or a body excluded by proclamation.

Under the clause, all appointments to the Public Service are to be regarded as having been made on behalf of the Crown and all persons appointed to the Public Service are to be regarded as employees of the Crown. Part II, comprising clauses 5 to 17, deals with the administration of the public sector. Division I, comprising clauses 5 to 7, deals with general principles.

Clause 5 sets out principles of public administration to be observed in the public sector—

- (a) the public sector is to be structured and organized so as to achieve and maintain operational responsiveness and flexibility;
- (b) Government agencies are to be structured and administered so as to enable decisions to be made and action taken without excessive formality or delay;
- (c) administrative responsibilities are to be clearly defined and authority sufficiently delegated to ensure that those to whom responsibilities are assigned have adequate authority to deal with those responsibilities;
- (d) government agencies are to have as their goal a continued improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of their performance;
- (e) resources are to be efficiently and effectively used;
- (f) proper standards of financial management and accounting are to be observed at all times.

Clause 6 sets out the principles of personnel management to be observed in the public sector—

- (a) selection processes are to be based on a proper assessment of merit (“selection processes” and “merit” being defined in clause 4);
- (b) no power is to be exercised on the basis of nepotism or patronage;
- (c) employees are to be treated fairly and not subjected to arbitrary administrative acts;
- (d) there is to be no unlawful discrimination on the grounds of sex, sexuality, marital status, pregnancy, race, physical impairment or any other ground, against employees or persons seeking employment nor is there to be any other form of unjustifiable discrimination;
- (e) employees are to have equal opportunities of promotion and advancement;
- (f) employees are to be employed in worthwhile and constructive employment and be afforded access to training and development;
- (g) employees are to have proper avenues of redress against improper administrative acts;
- (h) employees are to be provided with safe and healthy working conditions;
- (i) employees are to be remunerated at rates commensurate with their responsibilities.

Subclauses (2), (3) and (4) provide for equal employment opportunity programmes to be established by the Minister. Under any such programme, preference may be given to young people, or persons of a defined class disproportionately represented amongst the unemployed, in securing employment in the public sector, or to persons of a defined class with a view to enabling them to compete for other

positions or pursue careers in the public sector as effectively as other persons not of that class.

Clause 7 sets out principles of conduct to be observed by employees—

- (a) employees are to comply with provisions of this and any other Act governing their conduct;
- (b) employees are to be conscientious in the performance of official duties and scrupulous in the use of official information, equipment and facilities;
- (c) employees are to exercise proper courtesy, consideration and sensitivity in their dealings with the public or fellow employees;
- (d) employees are not to conduct themselves in their private capacity in a manner that would reflect seriously and adversely on their employers or fellow employees.

Division II, comprising clause 8, deals with reporting obligations of government agencies.

Clause 8 provides that each Government agency shall make a yearly report within 3 months of the end of the financial year, to the Minister responsible for the agency. The report is to contain such information as is required by regulation. Subclause (5) provides that the Minister shall cause copies of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament within 12 sitting days after receiving the report.

Division III, comprising clauses 9 to 17, deals with the Government Management Board. Clause 9 establishes the Government Management Board. Clause 10 provides for the appointment of not more than 6 members of the Board. One shall be the Commissioner and the remainder shall be appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall be nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council and the remainder to be persons who in the opinion of the Governor have appropriate knowledge and experience in the area of management. Clause 11 sets out the conditions on which a member of the Board holds office. The member is appointed for a term not exceeding 3 years and may be removed from office for the usual reasons including misconduct. A member is also eligible for re-appointment. Clause 12 sets out the procedure to be followed at meetings of the Board.

Clause 13 provides that proceedings of the Board may be conducted in public or private, at the discretion of the Board. Clause 14 provides that proceedings of the Board are not invalid by reason of a vacancy in its membership or defect in appointment of a member.

Clause 15 sets out the functions of the board—

- (a) to keep all aspects of management in the public sector under review and advise Ministers of policies, practices and procedures to be applied to the management of public sector operations;
- (b) to advise Ministers of structural changes that will in the opinion of the board improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public sector operations;
- (c) to recommend or carry out necessary planning for the future of the public sector;
- (d) to review the efficiency or effectiveness of any aspect of public sector operations;
- (e) to devise in cooperation with Government agencies programmes and initiatives for management improvement and recommend their implementation;
- (f) to carry out any other functions assigned by the Minister.

Subclause (2) provides that the board may investigate any matter within or affecting any government agency in carrying out its functions. Clause 16 enables the board to delegate any of its powers or functions. Clause 17 provides that the board shall submit a report at the end of each financial year to the Minister on the work of the Board and

in particular any significant improvements in management or major changes to the structure of the public sector. Subclause (3) provides that copies of the report shall be laid before each House of Parliament.

Part III comprises the remaining clauses of the Bill and deals with the Public Service. Division I, comprising clauses 18 and 19, deals with the structure of the Public Service. Clause 18 provides that the Public Service consists of administrative units and that all public employees are unless excluded from the Public Service under schedule 2 of the Bill to be employed in positions in administrative units. Subclause (2) enables the Governor by proclamation to establish, alter or abolish an administrative unit. Subclause (3) empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to incorporate a group of public employees (not forming part of the Public Service) into an administrative unit.

Clause 19 provides for an administrative unit of the Public Service that consists of or includes unattached positions and in relation to which the Commissioner is to have the powers and functions of a chief executive officer. Subclause (2) provides that where an administrative unit is abolished by proclamation, and no transfer of positions in the administrative unit is provided for, the positions become unattached positions in that administrative unit.

Division II comprises clauses 20 to 31 and deals with the Commissioner for Public Employment. Clause 20 provides that there shall be a Commissioner for Public Employment to be appointed by the Governor. Clause 21 sets out the conditions of appointment of the Commissioner. The Commissioner is to be appointed for a term of office not exceeding 5 years and is eligible for re-appointment. The clause provides that the Commissioner may be removed from office upon an address of either House of Parliament. Subclause (5) provides that where the person appointed Commissioner is employed in the Public Service the person is entitled at the conclusion of the term of office to be re-appointed to a position in the Public Service.

Clause 22 provides that the Governor may appoint a Deputy Commissioner to act as Commissioner during the absence or suspension of the Commissioner or during a vacancy in the office. Clause 23 provides where the Commissioner has a pecuniary or personal interest in a matter which conflicts with the Commissioner's duty, the Commissioner is to disclose the nature of the interest to the Minister and not take further action in relation to the matter, unless authorized by the Minister. Clause 24 provides that the Commissioner is subject to the direction of the Minister except in relation to certain matters set out in subclause (2).

Clause 25 sets out the functions of the Commissioner—

- (a) to establish and ensure implementation of policies, practices and procedures in relation to personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service;
- (b) to determine the occupational groups within the Public Service and endeavour to maintain appropriate staffing levels within each group and assist the Chief Executive Officers in making effective use of available staff within each group;
- (c) to determine in respect of the various occupational groups, classification structures and the remuneration; payable in respect of each level within the classification and where relevant, increments of remuneration;
- (d) to determine conditions of service;
- (e) to determine criteria, standards and procedures for classification of positions;
- (f) to determine qualifications in respect of positions;
- (g) to classify senior positions in the Public Service;

- (h) to provide advisory and other services in relation to personnel management and industrial relations;
- (i) to assist in establishing and ensure the implementation of equal employment opportunity programmes;
- (j) to establish and implement programmes of management training and staff development;
- (k) to assist in recruitment, deployment and redeployment of employees;
- (l) to investigate or assist in the investigation of matters in connection with conduct or discipline of employees;
- (m) such other functions as assigned by the Act or Minister.

Subclause (4) provides that the Commissioner shall, for the purpose of assisting in recruitment, deployment and redeployment, have power to create and abolish unattached positions and appoint and re-assign employees.

Clause 26 enables the Commissioner to issue instructions for the carrying out of any of the functions of the Commissioner.

Clause 27 enables the Commissioner to conduct a review of an administrative unit to determine the extent to which principles of personnel management prescribed by the Act are being observed, or investigate any other aspect of personnel management. The Commissioner is required to provide a report to the chief executive officer of the administrative unit of the findings and recommendations of the Commissioner upon a review. Subclauses (3) to (5) enable the chief executive officer to report any disagreement with the Commissioner's findings to the Commissioner and enable the Commissioner to follow up any report or failure to implement the Commissioner's findings with the Minister.

Clause 28 sets out the investigative powers of the Commissioner for the purpose of making a review under clause 27 or any other investigation required by the Act. The powers of investigation are limited to public employees or former public employees and premises occupied by the Crown or a Government agency. A public employee or former public employee who fails to comply with the requirements of the Commissioner, or hinders the Commissioner, is in the case of a public employee liable to disciplinary action and, in the case of a former public employee guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding \$1,000. Clause 29 enables the Commissioner to delegate any of the powers or functions of the Commissioner.

Clause 30 provides that the Commissioner shall, so far as is practicable, notify any recognised organisation of a decision, determination or action of the Commissioner likely to affect a significant number of the members of that organization and hear any representations or argument the organization may desire to present. Clause 31 provides that the Commissioner shall, within 3 months after the end of each financial year, submit to the Minister, a report on personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service during that financial year. Subclause (3) provides that the Minister shall cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

Division III, comprising clauses 32 to 40, deals with chief executive officers. Clause 32 provides that there shall be a chief executive officer, appointed by the Governor, for each administrative unit. Clause 33 provides that the chief executive officer shall be appointed for a term not exceeding 5 years and be eligible for reappointment, or if not reappointed, be assigned a position in the Public Service. Subclause (1) paragraph (d) provides that if a person ceases to occupy a position of chief executive officer before the expi-

ration of the term of appointment, otherwise than by a prescribed process, then if the person is assigned to some other position in the Public Service they are entitled to be remunerated at a rate not less than the rate of remuneration the person would have received had they remained in the position of chief executive officer for the remainder of the term, or if not assigned to some other position in the Public Service they are entitled to be paid a sum not less than the total remuneration that would have been payable to the person if they had remained in the position of chief executive officer for the unexpired portion of the term of appointment.

Clause 34 provides that the Governor may declare that the person for the time being holding or acting in an office created by or under an Act shall have the powers and functions of chief executive officer in relation to an administrative unit. Clauses 32 and 33 do not apply in relation to an administrative unit to which a declaration under this clause relates. If no chief executive officer is appointed to an administrative unit the Commissioner shall have the powers and functions of chief executive officer until such an appointment is made.

Clause 35 provides that the chief executive officer is subject to direction by the responsible Minister except in relation to—

- (a) appointment, assignment or reassignment of a particular person;
- (b) classification of a particular position;
- (c) the holding or refraining from holding of an inquiry in relation to the discipline of a particular employee.

Clause 36 provides that the chief executive officer is responsible to the responsible Minister for the efficient and effective management of an administrative unit. Subclause (2) provides that where the functions of an administrative unit are principally to assist a State instrumentality, or holder of an office created by an Act, in the performance of statutory functions, the Governor may, by proclamation, declare that the chief executive officer shall be responsible to the State instrumentality, or holder of the statutory office, for the efficient and effective management of the unit and, in that case, the instrumentality or office holder is in turn responsible to the responsible Minister.

Clause 37 provides that the functions of a chief executive officer in relation to an administrative unit extend to—

- (a) the proper organization and the establishment of an appropriate staffing level;
- (b) the financial and other management planning;
- (c) the appropriate division of responsibilities and assignment of duties to employees;
- (d) the appropriate deployment and redeployment of resources;
- (e) the establishment of procedures to ensure the use of resources is properly controlled and audited;
- (f) the implementation of equal employment opportunity programmes and devising of initiatives to ensure equal opportunities for employees;
- (g) the establishment and implementation of management training and staff development programmes;
- (h) the implementation of health and safety programmes;
- (i) resolving or redressing grievances of employees.

Clause 38 provides that the chief executive officer shall, so far as is practicable, notify any recognised organisation of any decision or action of the chief executive officer likely to affect a significant number of members of that organization and hear any representations or argument the organization may desire to present.

Clause 39 enables the chief executive officer to delegate any of the powers or functions of the chief executive officer. Clause 40 provides that the Governor may, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, withdraw from the chief executive officer any specified power or powers conferred on the chief executive officer under the Act. Powers withdrawn from the chief executive officer will be exercisable by the Commissioner and may be restored to the chief executive officer, by the Governor, on advice of the Commissioner.

Division IV, comprising clauses 41 to 44, deals with the creation and classification of positions in the Public Service. Clause 41 provides that positions may be created and abolished in the Public Service, in the case of a senior position by the Commissioner, and in any other case by the chief executive officer of the administrative unit in which the position is comprised. Subclause (4) provides that a position shall not be abolished while occupied by an employee.

Clause 42 provides that positions in the Public Service may be reclassified at the initiative of the Commissioner, or the chief executive officer, or upon application by the employee occupying the position. The position may be reclassified by the Commissioner where—

- (a) the position is a senior position;
- (b) the position is to be reclassified to the level of a senior position;
- (c) the classification structure is varied or replaced,

or by the chief executive officer in any other case.

Clause 43 provides that all classifications and reclassifications shall be published in the *Gazette* and shall not take effect until so published. Subclause (4) excludes this clause from applying to classification of positions created for the performance of urgent work and for temporary purposes.

Clause 44 provides that the Commissioner may establish classification review panels. Panels shall consist of the Commissioner, or his delegate, an employee selected by the Commissioner from a panel of employees nominated by recognised organisations, and an employee selected by the Commissioner from a panel of employees nominated by the Commissioner. Subclause (6) provides that an employee (not being an employee occupying a senior position, a temporary employee with service of less than 12 months or an employee appointed on negotiated conditions) who has made an application for reclassification of their position and is dissatisfied with the decision upon the application may, within 30 days after receiving notice of the decision, apply to the Commissioner for a review of the classification. Where such an application is made the Commissioner shall refer it to a classification review panel, which shall afford the applicant and the chief executive officer reasonable opportunity to make submissions either orally or in writing. An applicant may be represented by an officer of a recognised organization when appearing before the panel.

Division V, comprising clauses 45 to 60, deals with employment in the Public Service. Clauses 45 to 48 deal with appointments and filling of positions. Clause 45 provides that appointments to a senior position are made by the Commissioner and appointments to any other position are made by the chief executive officer. Evidence of a person's health and physical fitness may be required before an appointment is made. Clause 46 provides that an appointment to the Public Service may be on a permanent or temporary basis, or on the basis of negotiated conditions. Subclause (2) provides that appointment on a permanent basis—

- (a) shall not be made unless a person is selected through a selection process conducted in accordance with the Act;
- (b) shall be on probation at first subject to paragraph (c);

(c) may be made without probation—

- (i) where in the opinion of the appointing authority the appointee merits appointment without probation;
- (ii) where the appointee was, immediately before the appointment, in prescribed employment;
- (iii) where appointment without probation is authorized by this or any other Act;

(d) may be terminated during the period of probation;

(e) where an employee has been on probation for 6 months or more, the appropriate authority may confirm the appointment;

(f) unless the appointment is sooner confirmed or terminated the appointment shall be deemed to have been confirmed after the employee has completed 12 months of probation; and

(g) in determining the period of probation, any period for which the employee has been absent on leave without pay shall be disregarded.

Subclause (3) provides that appointment on a temporary basis—

(a) may be made for the purpose of filling a position without seeking applications;

(b) shall not be made for the purpose of filling a position with duties of a continuing nature unless, in the opinion of the appointing authority—

(i) additional assistance is necessary for the performance of urgent work; and

(ii) it is not practicable that work be performed by an employee appointed on a permanent basis;

(c) shall be made for a term not exceeding 12 months;

(d) may be extended from time to time by the appropriate authority but not so that the aggregate period of appointment exceeds 2 years;

(e) may be terminated at any time.

Subclause (4) provides that appointment on the basis of negotiated conditions—

(a) shall not be made unless through selection processes conducted in accordance with the Act;

(b) shall not be made except by or with the approval of the Commissioner;

(c) shall not be made for the purpose of filling a position with duties of a continuing nature unless the appointing authority, after having sought applications, is of the opinion that no suitable person is available for the position who, is already an employee or, is prepared to accept employment on the terms and conditions that apply to permanent appointment;

(d) shall be for a term determined by the appointing authority; and

(e) the conditions of appointment shall prevail to the extent of any inconsistency over the provisions of the Act.

Clause 47 provides that to fill any position applications will be sought and applicants will be selected in accordance with regulations made under the Act. For the purpose of filling positions below a prescribed classification level, a pool of applicants may be established and selections made by chief executive officers from amongst applicants in the pool.

Clause 48 provides that a position may be filled by reassigning an employee to the position for the position for the time being occupied by the employee. Subclause (3) provides in relation to reassignments that do follow on from selection processes that—

- (a) no employee shall be reassigned to a position other than a position of the same classification level;

- (b) an employee may be reassigned to a position at a higher classification level for temporary purposes provided that the employee is restored to the former classification level within 3 years;
- (c) no employee shall be reassigned to a position (other than a senior position) with duties of a continuing nature except—
- (i) where in the opinion of the Commissioner or chief executive officer, as the case may be, the reassignment is necessary for the performance of urgent work—
 - (A) during the period required to conduct selection processes for the filling of the position;
 - or
 - (B) during the temporary absence of another employee;
 - (ii) where a determination has been made pursuant to clause 55 that the employee is an excess employee;
 - (iii) where a determination has been made pursuant to clause 56 that the employee is incapacitated;
 - or
 - (iv) subject to conditions determined by the Commissioner, where, in the opinion of the Commissioner or Chief Executive Officer, as the case may be, the reassignment is necessary for the purpose of—
 - (A) the training or development of the employee;
 - (B) providing the employee with wider work experience;
 - (C) effecting re-organization of the whole or part of an administrative unit;
 and
 - (v) no reassignment shall be made by the Commissioner except at the request of, or after consultation with, the Chief Executive Officer.

Clause 49 deals with Promotion Appeals. The clause provides that, where an employee has been nominated for reassignment to a vacant position, any other employee who is eligible to be reassigned and has made an application in respect of the position may, within 7 days after publication of the notice of nomination, appeal to the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal. The Tribunal on an appeal may make a declaration that the appellant should have been nominated for the reassignment, or quash the nomination; or it may order that the selection process be recommenced from the beginning or some later stage specified by the Tribunal. Subclause (4) provides that a person is not eligible for reassignment to a position if the person does not have qualifications determined by the Commissioner to be essential in respect of the position. Persons employed on a temporary basis and who have had less than 12 months continuous service in the Public Service, or who are appointed on the basis of negotiated conditions, are not entitled to appeal. By virtue of clause 47 (5) (a) there is also no appeal in respect of reassignment to a position above a prescribed classification level.

Clauses 50 to 53 deal with remuneration. Clause 50 provides that an employee shall be remunerated at a rate appropriate to the employee's classification level. Subclause (2) provides that where a person is assigned or reassigned to a position at a particular classification level, the authority making the assignment or reassignment may determine that the person is entitled to be paid a higher increment of

remuneration payable in respect of that classification level notwithstanding that a condition of payment of the increment has not been satisfied.

Clause 51 provides that where the chief executive officer directs an employee to perform duties in addition to those on which the classification level of the employee's position is based for a continuous period of more than 1 week, the chief executive officer may authorise the payment to the employee of an allowance appropriate to the duties being performed. Clause 52 provides that the Commissioner may:

- (a) determine allowances payable to employees and the circumstances in which they are payable;
- (b) determine charges payable by employees in respect of accommodation, services, goods or other benefit provided to them in connection with their employment.

Clause 53 provides that where, in consequence of furtherance of industrial action, an employee refuses or fails to carry out duties that the employee has been lawfully instructed to perform, the employee shall not, if the Commissioner so directs, be paid salary for a day or days on which the employee so refuses to carry out those duties. Subclause (2) provides that a direction under subclause (1) is effective on a day or days during which the employee performs some (but not all) the duties the employee has been lawfully instructed to perform. For the purposes of this clause "day" is defined to include "a part of a day".

Clause 54 deals with hours of duty, etc. Clause 54 provides that the hours of duty and rights of an employee to holidays and leave are contained in the fourth schedule to the Bill.

Clause 55 deals with excess employees. Clause 55 provides that the chief executive officer of an administrative unit may determine that an employee is an excess employee if the chief executive officer is satisfied that—

- (a) the position has become redundant;
- (b) the services of the employee have become underutilized by reason of changes in technology or work methods or in the organization or nature or extent of Government operations; or
- (c) the employee has lost a qualification that is necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the position.

Where the chief executive officer determines that an employee is an excess employee he shall, where the position is a senior position refer the matter to the Commissioner, and in other cases make all reasonable endeavours to reassign the employee. Where the chief executive officer is unable to reassign an employee he shall refer the matter to the Commissioner. Subclause (3) provides that where the matter is referred to the Commissioner and the Commissioner is satisfied that all reasonable endeavours have been made to reassign the employee, but that reassignment is not possible or practicable in the circumstances, then the Commissioner may recommend to the Governor that the employee either be transferred to some other position in the Public Service or retired from the Public Service. Subclause (5) provides that where an employee is transferred to a position that has a lower level of remuneration, the employee shall be entitled to supplementation of the employee's remuneration in accordance with the relevant provisions of an award or industrial agreement or, where there is no award or industrial agreement covering the matter, in accordance with a scheme prescribed by the regulations made under the proposed Act.

Clause 56 deals with mental or physical incapacity. Clause 56 provides that where it appears to the appropriate authority that an employee is, by reason of mental or physical illness or disability, incapable of performing satisfactorily or at all the duties of the position occupied by the employee,

the appropriate authority may require that employee to undergo medical examination by a medical practitioner nominated by that authority. Subclause (2) provides that where the employee refuses to submit to medical examination the employee may be suspended without remuneration until the employee submits to the examination. Subclause (3) provides that after consideration of the medical reports (including any furnished by the employee) the appropriate authority shall determine—

- (a) that the employee is not incapacitated from performing the duties of the position;
- (b) that the employee is incapacitated, but is not totally incapacitated for work in the Public Service; or
- (c) that the employee is totally incapacitated for work in the Public Service.

The employee shall be given notice of the determination in writing. Where the determination is made by the chief executive officer that an employee is not totally incapacitated for work in the Public Service the chief executive officer shall, where the position is not a senior position, make all reasonable endeavours to reassign the employee to some other position in the unit, or in any other case refer the matter to the Commissioner. Subclause (7) provides that where the matter is referred to the Commissioner and the Commissioner is satisfied that all reasonable endeavours have been made to reassign the employee, but that reassignment is not possible or practicable in the circumstances, then the Commissioner may recommend to the Governor that the employee either be transferred to some other position in the Public Service or retired from the Public Service. Subclause (8) provides that where the Commissioner determines that a chief executive officer is incapacitated but not totally incapacitated for work, the Commissioner may recommend to the Governor that the chief executive officer be transferred to some other position in the Public Service, or retired from the Public Service. Subclause (9) provides that where any employee is determined to be totally incapacitated, the Commissioner may recommend to the Governor that the employee be retired from the Public Service.

Clauses 57 and 58 deal with resignations. Clause 57 provides that an employee may resign from the Public Service by giving notice in accordance with the regulations under the proposed Act. Subclause (2) provides that where an employee is absent from work for a period of 10 working days without giving a proper written explanation, the employee shall, if the Commissioner or chief executive officer so determines, be deemed to have resigned. Clause 58 provides that an employee of the Public Service who resigns for the purpose of standing as a candidate for election to the Parliament of the State or the Commonwealth, and is not elected, shall, if the person applies to be reappointed, be reappointed to the same or a corresponding position and that the period of absence shall be treated as leave without pay.

Clause 59 deals with age of retirement. Clause 59 provides that an employee who has attained the age of 55 years may retire from the Public Service. An employee who attains the age of 65 years shall retire, but may be appointed to the Public Service on a temporary basis or on the basis of negotiated conditions.

Clause 60 deals with grievance appeals. Clause 60 provides that an employee aggrieved by an administrative act directly affecting the employee may apply to the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal for a review of that act. The chief executive officer or Commissioner may attempt to resolve the matter by conciliation prior to the commencement of the hearing upon the application. Subclause (3) provides that the tribunal may decline to entertain the application if it is of the opinion that it is a frivolous and vexatious application, or that the applicant has not fully

explored avenues of review or redress. The tribunal on review under this clause may confirm the administrative act, or give such directions as are necessary to redress the grievance. Subclause (5) provides that no review shall be conducted in respect of an administrative act—

- (a) that is appealable or capable of review under some other provisions of the Bill;

or

- (b) that is of a class excluded by regulation made under the proposed Act.

Division VI, comprising clauses 61 to 68, deals with the conduct and discipline of employees within the Public Service. Clause 61 requires an employee occupying a position prescribed by regulation, or a position of a class prescribed by regulation, to disclose pecuniary interests of the employee in accordance with the regulations. Under the clause, any person may request the Commissioner to review the information disclosed by an employee and report whether in the Commissioner's opinion there is a conflict between the employee's pecuniary interests and official duties.

Clause 62 requires any employee who has a pecuniary or other personal interest in a matter that conflicts or may conflict within the duties of the employee in relation to the matter to disclose the nature of the interest to the appropriate authority. The appropriate authority is, in the case of a chief executive officer, the responsible Minister and, in the case of any other employee, the chief executive officer of the administrative unit in which the employee is employed. The appropriate authority may, under the clause, direct an employee to take specified action to resolve a conflict of interest.

Clause 63 sets out the general rules of conduct to apply in relation to employees. Under the clause an employee is to be liable to disciplinary action if the employee—

- (a) contravenes or fails to comply with—
 - (i) a provision of this Act;
 - or
 - (ii) a direction given to the person as an employee by a person with authority to give that direction (whether being authority derived from this Act or otherwise);
- (b) is negligent or indolent in the discharge of the duties of the employee's position;
- (c) is inefficient or incompetent through causes that are within the employee's control;
- (d) is absent from duty without reasonable excuse (proof of which shall lie on the employee);
- (e) is guilty of disgraceful or improper conduct in an official capacity, or is guilty in a private capacity of disgraceful or improper conduct that reflects seriously and adversely on the Public Service;
- (f) makes improper use of property of the Crown;
- (g) except as authorized under the regulations, engages in any remunerative employment, occupation or business outside the Public Service;
- (h) except as authorized under the regulations, discloses information gained in the employee's official capacity, or comments on any matter affecting the Public Service or the business of the Public Service.

Clause 64 empowers the disciplinary authority (defined in clause 4) to hold an inquiry to determine whether an employee is liable to disciplinary action. An employee must, under the clause, be given written notice of an inquiry into the employee's conduct. The clause makes it clear that preliminary investigations may be undertaken prior to the inquiry or notice of inquiry. The clause entitles the employee to be present during the inquiry, to ask questions, bring information before the authority and make representations

and statements to the authority. The disciplinary authority may, upon an inquiry, if satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the employee is liable to disciplinary action—

- (a) reprimand the employee;
- (b) order that the employee forfeit an entitlement to leave;
- (c) order that the employee be suspended from the employee's position in the Public Service without remuneration for a specified period;
- (d) order that the salary of the employee be reduced by a specified amount for a specified period; or
- (e) recommend to the Governor—
 - (i) that the employee be transferred to some other position in the Public Service; or
 - (ii) that the employee be dismissed from the Public Service.

An employee found to be liable to disciplinary action must be given at least 14 days notice of the finding and proposed or recommended disciplinary action (during which period the employee may exercise the right of appeal under clause 68). The holding of an inquiry must, under the clause, be suspended where the inquiry relates to a matter the subject of a criminal charge pending the determination of proceedings on the charge.

Clause 65 provides for the suspension of an employee with or without remuneration where the employee is charged with a serious criminal offence (defined in clause 4) or is given notice of an inquiry under clause 64. Clause 66 provides that the disciplinary authority may, where an employee is convicted of an offence or sentenced to imprisonment for an offence, recommend to the Governor the transfer or dismissal of the employee. An employee must be given 14 days notice of any recommendation based on the employee's imprisonment for an offence other than a serious offence shall not be made until the employee's rights of appeal in respect of the conviction or sentence are exhausted. Clause 67 empowers the Governor to transfer or dismiss an employee upon the recommendation of the disciplinary authority. Clause 68 provides for a right of appeal to the Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal (constituted under schedule 3 of the Bill) in respect of any disciplinary finding or proposed disciplinary action (other than disciplinary action) based upon a conviction for a serious offence.

Division VIII, comprising clauses 69 to 81, deals with miscellaneous matters relating to the Public Service. Clause 69 preserves the power of the Governor under the Constitution Act to appoint a person to, or dismiss a person from, a position in the Public Service. The clause also preserves the current overriding power of the Governor under the Public Service Act, 1967, to transfer an employee from one position to another position at the same or a higher classification level. Clause 70 authorizes the Governor to enter into an arrangement with the Governor-General or any other authority of the Commonwealth for the discharge of State functions by Commonwealth employees, or *vice versa*.

Clause 71 empowers the Governor to extend, by proclamation, the operation of specified provisions (subject to any specified modifications) to a specified class of public employees (not being employees in the Public Service). The clause also provides that the provisions of schedule 4 relating to long service leave are to apply to all employees of the Crown remunerated at hourly, daily or weekly rates of payment.

Clause 72 provides that the Commissioner may, if of the opinion that an association registered under the Industrial and Conciliation Act, 1972, or under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904 of the Commonwealth, represents the interests of a significant number of employees, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare the association to be a recognized organization. This clause should be read in conjunction with

clauses 30 and 38 which provide for the right of recognized organizations to make representations to the Commissioner or any chief executive officer on certain matters.

Clause 73 provides that any determination or decision under the measure affecting remuneration or conditions of employment is to be subject to any award or determination of the State Industrial Commission, of a conciliation committee or of the Public Service Arbitrator and to any agreement registered under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972. Clause 74 protects any employee or other person holding an office or position under the measure from any liability for any act or omission done or made in the exercise or purported exercise of official powers or functions. An action that would otherwise lie against the person is to lie against the Crown. The provision does not prejudice rights of action of the Crown itself.

Clause 75 provides that where a statutory power or function is exercisable by an employee in an administrative unit and the employee is absent or for any reason unable to exercise the power or function, the power or function may be exercised by the Chief Executive Officer of the unit or some other employee nominated by the chief executive officer. Clause 76 provides for obsolete references in an Act or other statutory instrument to an administrative unit or position to be read as references to the unit or position as renamed or to some other unit or position. Clause 77 is an evidentiary provision facilitating proof as to the existence of an administrative unit or as to the person occupying a particular position in the Public Service. Clause 78 provides that the measure does not derogate from the War Service (Preference in Employment) Act, 1943. Clause 79 provides for the service of notices. Clause 80 provides that offences against the measure are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 81 provides for the making of regulations.

Schedule 1 contains necessary transitional provisions. All existing departments are continued in existence, the Department of the Public Service Board, however, continuing under the title the "Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations". Existing offices are continued in existence as positions. Existing employees remain employed on the same basis with their existing and accruing rights remaining in full force and effect. The existing permanent heads, however, are, under clause 3(9) of the schedule, deemed to have been appointed on the commencement of the measure as chief executive officers of their respective departments for a term of 5 years. The clause provides that each permanent head is, upon ceasing to be a chief executive officer, entitled to be assigned to some other position in the Public Service and to be remunerated at the rate that would have applied if the person had continued to occupy the position of chief executive officer.

Schedule 2 excludes certain persons from the Public Service, namely:

- (a) members of the Judiciary;
- (b) members of the Police Force;
- (c) the Auditor-General;
- (d) the Ombudsman;
- (e) the Police Complaints Authority;
- (f) the Electoral Commissioner and the Deputy Electoral Commissioner;
- (g) the holder of any other office or position (not being a chief executive officer) whose remuneration is determined by the Remuneration Tribunal;
- (h) any officer of either House of Parliament or any person under the separate control of the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Assembly or under their joint control;
- (i) any officer of the teaching service within the meaning of the Education Act, 1972;

- (j) any officer or employee of the Electricity Trust of South Australia;
- (k) any officer or employee who is remunerated solely by fees, allowances or commission;
- (l) any employee who is remunerated at hourly, daily, weekly or piece-work rates of payment;
- (m) subject to a proclamation under Division I of Part III, any officer or employee who is excluded by or under any other Act from the Public Service;
- (n) any officer or employee excluded from the Public Service by proclamation under subclause (2).

Schedule 3 provides for the constitution and proceedings of the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal and the Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal. Under clause 2 of the schedule, the Presiding Officer and Deputy Presiding Officer of the Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal is to be a member or former member of the judiciary, while the Presiding Officer and Deputy Presiding Officer of the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal is to be a person (not being an employee) with appropriate knowledge and experience of principles and practices of personnel management in the public sector. Clause 3 of the schedule provides for the constitution of a panel of employees nominated by the Commissioner and a panel of employees nominated by recognized organizations. Under clause 4, each tribunal is to be constituted of—

- (a) the Presiding Officer or Deputy Presiding Officer;
- (b) a member of the panel of nominees of the Commissioner selected for the particular proceedings by the Presiding Officer; and
- (c) a member of the panel of nominees of recognized organizations selected by the appellant.

Each tribunal may sit in different divisions at the same time.

Clause 5 of the schedule deals with the procedure at meetings of the tribunal. Clause 6 provides that an employee is not subject to direction as a member of either tribunal. Clause 7 provides for a secretary to the tribunal. Clause 8 provides that the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal shall act according to equity and good conscience and is not to be bound by technicalities, legal forms or rules of evidence. Clause 9 of the schedule provides for the parties to be given notice of proceedings before either tribunal and to be afforded a reasonable opportunity to call or give evidence, examine and cross-examine witnesses and to make submissions to the Tribunal. Clause 10 provides that a person is entitled to appear personally or by representative in proceedings before either Tribunal but that a party to proceedings before the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal is not entitled to be represented by a legal practitioner. Clause 11 provides the necessary powers for each tribunal for the purposes of proceedings before the tribunal. Clause 12 provides for witness fees. Clause 13 entitles a party to be furnished with reasons for a decision of either tribunal. Clause 14 requires the Presiding Officer of each tribunal to furnish an annual report to the Minister, who is then to table the report in Parliament.

Schedule 4 deals with hours of attendance, holidays and long service leave. Clause 1 of the schedule deals with hours of attendance. Under the clause an employee is, subject to the clause and any direction of the chief executive officer, obliged to attend at the employee's place of employment throughout the hours fixed by regulation as ordinary business hours in relation to the Public Service. The clause provides that the chief executive officer may, at the request and with the consent of an employee, determine that the duties of the employee's position be performed on a part-time basis. The clause also provides for flexitime schemes. Clause 2 deals with public holidays and other holidays in the Public Service. Clause 3 provides for the closure of

offices. Clause 4 provides for recreation leave upon the same basis as under the current Public Service Act, namely, 20 days in each year. Clause 5 provides for sick leave on the same basis as under the current Act, namely, 12 days accruing each year. Clause 6 of the schedule provides for special leave with pay and special leave without pay. Clause 7 provides for long service leave of—

- (a) ninety days in respect of the first 10 years of effective service;
- (b) nine days in respect of each subsequent year of effective service up to and including the 15th year of effective service; and
- (c) fifteen days in respect of the sixteenth and each subsequent year of effective service.

Clause 8 provides for the time and manner in which long service leave is to be taken. Clause 9 deals with the payment to which employees are to be entitled while on long service leave. Again, this clause preserves the current entitlements. Clause 10 deals with payment in lieu of long service leave. Clause 11 allows certain prior service to be counted as service for the purpose of leave rights. Clause 12 empowers the Commissioner to direct that an amount payable in respect of leave on the death of an employee be paid directly to a dependant or dependants of the deceased employee and not to the personal representative.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOUNT LOFTY BOTANIC GARDEN

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

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Botanic Gardens Act, 1978, part section 529, hundred of Onkaparinga, be disposed of, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

In April 1984, Cabinet approved the disposal of two small parcels of land in section 529, hundred of Onkaparinga, as part of a proposed boundary rationalisation for Mount Lofty Botanic Garden. The rationalisation is to reduce fencing costs and maintenance of land which cannot readily be utilised for Botanic Garden purposes. Cabinet, and subsequently Parliament also approved the disposal of the house and land known as 'Koorooroo' (CT 2017/108) as an additional part of this rationalisation.

When the disposal of 'Koorooroo' was submitted for parliamentary consideration it had been mistakenly thought that the disposal of part section 529 was also under consideration. However, it later came to light that administrative files relating to these two pieces of real estate had been separated and only disposal of the house was submitted for the Parliament's consideration. Under the terms of section 13 (2) (f) of the Botanic Gardens Act 1978, Parliament's approval for the disposal of part section 529 is still required.

I recommend that this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Botanic Gardens Act, 1978, the disposal of part section 529, hundred of Onkaparinga, designated lots A and B on the attached plan.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 August. Page 725.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The House has before it the third budget of this Government. More importantly, for South Australia's sake, it will be this Government's last budget. South Australians have had enough. Enough of this Government's assault on their living standards; enough of the erosion of their earnings and their savings by the never-ending spiral in taxes and charges; enough of big government, wanting to direct more and more of the State's economic activity at the expense of the community's only wealth and job creator, the private sector, and small business in particular.

Let the House record that three years of Labor Government has been three years of the highest taxing, biggest spending, and largest borrowing government in the history of our State. This budget clearly signals that another term of Labor Government would only mean more of the same: more tax rises, a range of State charges escalating again at well above rates of inflation, and more broken promises, because this budget is as rubbery as was the Premier's 1982 election manifesto.

Remember that manifesto—based on no tax increases and on only what the Premier called modest spending proposals. It was a manifesto ripped up and discarded within days of the election in a sell out of the State's interest to pressure groups demanding higher levels of government spending.

The Premier funded his broken promises in his first two budgets by record rises in taxes and charges. Now, in this third and last Labor Government budget, there is still no relief for taxpayers. This is the bankcard budget—the buy now, pay later budget, the budget attempting to buy votes.

But, this is where the Premier has made a mistake. The electors of South Australia are well aware of the horrific charges that accompany big spending. The people of this State know from past experience with this Government that they will be asked to cop the high price—plus interest—when the Labor Party's package of promises fails to materialise. And they just will not accept a Government which tries to buy them off with short term gifts offered cynically on the never-never plan.

Nobody should accept a ride with a man whose track record proves beyond doubt that he cannot be trusted with our money. We all know the folly of buying up big on credit and facing massive interest charges as punishment. Apparently the Premier does not: he is attempting to use his bankcard budget in a vain attempt to woo back the people he has disillusioned so badly over the past three years. However, the effect on taxpayers this time will be the same as it was when the Premier last offered them up as a sacrifice in order to put the Labor Party in Government.

The Premier is funding his tax cuts not with reduced spending, but with huge borrowings. They have to be repaid; the day of reckoning is simply postponed. That is why the next budget will be introduced by a Liberal Government—a government which will honour its promises and a Government which will provide genuine, long term relief to taxpayers and families by limiting Government spending and borrowings within clearly defined and realistic targets; cutting waste and inefficiency; and eliminating Government duplication and interference in the economy where it is not socially desirable.

Labor has no such strategy. The Premier asks South Australians in this budget to accept that he had to put up taxes by record amounts in 1983 to cover an inherited deficit, that he can now afford to give \$41 million back in tax cuts, and that he will maintain a freeze on a range of charges. However, the public rightly does not believe that the Premier had to put up those taxes in the first place. That is why the Premier is now dangling election tax carrots. But again, South Australians are not biting.

The Premier first announced the tax cuts six weeks ago. When ALP research identified significant public cynicism about that, the Premier decided to go further in this budget, with a freeze on a range of charges which a second term Labor Government would be unable to maintain. Indeed, the tax cuts in this budget—misleading as they have been presented—will be nothing more than a tax pause under a second term Labor Government should that ever eventuate, and the freeze on charges would thaw well before next winter, because the levels of on-going spending and borrowings foreshadowed by this budget rule out any possibility of long term relief to taxpayers under a Labor Government. I will prove that point in more detail later.

Of course, promises about taxation formed only a part of the program which the Premier presented to the electors in 1982. Other key elements included lower levels of unemployment; relief from rising home interest rates; and a better deal for consumers through price control. It is not surprising that we hear little from the Premier now about these issues, because unemployment remains higher than it was three years ago, real interest rates are five times higher than they were in 1982 (and are still going up), and Adelaide has just recorded the highest rise of any State capital in its CPI for the last financial year.

These are the concerns of ordinary South Australians, yet this Government is ignoring them. It believes it can hide its failings with an avalanche of pre-election taxpayer funded advertising and public relations activity, such as the advertising campaign for its belated youth employment program; the glossy pamphlets to promote an industry incentives scheme which is dressed up as new but which, in reality, is the same basic program with a few new names; the so-called \$90 million Jubilee public works maintenance scheme (a sham); and the biggest of all these deceptions—the \$41 million tax cuts.

The taxpayer funded newspaper advertising of these tax cuts was carefully calculated to give the impression that South Australians were getting \$41 million in tax cuts this year. But what is the truth? The \$11 million rebate to the Electricity Trust on its turnover tax was paid last financial year from the proceeds of another massive increase in total tax collections above budget estimates. The impact of that measure is a reduction of \$2 in the quarterly bill for the average family—for one year only, as this budget confirms—because the Government's revenue from the turnover tax is going up to \$28.5 million this financial year.

Mr Mathwin: It's for the election year!

Mr OLSEN: Quite clearly, it is just for this election year. Reading further into the budget papers, we discover that this financial year the impact of the tax cuts in revenue forgone to the Government is \$27.5 million—not \$41 million, as the Government has suggested. Their full year impact is \$30 million—again, not \$41 million. These so-called tax cuts have been the flagship on this Government's voyage of deception towards the polls. But, they are just one of the many sleights of hand in this budget. Its borrowing burden is another.

The Premier says at page 4 of his Financial Statement that the Government has reduced the borrowings of the State and thus eased the burden on future generations. However, this is a statement directly contradicted at page 49 of the same document. There, the Premier makes the following admission:

With the size of the Loan Council program not changing in cash terms, the desired overall works program will thus be achievable only through a massive 56 per cent increase . . . in the borrowings from statutory authorities.

The Auditor-General refers again to the practice of taking funds from statutory authorities. I trust that the Deputy Leader will refer to that practice later and also to the lack

of appropriate accountability for that practice before this Parliament. In fact, borrowings from statutory authorities are going up from \$125.6 million in 1984-85 to \$195.6 million this financial year—a \$70 million rise in borrowings compared with \$27.5 million in revenue forgone in tax concessions. Here are the hidden costs of this budget—the 'massive', to use the Treasurer's own word, increase in borrowings, debts which must be serviced by future generations of South Australians in the form of increased taxation to pay for the mounting interest bills.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, the debt has gone up by \$1 billion. Total debt servicing costs to be met from this budget will amount to \$373 million. We, the taxpayers of South Australia, will be finding from our resources \$373 million to foot the interest bill on the outstandings of this Administration. In three budgets, this Government has lifted the State's annual debt servicing obligations by \$115.5 million. More and more this Government is mortgaging our future. This is not balanced budgeting—it is begging bankruptcy.

In three budgets this Government has also increased total State tax collections by 55.2 per cent, including another \$58 million in this budget—a rise in real terms of 27.9 per cent. Tax is up 27.9 per cent, and here again the Premier has attempted to misrepresent the fact. He says, at page 7 of his budget speech, that 'of the growth in taxation revenues since 1982-83 only 11.8 per cent is attributable to our revenue decisions'. That is completely untrue. Let me first recall what those revenue decisions were. There were those broken promises—eight of them in all—by the Premier who promised, in what must be almost immortal words, not to increase the rate of existing taxes or introduce any new taxes.

There were the introduction of South Australia's first new tax in 10 years—the financial institutions duty—at the highest rate in Australia, the reintroduction of the turnover tax on the Gas Company, and increased rates of tobacco tax, petrol tax, liquor licence fees, stamp duties on insurance, driver's licence fees and motor registration fees.

In total, during the last two financial years, these decisions have added \$136.3 million to the Government's tax collections. Over the same period, the Government has collected \$359.7 million in extra tax above the level at June 1983. In other words, the Government's revenue decisions have been responsible for increasing its tax take by 37.9 per cent—not the 11 per cent suggested by the Premier.

And what of the third factor in this Government's wilful and excessive financial binge, its spending? The massive increases in borrowings and taxation have funded total outlays which have risen by 52 per cent. Yet the Premier said at the time of the last election that his policy promises would cost only an extra \$29 million a year. In fact, the three budgets that he has introduced have increased Government outlays by an annual average of \$394 million. The impact on ordinary South Australians, who have had to foot the bill, has been severe.

Per capita State taxation amounts to \$627.72 a year with this budget—or \$12.07 a week, a rise of 52.6 per cent over three budgets. Based on *per capita* rises in taxation, electricity tariffs, water rates and public transport fares, these will now cost a family of five \$91.70 a week—a rise of \$28.80 in three budgets. These increased household bills have made a major contribution to Adelaide's rising cost of living, compared to that of the other States. In the 12 months to June, selected State and local government charges contributed 11.1 per cent of the increase in Adelaide's CPI, compared with 7.9 per cent nationally. Over the same period to June 1984 the contribution was 13 per cent for Adelaide and 4 per cent nationally.

This Government has shown no restraint in its own earnings, yet it has asked South Australians to cooperate in wage restraint. Its strategy has been as blatant as it has been irresponsible. This Government has embarked on a systematic exercise to use gains derived from South Australians in the form of taxes and charges on individuals and industry to boost activity in the public sector. In doing so, it has wasted a significant opportunity to boost the economy of South Australia—to give real incentives to the real job creators.

Honourable members will recall that at the time this Government came to office the wage pause had been initiated, severe drought was coming to an end, and the impact of international recovery was beginning to flow through the Australian economy. But South Australia has failed to make the most of these opportunities. The Premier claims in his budget speech that the economy is growing strongly, but that proposition is not supported by the Treasury economic paper that he presented with the budget. That paper shows significant reductions in employment in manufacturing and rural industries—our key economic sectors—continuing high levels of unemployment, slower population growth than any other State, and continuing uncertainty over interest rates. These are hardly the symptoms of an economy performing strongly.

I refer to jobs. At the last election, in his policy speech, the Premier promised that as a first step to getting South Australians back to work his Government would establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund. Those were his precise words. But, typically, that first step took this Government two years. The fund was not established until late last year. Even now, the Premier cannot tell us how many jobs this linchpin of Labor's election jobs strategy will create.

Referring to the Enterprise Fund, the paper entitled 'Employment Aspects of the 1985-86 Budget' states at page 20:

Where this innovation will generate employment, at this early stage it is very difficult to estimate the direct employment generation effect.

It is now plain that at the last election, the Premier, in his policy speech and in the considerable advertising built around the enterprise fund, greatly, deliberately and mischievously exaggerated the fund's ability to create jobs. It has not been the great job creator promised, nor will it ever be. It was presented as an excuse for Labor's failure in 1982 and, still, to put forward a coherent long-term economic strategy for South Australia. Indeed, it is interesting to recall other statements that the Premier made before the last election about the Enterprise Fund.

In a statement on 23 September 1982, he promised that the Enterprise Fund would be Labor's flagship to revive the economy; that it would use its capital resources to develop job creating industry; and that it would be able to pump investment funds into industries selling outside the State and high technology industries, and assist restructuring in order to secure a sounder employment base in South Australia. I invite the House to compare those promises with statements that the Premier has recently made about the establishment of what he calls a South Australian Development Fund. So, we have gone from the Enterprise Fund and are now talking about the South Australian Development Fund. There must be an election coming up.

The South Australian Development Fund, apparently, is to have many of the objectives which the Premier set for the Enterprise Fund before the last election. There is nothing wrong with well based, well motivated schemes to assist industry and jobs growth, but this Premier has developed a habit of plucking schemes out of thin air just before an election and making all sorts of grandiose forecasts about what they can achieve. He is doing it now in a futile attempt

to conceal the fact that his Government is doing nothing of substance to arrest the collapse in employment in South Australia's vital manufacturing industries, and much to speed the decline in our rural industries. The Premier would have got that message at the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society lunch last Friday.

Since June 1982, the number of manufacturing establishments in South Australia has dropped by 5.4 per cent, which was almost 1.2 per cent above the national decline in the same period. The number of people employed in those establishments in South Australia dropped by 14 482, or 13.9 per cent. Our rural industries, the other traditional mainstay of the South Australian economy base, also are in decline. Employment in these industries has dropped by 2 100 in the last three years, and profitability of individual farmers is being drastically eroded, in large part by the insensitivity of Federal and State Labor Governments to the costs and problems of these industries.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It's \$6 500 per family per year now.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, a figure that has not been refuted nationally; nor would one expect any attempt to refute it to be made here. Looking at unemployment overall, latest figures show that for the three months ended July this year the average number of South Australians looking for work was 52 000—6 000 more than three years ago. While unemployment has been falling over the past year, Tasmania, with a Liberal Government, has the best record. There, unemployment has reduced by more than 20 per cent. Tasmania also has led the growth in employment over the past 12 months, followed by Western Australia. So, however much we would like it to be the case, the Premier is wrong in claiming, as he often does, that South Australia is leading the nation's job recovery. Glib talk like that only masks other serious underlying problems with our economy, such as the fact that our ratio of persons registered as long-term unemployed—at 33.3 per cent—6 per cent higher than the national average. Population was another indicator often quoted by the Premier before the last election. He complained, in his October 1982 Opposition report, just before the election, that by the end of 1982 Western Australia's population would exceed South Australia's by 9 800. It is understandable why the Premier ignores this indicator now, because the latest figures show that Western Australia's population is now 35 500 more than ours—almost four times the gap three years ago.

In the two years to December 1984, South Australia's population growth rate was the lowest of any State or Territory in Australia. These indicators are important in considering budget strategy, because they demonstrate that South Australia has not yet established a basis upon which its economy is growing in any sustained or diversified way. In these circumstances, any budget strategy which depends, as this Government's does, on continuing very high levels of receipts and borrowings, will run the State into very serious trouble—because it will further drain the private sector of incentive to create jobs and generate growth. Already, this Government has redirected considerable resources from the private to the public sector through its taxation policies. And a Labor Government, after the next election, would transfer even more of the community's resources into the public sector to fund the programs and the policies foreshadowed in this budget.

This point is crucial to an understanding of the reasons why the Premier has tried so hard and so desperately to sell this budget—to indulge in what Matthew Abraham has called the 'overkill'. Quite simply, the Premier does not want this Parliament or the public to focus on the implications that this budget has for the next Government, next financial year. First, at the bottom line, remains the accu-

mulated deficit of more than \$50 million—the deficit that this Government's big spending, waste and inefficiency have run up, despite the massive increase in taxes and charges.

On the debit side, for next financial year there is also the run-down in Commonwealth funds. At this year's Premiers Conference, without so much as token resistance, the Premier sacrificed a very important and fundamental principle of federalism for short-term political gain. Without any fight at all, he caved in to the Commonwealth's intention to implement the recommendations of the Grants Commission. It has been a long established principle of federalism that the larger States, with their more extensive taxing capacities, should support the smaller States which have still to provide the same basic infrastructure for their citizens in areas like roads, water, health, and so on.

That principle has gone out the window with the implementation of the Grants Commission recommendations. But the Premier did not fight that because he received a political handshake in the form of special grants to get over the hurdle of the coming election. That decision begins to bite into our revenue base from next financial year. Our share of Commonwealth grants will reduce by \$17 million from next July, and by \$34 million the following year because the new relativities redistribute funds away from South Australia.

This decision also must be seen in the context of a continuing overall decline in Commonwealth funding to the States. This financial year, the States are getting 30 per cent of total Commonwealth budget outlays, compared with 32 per cent three years ago. This financial year, Commonwealth payments to the States have been reduced by .5 per cent in real terms compared with a 2.1 per cent rise in the Commonwealth's spending for its own purposes. And in the category of specific purpose payments to the States, South Australia's allocation this financial year is down in real terms by about 4 per cent.

This affects areas such as education, where there is a real terms cut of 3 per cent; health 5 per cent; housing 8 per cent; and roads 6 per cent. The Commonwealth's decision to significantly reduce housing funding, making less money available at concessional rates of interest, will begin to have a major adverse impact from the 1986-87 financial year. As well as declining Commonwealth funding, this budget also indicates rising deficits in some State Government departments and agencies which have implications for future years. For example, the cost of operating the State Transport Authority is to rise by a further \$7.7 million this financial year. One of the major reasons, confirmed in the budget explanation is this Government's sellout to union officials on the 38 hour week.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is also going into deficit this financial year to the tune of a record \$22 million. These debts further highlight the fact that this Government cannot control the costs of its operations. On the spending side of the budget, a number of programs in this year's allocations will require significant additional funding in coming years. I will refer to just some of them:

- The Jubilee Maintenance Program which, if the Premier's promises are to be honoured, will require additional funding of more than \$20 million in the next two budgets.
- The Youth Employment Scheme—additional funding of \$18.2 million over the next two years.
- Picking up the shortfall in Commonwealth funding of pre-school services—an extra \$2 million next financial year.
- The special Taxi Subsidy Scheme for the disabled—which does not have a source and amount of funding specified in this budget.

- \$7 million additional funding for a replacement vessel for the *Troubridge*.
- The Second Storey drop-in centre for adolescents.

These initiatives also include: native vegetation compensation; the new Mobilong prison; relocation of the Hackney bus depot; the new Children's Services Office; infrastructure requirements for the Roxby Downs project; and a series of education initiatives, including second language study in primary schools, additional teacher librarians, as well as maintenance of class sizes and additional ancillary staff. Some of these projects require additional staff.

From figures provided in the employment paper tabled with the budget, it appears that total public sector employment between June 1982 and June 1986 will grow by about 7 000 people. Based on average weekly earnings and expressed in full-time equivalents, that represents an addition of \$102 million to the public sector payroll bill than otherwise would have been payable if the 1982 employment levels had been maintained, including a further \$22 million this financial year. I list these revenue shortfalls and costs not to suggest that many of the projects I have referred to should not proceed. Indeed, some of them are vital for South Australia. But to fund them, unless savings are made in other areas, taxes and charges inevitably must rise again. That is because the difference between the on-going spending commitments established in this budget and the funding likely to be available to pay for them will be more than \$100 million next financial year.

This House knows, from the experience of the past two years, that this Premier has no compunction about ripping an extra \$100 million out of the pockets of South Australians in taxes and charges in a single year. That is what would have to happen next financial year. The 1986-87 budget would be a horror budget for South Australians under a Labor Government. It would be some way to celebrate our jubilee year! Another round of massive increases in taxes and charges would be Labor's way of funding the program outlined in this budget. This House should make no mistake about it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: A catch-up.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, it will be a catch-up. We are going through the same cycle as that which occurred previously: it is 1982 revisited in 1985. The electorate has been bitten once and will be twice shy. The electorate will not buy it again. The market research of the Government is clearly demonstrating that the electorate will not buy this phoney tax package that has been delivered. The Government refuses to look at the hard decisions, and its financial strategy is bankrupt in responsibility and credibility.

The Government refuses to face up to the need to place firm controls on Government spending; implement a comprehensive deregulation program; cut waste, inefficiency and duplication; and put into the private sector those services which, over time, experience has shown can best be performed by the private sector at lower cost to the consumer and with a consequent saving to the taxpayer. These are the fundamentals of sound and responsible management of the public's money. They represent the basic difference between my Party's approach to financial management and the approach of the Government. They constitute the formula for giving genuine tax relief—a formula that only a Liberal Government can and will adhere to.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed it did: the former Liberal Administration took taxing levels of this State to the lowest level *per capita* in Australia. It is a record which every Liberal is proud of having achieved. One can compare that to the present Government's track record of an increase of tax levels of 55.2 per cent, which has occurred during the present Government's Administration. Yet the Premier when

Leader of the Opposition promised South Australians that a Labor Government would not introduce any new taxes or increase the rate of tax, and he asked the people of South Australia to believe in him. However, one has only to look at the Government's track record, and \$359.7 million later the Government is still collecting more, and this financial year there will be an increase yet again in the tax taken from South Australians. That is the Premier's track record and his credibility is established on his performance, which has been abysmal, and well the Premier knows it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The Leader will address the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: Well, I was not addressing anybody else. But that is why the Government has had to scurry out to the north-eastern suburbs and undertake, in the marginal seats, an in-depth market research study, asking people what they think of the Government's tax package. The Government got the message of what they thought about its \$41 million tax package—people saw it for what it was, namely, something that was phoney. The people in the electorate bought it in 1982, but they will not accept the Government's lack of credibility a second time a round.

The formula I put down for giving genuine tax reform is the only formula that would be able to deliver it, and a Liberal Government can and will adhere to it. We do not resile from the hard options where they are also the responsible options to pursue. Unlike Labor, we do not believe that some hard choices can be avoided by dressing up budget strategies in glossy brochures, superficial advertising, more development funds and budget selling exercises which fudge and mislead. Take, for example, the industrial incentives program announced by the Premier last month. It has been a long time coming. The Premier was quoted in the *News* on 27 April last year as saying:

We are currently undertaking a review of our range of incentives and I hope to be able to make an announcement on changes to our industrial assistance package in a couple of months.

This is April 1984 that I am talking about. Almost a year later, in a speech in Sydney on 7 March, the Premier was still promising. On that occasion he said, and again I quote:

I can predict an exciting and innovating range of incentives to encourage investment and relocation to South Australia.

Three weeks ago, the Premier finally produced a glossy pamphlet but, stripped of the advertising jargon, what does it amount to? This budget shows that the Government plans to spend less, in real terms, this financial year on industrial incentives than was allocated last financial year. In 1984-85, \$10.7 million was allocated for industrial incentives. This year, \$11.4 million—a 1 per cent reduction in real terms—has been allocated.

An analysis of the glossy brochure explaining the incentives indicates that there is little new on offer. Of course, that did not stop the Premier from claiming in one of his pre-budget press releases that the incentives scheme would generate more than 10 500 jobs. But again, this is not supported by the documents tabled with the budget. The budget papers are clearly identifying how this Premier is prepared to attempt to deceive the public of South Australia.

Page 20 of the employment aspects paper estimates that the net increase in jobs to be generated by industrial incentives this financial year will be 905 jobs. Not the 10 500 jobs mentioned in the Premier's press release! His own budget papers put the lie, the deception, which he is trying to inflict upon South Australians. We have already exposed him and well he might be embarrassed and look down and read the paper. He does not want to hear the truth, because his own budget papers demonstrate to what extent he is prepared to mislead and tell untruths to the public of South Australia, and well I would be embarrassed about it, because I thought he, as an individual, was a person who preserved

his personal integrity. According to the press release put out by the Premier, compared to the budget papers he has now submitted to this Parliament—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: I can well understand the sensitivity and the raw nerve, on the other side, because the truth often hurts. I have already exposed in this House the Government's plan to spend taxpayers' money for blatant Party political purposes to promote its youth employment plan. Several hundred thousand dollars of taxpayers' funds will be spent on that in an effort to prop up the Government's lack of performance over 2½ years.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Using public funds for their election campaign. That is what it amounts to.

Mr OLSEN: Not only the membership of the Party dropped off: they have a whole lot of other problems surfacing in the Labor Party at the moment.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will the Leader continue to address the Chair rather than the rest of the floor, and will the Deputy Leader refrain from commenting, as he is not making the speech.

Mr OLSEN: This appears to be another example of benefits being deliberately exaggerated. First, the Government has not admitted that in total it will spend much less this financial year on employment schemes than in 1984-85. This budget indicates total spending on employment schemes of \$26.8 million in 1985-86, compared with \$33.4 million last year. So less this year is being spent on employment schemes than was spent last year.

The Department of Technical and Further Education is to play a major role in this new employment and training package, yet the budget indicates a real terms cut of about 1.5 per cent in recurrent funding for TAFE after allowing for the additional superannuation costs allocated this year. With all the other pressures on TAFE it is difficult to see how it can cope with a major employment and training program when it has a reduced recurrent budget. TAFE's capital budget also is slashed this year. The claim by the Government that under this scheme 6 300 traineeships will be provided this year also is unlikely to be met. The Premier has feigned belated concern for young unemployed by creating separate ministries of youth affairs and employment. Again, this is just window-dressing, because there are no specific allocations in the budget to support the activities of these ministries.

I now turn to the project described by the Premier in his budget speech as 'a special Jubilee 150 program which will be run over three years'. He put the spending on it at in excess of \$90 million. An examination of the budget papers reveals just what a sham this is, because spending on these maintenance programs this financial year is not being increased, but cut by 14 per cent in real terms. In three budgets, the former Liberal Government spent \$71.6 million on public works maintenance. This Government, in its three budgets, has spent \$70.5 million. This dressed up version of public works maintenance schemes run over the next three years does not stand up to an analysis of the budget papers. Taking into account inflation, this represents a reduction of more than 30 per cent.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: The greatest Jubilee gift that this State could have would be the defeat of the Bannon Government.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed it would be. That was yet another press release specifically put out by the Premier in his attempt to sell this budget without the critical analysis after the event, but the critical analysis has shown that the press releases put out by the Premier were deceitful having regard to facts as presented to this Parliament in the budget papers.

Housing is another construction sector in which the Government continues to exaggerate the extent of its activity. In the last two budgets the Government has promised to complete 6 200 Housing Trust dwellings. However, actual completions have been 511, or more than 8 per cent less. In this budget the Premier maintains that the Government will still meet its commitment of 9 000 completions over three years. That would require the trust to complete 3 311 dwellings in 1985-86. This will be impossible, given that capital funds for housing have been reduced in real terms in this budget and construction costs are continuing to increase.

In other capital areas, the fact that funds allocated for the O-Bahn have been underspent for the third successive year has not stopped the Labor Party cynically running around the north-east suburbs claiming credit for this project. This Government has now underspent budget allocations for the O-Bahn by \$6.2 million in slowing down the project. In spending on metropolitan and country waterworks and sewerage, there is a reduction in real terms of 13 per cent this financial year, and there is only token spending for vital salinity control on the Murray River.

The fact that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has a report showing the need for massive spending to rehabilitate the metropolitan sewerage system means that significant resources will have to be reallocated to this area soon. Salinity mitigation works for the Murray River are vital to future water supply in South Australia, requiring the Commonwealth and the three States affected to seriously consider the funding implications as a matter of urgency.

As part of the budget selling exercise, the Deputy Premier talked about the decision to increase the size of the Police Force by 50 officers. But what he did not say is that all this will achieve is to bring the number of commissioned officers, non-commissioned officers, constables and trainees back to the 1982 level. Between 1982 and 1984 active police manning levels were reduced by 46. An examination of the Police Department's recurrent budget also suggests a reduction in real terms of about 3 per cent when this year's new allocation for superannuation costs is taken into account.

This raises serious questions about Government promises to provide more resources to our Police Force in its fight against escalating crime rates and drug trafficking. Last year, the Government was presented with a report recommending a rationalisation of concessions to the needy. It appears that some reductions are now to be implemented, without announcement by the Government.

This year's allocation for electricity, land tax, local government rates, water and sewerage, and transport concessions is 1 per cent less in real terms than the amount spent in 1984-85. Turning from payments to receipts, the House should note that, despite land tax relief, total collections this financial year from land tax are estimated to rise in real terms by 14.5 per cent. The average land tax bill in 1984-85 was \$365: this year it will be \$1 583.

Stamp duty and the Government's taxes on power and gas will also bring in increased revenue in real terms. The tax on electricity will amount to \$28.5 million—almost twice the amount collected in the last year of the former Liberal Government, despite this Premier's promise not to use electricity tariffs as backdoor taxation.

There is, in fact, much in this budget which the Premier has tried to get in through the back door. His budget selling exercise tried to conceal much more than it revealed about the true and on-going impact of his budget strategy on ordinary South Australians. For what this budget shows is that the Liberals were right before the last election in warning the electorate that a Labor Government would significantly increase public sector spending; and the Liberals were right before the last election in warning the electorate that

a Labor Government would significantly increase taxes and charges to pay for bigger Government. The Liberals are now right in warning that a second term Labor Government will again impose much higher rates of taxation and charges, resulting in even more broken promises.

Remember, before the last election, the feast of promises: no tax increases; an inquiry into State taxation; the Enterprise Fund, as a first step towards creating jobs; much lower unemployment; relief from rising home interest rates, which are having a direct impact on ordinary South Australian citizens who are trying to buy their own home; the Ramsay Trust; much lower unemployment; and relief to families from rising prices. Those were the key promises of this Premier affecting ordinary South Australians, and the record now shows failure after failure. As a result, the Government is now scrambling to cover its failures and inaction with the incentives scheme, the youth employment program, and the five year economic plan, all of which are dressed up in advertising and glossy brochures. However, they are no substitute for firm, consistent and responsible policies for South Australia's economic future.

Before the last election the Premier released what he called 'South Australia's Economic Future, Stage One'. We have never seen stage two—and I do not think we want to after their track record, I might add. We know why we have not seen stage two. Labor has no policies which will encourage sustained and diversified growth of the South Australian economy.

The Premier is afraid to admit that Labor's approach has only one objective—more economic intervention and more direction giving less freedom to the entrepreneurs, to small business and to people willing to give it a go, to take a risk, to create jobs.

The document he released last month on South Australia's economy for the next five years makes some very vague statements about Labor's attitude to a partnership between the public and the private sectors. But it omitted the words activist and interventionist—the words the Premier used in another document circulated earlier this year for Trades Hall consumption. That document revealed Labor's true colours—and the clear choice between Labor and Liberal.

This Government has failed over the past three years to address the key issues affecting South Australia's future: it has no policies to revive our manufacturing and rural industries, which must remain key components of South Australia's economic base; it has no wages policy—it simply does what it is told by union officials; it will not come to terms with the need to have more flexibility in our system of setting wages and conditions; it has no policy of any substance to increase our trade with the Asia-Pacific region, the world's most rapidly growing area; it has no policy to limit growth in taxation and reduce Government regulation and interference so that South Australians can have more control over their own lives; and it has no policy to improve education standards and give our young people better opportunities for long term jobs.

These are the key issues that will concern South Australians at the next election. They are the issues which this Government has ignored for three years—three years of inaction, three years of the biggest spending, highest taxing, largest borrowing Government in South Australia's history. The next time this House debates a budget it will be a budget which addresses the needs of ordinary South Australians, stops the assault on their living standards and offers leadership, vision and direction for South Australia's economic future. It will be the budget of a Liberal Government.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to comment particularly on the documents put before the House by the Premier relating to the

South Australian economy and employment. The statement on the South Australian economy makes reference in the first instance to the federal scene. The South Australian Government follows the same economic track and subscribes to the same economic theories as do its federal colleagues. I will draw to the attention of the House one or two facts that indicate the parlous state in which this nation and this State find themselves as a result of Federal and State Labor Governments pursuing those economic policies.

We have heard today about interest rates and the fact that they are moving upwards in an alarming fashion. This is as a direct consequence of the economic policies followed at both the federal and State level. The Premier's document makes reference to the federal scene, and in the opening paragraph, referring to Commonwealth Government economic policies, states:

Following the expansionary fiscal policy adopted in recent years to move the economy out of recession and with private activity resuming a more prominent role, the Government has moved to contain budget outlays and further reduce the budget deficit.

What an understatement of what is happening at the federal level that is. What was it that led to the resignation of former Under Treasurer Stone, a man for whom I have had considerable respect for a long time? In fact, I have put on record—

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I hear what the economic gurus opposite say, but I saw Under Treasurer Stone in action when we were in government (I think I knew what they were about at the federal level then), and when the Federal Government was trying to contain our overseas debt. It was not an easy task in the existing economic climate: we were competing with a Labor Government that had a grab bag full of promises with the sky as the limit. That has been the record of Labor Governments both in this State and federally, and so the passage I have quoted is the understatement of the year.

I will read into the record a few more statements made concerning what has happened federally, dealing with the enormous problem that faces this nation and indicating the very stiff medicine that will have to be administered over a period unless we are to continue going down the tube. I will bring to the attention of the House a few other facts to help demonstrate what is happening in the federal scene. I will then refer to the State scene in the same context.

The average real increase in Government spending under the Hawke Government is still 4.9 per cent per year—more than double the average of the Fraser years. In this day and age it is popular with the Labor Party to criticise the Fraser Government and particularly the then head of the Treasury.

Mr Groom: They failed.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If they failed, all I can say is that the present Labor Party is failing far more miserably and at a greatly accelerated rate of failure. Let me continue with these economic facts of life. We know that Australia's external debt servicing obligation—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I always believe that I am doing well when members opposite get vocal. That indicates that they want to disturb me because what I am saying to them is indigestible. They will get it whether they like it or not, because it happens to be economic fact.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Australia's external debt servicing obligations, expressed as the ratio of interest payments and contractually due capital repayments to exports of goods and services, rose from 8.3 per cent of GDP in 1979-80 to 33.6 per cent of GDP in 1984-85. Let me put that a little more succinctly so that, if members opposite

do not understand the import of what I have just said, some of these facts might sink in. A deficit of \$4.9 billion has been proclaimed this year. I do not believe it will be contained at that level, particularly in the light of the latest deal with the union movement, but that is what has been predicted by Treasurer Keating. If he could only get his way with his multi factionalised Party we would not be in the mess in which we are now—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Keating is the driest of the dry in the Labor Party, but they are all pretty wet. We cannot get them wet enough to describe them. With a deficit of \$4.9 billion this year the cumulative deficit in the first three Keating budgets is \$20 billion.

Mr Hamilton: Who wrote that for you?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No-one. That is more than the cumulative deficits of the seven Fraser budgets under Liberal Treasurers and Under Treasurer Stone.

Mr Hamilton: Where did you get that?

Mr Lewis: Federal Treasury papers.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Some very interesting facts emerged from the Auditor-General's Report which was tabled today and which I have looked at concerning the public debt and where we are going in South Australia. Borrow now—pay later. That is the philosophy of Labor Party strategists and economists. Try to meet your bag full of promises in the first budget and then try to come to grips with the situation later. That is an impossible task. In regard to the public debt on the federal scene, the Commonwealth's public debt interest bill (that is, not including States or statutory authorities) will be a massive \$6 724 million in 1985-86—an increase of over \$1 billion over last year or almost 19 per cent. Public debt interest is the largest individual item of spending after social security and payments to the states and local government, that is, higher than defence, health, and education. In fact, it has doubled in the three Keating budgets.

There is a strange silence from members opposite now they they understand what I am saying. This is simple and straightforward stuff. The public debt interest has doubled from \$3 378 million in 1982-83 to the present \$6 724 million. The interest due on that is equal to about \$20 a week per taxpayer across Australia. That means that every man in the street in this nation is involved in paying for works and projects that were put into operation as work schemes, for instance. I understand that the best part of \$1 billion for temporary work schemes has been financed on borrowed money. The average taxpayer in this nation is paying \$20 a week to come to grips with that interest bill. What sort of way is that to lead this nation? Of course members opposite scoff at what John Leard had to say.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: He's a phoney.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The genius opposite, the Deputy Premier, says that he is a phoney: if he is a phoney so are many people around this nation who believe that there is more than a spark of truth in what he had to say in that advertisement for which he paid. He talks about—

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: He had more than a spark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He had more than a spark of financial common sense in what he had to say: he talks about Australia's foreign debt. I defy anyone opposite to refute what I have been saying in terms of the national economy. Therefore, we are forced to borrow an additional \$10 billion a year just to pay the interest on our overseas debt, says John Leard. Do members opposite dispute that?

Mr Trainer: Yes, two-thirds is private sector indebtedness.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I see. Let us hear in due course the contribution made by the honourable member opposite. There is a lack of confidence by the interna-

tional financial community in Australia's future. This was sparked off by that unfortunate event, the MX missile fiasco, but has been followed by other events.

Mr Trainer: What would you have done about the MX missile?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member knows damn well what we would have done, and I will not be distracted. This country is indeed going broke, yet the Government in Canberra will mortgage the future of our children unless there is a complete reversal of direction and unless the Labor Party gets out of the habit of trying to buy votes, buy its way into office and let the day of reckoning catch up with it.

We are going down the same track in South Australia. What has happened to our indebtedness? The Auditor-General made some statements last year about the South Australian Financing Authority and they have been repeated, in effect, in this year's Auditor-General's Report in which he says:

The South Australian Government Financing Authority now adds a new dimension to the financing of capital works.

The Government has a lot more money to play with. The report continues:

The authority has an asset base of almost \$1 000 million and available cash resources of \$347 million at June 1984. It provides a ready source of funds to support projects of economic benefit to the State.

Fine and dandy! The Labor Party loves to have that sort of money at its disposal. Let us listen to the muted warnings of the Auditor-General:

Three factors need to be watched carefully in using those funds for public purposes: that the funds so used are channelled through the Consolidated Account, so that prior parliamentary scrutiny of their intended use and effect on the State budget can be made; that those funds are not used as a device to expand the capital works program in order to avoid difficult decisions with respect to project priorities; their use does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of debt servicing costs on the Consolidated Account and on taxation.

Let us look at what has happened to the State's indebtedness during the life of this Administration. At page 32 of the Auditor-General's Report appears a statement about public debt and other indebtedness. If one looks at the total liability of the State, one sees some interesting figures from 1981 to 1985. We read there that the indebtedness of the State in 1981 was \$2.76 billion.

Mr Hamilton: Oh!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is very boring, indeed. The fact that the honourable member's children's future interests are mortgaged matters not one little bit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact that members opposite might delude the public and buy their way into office is of far more moment to him at this time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If he applied himself to it rather than to his image as he gazes in the mirror frequently, it may be of use to him. They do not call him 'Hollywood' for nothing.

An honourable member: This is statesmanlike!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I wanted any lessons in statesmanship or on how to climb into the gutter, I would not have to gaze long at the Deputy Premier. He had a pretty good go today and last week.

Let us get back to matters of fundamental importance to the rising generation and to every member of this House. I trust that honourable members will take time out to try to absorb the point I am making. Public indebtedness rose, from 1981 to 1983, from \$2.76 billion to \$2.9 billion (in round figures). From 1983 to 1985, during the life of the present Administration, we have seen an enormous leap in

public indebtedness—from \$2.9 billion to \$3.8 billion. That is an enormous jump, far outstripping anything that occurred during the life of the Liberal Administration. We can see the net effect on Consolidated Account; it is a mini repeat, although not as spectacular, of what happened federally. It is the same track, with the same policies.

The net cost to Consolidated Account in 1981-82 was \$144 500 000 (as I read it). By 1985 it had increased to \$267 200 000—almost double. The net impact on the State budget of debt servicing costs has doubled. The State Labor Government is following precisely the same policies as its federal counterparts. The Premier of this State who, as a member of EPAC, is representing the interests of this State around the nation, is fully subscribing to what is happening in Canberra. When he went overseas seeking to sell to financial investors in London the benefits of this nation and this State, he was heard to make the statement that the economy in Australia was basically sound, that we are on the right track, on the road to recovery, and that we had no real problems.

Mr Trainer: And you prefer doom and gloom!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We had a lovely dose of doom and gloom from members opposite when in opposition, and they did not sustain it with facts. Although the Premier made the prediction in March that interest rates would fall, in April, a month later, he had to agree to a .5 per cent increase in interest rates for building societies. Banks were well and truly on the way up. Again, not much later in the year—in July, I think—he had to agree to another .75 per cent increase in interest rates. The Premier, who is in charge of the finances of this State, said that the economy was sound, that we had nothing to worry about, that interest rates would fall and that all in the garden was rosy.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He put personal credibility on the line.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He has not got much in light of what happened in the lead-up to the 1982 election and what has happened since. Economically, he has nil credibility. The building societies will be knocking on his door and asking for yet a further interest rate rise. We had that interesting little diversion today from the member for Mawson, who obviously is scared stiff about what is happening to the economy, despite these optimistic prognostications of the Premier. She brought in the red herring and dragged it across the path that the Liberals would allow interest rates to rise further. In fact, the banks are getting around the restrictions, anyway, by requiring people to take some of their borrowings on a personal loan at very much increased interest rates. They charge an annual service fee, which amounts to about .2 per cent, and I quote no less an authority than a former member of this House, the Hon. Peter Duncan. So, the banks are getting around the law.

It is a nonsense to suggest that interest rates have a ceiling when financial institutions such as banks are devising means of getting around it. Nothing the members opposite can say can get away from the fact that interest rates, as one commentator, at least, in the media has suggested, are the highest in real terms than they have been for 100 years. Honourable members opposite, who are not particularly interested in economic facts, may not know what that means: the gap between the underlying rate of inflation and interest rates is what we are talking about when we talk about interest rates in real terms. The real inflationary interest rate is at a level above that of inflation. It is the highest for 100 years, according to the financial reporter—I think that it was Grant Rowlands in the *News*, but certainly in one of the dailies.

That indicates that Labor Governments, both Federal and State need not only to change their thinking and get in

reverse gear, but turn around and go as fast as they can in the opposite direction. We well remember the economists of their ilk, when they were first elected in Canberra, suggesting that it does not matter about running up deficits now; let us expand the economy: we will catch up later. That is exactly what the State Government has done and is doing in this State.

The budget papers indicate that there is a slower growth in South Australia, on all the major indicators, than in any other State. There has been a decline in manufacturing employment at a faster rate than there has been in any other State. In terms of population trends, the record of this Government is by far the worst of any State around the nation. We remember the 1982 election campaign, when the present Premier, with his great crocodile tears, which were almost rolling down—one could see them—talked about people leaving the State in droves. He talked about 'losing our greatest resource—our people' and about the levels of unemployment. What a sorry story! Talk about doom and gloom! We would have run out of handkerchiefs if we had taken him seriously, but the migration from this State and the population growth in other States indicate that we have by far the worst record around the nation: Western Australia has leapt ahead of us. People are migrating to that much despised State of Queensland, but in South Australia we are losing them hand over fist, and the budget papers indicate what is happening.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let members opposite examine the budget papers a bit more closely and see what is happening in terms of population trends and where South Australia fits into that area. Let them say that there has not been a bigger decline in manufacturing industry in this State than anywhere else. The papers indicate clearly what the drop in employment and activity in the manufacturing sector has been under this Government.

I now refer to the big electoral issue: the employment aspects of the budget. All the thrashing, the schemes, the theorising, the increase in the size of the Government sector and the increase in taxes to fund it—what was the end result of all these during the life of the Labor Government? It was a big election issue. The member opposite who is nearly killing himself with his sense of humour cannot get around the fact that there are now 6 000 more people out of work than was the case when the Government came to office. It is members opposite with crocodile tears rolling down their faces, day in and day out, who are responsible for this appalling unemployment level and who ask what is to be done about our young people. What is the end result? South Australia has by far the longest period of unemployment, on average, for the unemployed.

If a person is out of work in South Australia—if they are among the increasing number of unemployed—their chance of finding a job in South Australia is slimmer than in any State in the nation. They must wait longer than is the case in any other State to obtain a job. We have the worst figures in relation to the young unemployed. In fact, a quarter of our young people cannot find a job. The Labor Party cannot get around the fact that there are 6 000 more people out of work now than was the case when it came to power. All the fancy figures in its statement on employment seek to disguise that fact. However, it cannot disguise the fact that there are more people out of work in South Australia now than was the case when the Labor Party came to government. I refer to the tables on page 9 where the Government conveniently omits the figure for 1982. The top table gives the number of unemployed persons. In 1982 (which was the last year of the previous Liberal Government) the number of unemployed was 46 600. They conveniently left that out—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: What is it now?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is now 52 600. In fact, the budget papers have been cobbled together to give the rosier picture possible. The figures indicate some improvement in terms of the number of unemployed during the life of the Government; in fact, it has been up and down like a yoyo. The Government cannot get around the fact that there are now 6 000 more people out of work compared with when it came to office. More young people are unemployed and, therefore, it is the worst situation in the nation. There is less chance of finding a job in South Australia compared with any other State in the nation. Unfortunately, the public have become a bit hardened on this question of unemployment, in my judgment.

The Government made a big deal of unemployment when it was elected, but its record has been appalling. The one bright spot in the budget papers appears on pages 20 and 21, where I note that the budget has been significantly assisted by the development of the oil scheme at Stony Point. Enormous growth is shown in revenue as a result of that scheme. The sale of condensate has escalated from \$35 million to \$88 million; the sale of crude oil has escalated from \$166 million to \$229 million; and the largest LPG contract ever signed in the life of the State was with Japan (during the previous Administration, of course). That contract now accounts for \$37 million. The State is reaping very large royalties indeed. During the time of the previous Liberal Government the then Labor Opposition said that we went too fast when I, as Minister on behalf of the Government, negotiated that scheme. We went through all of the negotiations and struck a very good bargain. However, all the then Labor Opposition could do was squawk in this place that we had gone too fast.

I have a particular interest in what is happening in the mineral industry. Of course the Premier is now clutching the Roxby Downs project to his bosom, although when the House was considering that project he had a lot to say about the matter, and he opposed it: he described it as being a mirage in the desert. However, the Government is now talking about making a commitment to that project this month. I am not too sure about that, but, anyway, I hope that a commitment will be made.

Of course the only problem now is that there might be problems with obtaining markets for uranium. Reports in the media have been interesting, and I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* as a result of the Premier's abortive trip to Japan, wherein it is stated that Japan is worried about Australia's attitude. Under the headline 'Blow to Roxby as talks fail' it was stated that:

It was revealed at the weekend by Mr Bannon that Japan had doubts about the long term security of supply.

That must be as a direct result of the Labor Party's policy, its backing and filling and complete turnaround in this State. How could any overseas investor have any confidence in a Government which can gyrate in such a way?

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): In considering a budget such as that which has been brought down, I believe that the most important aspect of all is to consider the philosophy and the direction behind it. However, it is fine to get down to the details, and I shall deal with the matters concerning my shadow portfolio in a moment. I am concerned about the Bannon Government's approach taken not only in this budget but in previous budgets also. Is it the sort of approach that we in South Australia (and indeed in relation to Australia as a whole) want the Government to take?

I bring to the attention of the House three specific areas of concern. First, I refer to the extent to which the Government in this budget (and this relates to Governments throughout Australia, particularly Labor Governments) is creating huge borrowings to pay for the rapid growth of the Government generally. I refer to some specific figures on this: in this year's budget there has been a 56 per cent increase in the borrowings by statutory authorities in South Australia. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, it is a bankcard budget for which the taxpayers of South Australia will pay enormous interest rates on the increased borrowings. A 56 per cent increase in borrowings by statutory authorities has occurred, increasing from \$126 million to \$195 million—an increase of \$70 million for statutory authorities alone.

Alarming figures brought out by the Auditor-General today indicate that under the Bannon Government the total indebtedness of South Australia has increased from \$2.9 billion in 1983 to \$3.8 billion in 1985—a very substantial increase of 30 per cent in two years. On top of that, we have the increase in debt of the State Government through its statutory authorities, under this budget.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That is as well, is it?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes. Therefore, there was already a 30 per cent increase in the first two Bannon budgets, with a further 30 per cent increase in the borrowings of statutory authorities this year alone. The same trend has occurred nationally, where Australia's foreign debt now stands at some \$70 billion. The national debt was only \$3.5 billion 15 years ago, and there has been an increase from \$3.5 billion to \$70 billion with the forecast being that by 1988, Australia's bicentennial year, that figure will have reached the publicly disgraceful figure of \$100 billion national debt.

The national debt already stands at something like \$15 000 for every Australian family. The interest bill on that debt is over \$10 billion a year, but to make matters worse the Australian Government is currently borrowing money to pay the interest bill. Therefore, our national debt is escalating not only due to over expenditure by Governments but due to Governments having to borrow money to pay even the interest on the debt.

A sum of \$10 million has been borrowed in the last year to pay off the interest bill on that national debt. We have the classic case that under a Federal Labor Government and under the State Labor Government there has been a very substantial leap in government debt. In fact, Federal, State and local governments in Australia, collectively, are currently spending \$15 million more than they are receiving through their receipts. Of course, that reflects that 15 per cent shortfall which has had to be made up through the public debt. Thus the first point I wish to make is that Labor Governments, particularly this Bannon Government, have the tendency to spend more than they receive and to raise the rest by increasing the public debt substantially.

The second area of concern is that extra Government employees have been put on well in advance of growth in the economy, and well in advance of growth in the private sector, so directing a greater share of our national and State economy to prop up government: 26 per cent of the Australian work force is now employed by government and that compares with 7 per cent in Japan, 15 per cent in West Germany and 17 per cent in the United States of America. I draw those comparisons, because it is the private sector in the economy and not the government sector which is the productive sector, and the fact that Australia has built up its public sector to such a large extent that it is now something like three times the level of that in Japan and almost double the level of that in West Germany is probably the most important single factor why national productivity per employee in Australia has fallen to such a low level.

Australia has gone from second in the world to something like eighteenth in the world in terms of productivity per person. What is the case here in South Australia? Under the Bannon Government since 1982 we have seen an increase of 6 130 on the Government payroll, with 800 extra jobs being created in this financial year 1985-86 and in the budget we are currently discussing. Therefore, we can say that under the Bannon Government the State Government work force has increased by something like 7 000. What has occurred in the meantime in the private sector? In the past three years in the private sector we have seen a drop of something like 14 000 jobs in manufacturing industry alone, a decline of 13.5 per cent.

It makes an absolute mockery of the Premier's boasting of improved employment circumstances in South Australia when we find that in one of the productive sectors we have lost 14 000 jobs, but 7 000 of those have been mopped up by Government, having to be paid for by the private sector and by individuals. From the figures available in the budget, we also see a drop of 5.4 per cent in the number of manufacturing establishments in South Australia.

I deliberately pick on the manufacturing industry as it is our biggest and largest industrial sector. It is the one on which this State has relied so heavily compared to other States and it is the one in which we must achieve a recovery if this State is ever to become great again. But it is the one where this budget has done absolutely nothing to help any such recovery. I would like to touch on that matter shortly in regard to the direction of the industrial incentives offered by this budget and also the lack of emphasis and the lack of achievement by the Office of Technology in terms of any real impact on our manufacturing industry.

The third area of concern in relation to government direction, both State and federally, is that the growth of government is well ahead of the growth of our economy and well ahead of the inflation rate that Australia is experiencing. I can give figures to back up that statement. Total spending by Governments in Australia will consume something like 44 per cent of our gross domestic product this year. In three years the Bannon Government has increased tax collection in South Australia by 55 per cent, which is almost three times the inflation rate. In its first two years the Bannon Government has collected an extra \$375 million in State taxes. Despite the so-called tax cuts, it will collect an extra \$58 million this year.

That is the sort of Government that you, Madam Acting Speaker, have been supporting in this House and that is the sort of high tax Government that is upsetting and annoying so many voters in the community. Madam, that is the very reason why the Bannon Government is under threat. In its three years in office the Bannon Government has increased tax collections by \$433 million.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: As the member for Hartley interjects asking what is the record of the Liberal Party, let me state that record. Under the first two Liberal budgets, 1979-80 and 1981-82, total State taxation revenue increased by 17 per cent, in real terms a reduction of 3.1 per cent, and that compared with an increase in the Bannon Government's first two years in actual terms of 47 per cent, or a real increase of 30 per cent.

Having been a member and a Minister of the Liberal Government and a member of the budget review committee, I am proud of that record. The first two budgets of the Liberal Government produced a 3 per cent decline in State taxation revenue compared to a 30 per cent increase in real terms under the Bannon Government. No wonder that the member for Mawson is red in the face trying to defend the Bannon Government's record on that sort of basis. It is no wonder that the honourable member's constituents are

expressing the view that it is time for a change of Government in this State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! Will the honourable member take his seat. I have expressed earlier today that persons on their feet addressing this Chamber are addressing themselves to the Chair and not to other members of the Chamber, so could I please ask the honourable member to abide by that?

Mr Baker interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: I call the member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would certainly direct all my comments through the Chair and I thought I was doing so by referring to you, Madam Acting Speaker, as 'Madam'. In the future I will say, 'Madam, through you' rather than 'Madam'. I want to point out to the member for Mawson, Madam, through you, that in fact I can understand the reason why she is so embarrassed by the performance of her Government. I guarantee that she would not be prepared to distribute literature in her electorate highlighting the differences between the Liberal Government's budget in its first two years and the Labor Government's budget in its first two years. It is interesting to see that the honourable member who just wandered across the House then—I forget his name—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Hollywood Hamilton. They are always so insignificant that I cannot remember their electorates. They do so little in this House and for the State that I have difficulty in remembering who they are.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address members in this Chamber by their electorate and not by some thought up name as he goes along.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Madam Acting Speaker, there are three areas in which I highlight the direction of the Bannon Government and the direction of our national economy under a Labor Government: the increase in borrowings by Government at Federal and State level; the increase in employment by State and Federal Governments is well ahead of the growth of the economy, and the growth in government generally whereby it is consuming a greater and greater proportion of our national productivity.

Australia has had that type of Government for a number of years and in South Australia for three years. We fare very poorly when we try to compete against overseas developed countries. We all know the extent to which our national debt has increased and our competitive position, our productivity, and standard of living has declined during those three years. For that reason, Australia needs a new direction. It is time that the philosophy that we have seen during the past three years was thrown out the door and that we saw a new style of economic management, a new philosophy and a new direction for South Australia and Australia.

That must be a direction, a philosophy and a style of economic management that constrains and, in fact, reduces the size of Government. Australia will never be a great nation until it brings the portion of the economy consumed by Governments back to a more reasonable level and puts some profitability back into the private sector, so that there can be a genuine increase in jobs and in our standard of living. It is on this basis that I reject the whole philosophy of this Bannon Government, the two previous Bannon Governments and the direction in which the Labor Party is trying to take this State and this nation.

I come back to deal specifically with areas of interest for which I have responsibility as shadow Minister of Transport and shadow Minister of Public Works. I refer to information provided in the Auditor-General's Report that was handed down in this House today. I will highlight what I have been talking about in terms of growth of government and putting

it into the public sector (which is the philosophy of this Government) compared to putting it into the private sector (which is the philosophy of the Liberal Party, shortly to be the Liberal Government of this State). I highlight certain matters for the sceptics on the other side of the Chamber—those who like to hit at privatisation.

I bring to the attention of the member for Hartley and the member for Mawson some facts about privatisation as highlighted by the Auditor-General. I know that both those members have given speeches in this House in relation to privatisation and have knocked the philosophy of it. However, let us look at what an independent authority—the Auditor-General—has to say.

On page 130 of the Auditor-General's Report, referring to the Department of Housing and Construction (formerly known as the Public Buildings Department), the Auditor-General came out with the following figures. First, if Government work is put to a private contractor using a competitive tendering procedure, the likelihood is that it will be completed at a price 10 per cent below what the Department of Housing and Construction's quantity survey office has said it will cost. If it is done in-house by the department's own work force, the figures suggest it will cost 20 per cent extra. How can members opposite defend their policy of putting as much work as possible into the day labour work force or the weekly paid work force of the Department of Housing and Construction when it is costing the taxpayers of this State 30 per cent extra using that mechanism? I see sitting in the Chamber the member for Florey, who has defended time after time that sort of policy that we currently have espoused and is now criticised by the Auditor-General.

Mr Groom: Using privatisation?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The figures show that if private contractors were used the cost would be 10 per cent less than the department's estimate for its work. If the department's work force is used, the price will be 20 per cent higher than the departmental estimate. That means that by using the internal labour force as opposed to the competitive tendering procedure a difference of 30 per cent arises.

I can think of no better example than that of the benefit for the taxpayers of this State than privatisation and putting work out to private tender, as highlighted by the Auditor-General. In fact, the Auditor-General goes on to show that last year alone putting work to the departmental work force ahead of the public tendering cost this State \$3 million. He has also shown that by maintaining that policy in 1985-86, as this budget will, it will cost another \$3 million. Until the end of June 1984 it had already cost about \$860 000. In other words, in three years this Government's policy of using its own work force rather than a system of competitive tendering has cost the taxpayer of this State a cool \$7 million.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: How do members opposite explain that to their constituents? I wonder how the member for Mawson or the member for Hartley will explain it to their constituents. How can they criticise privatisation when it could have saved this State \$7 million? It goes beyond that. An allocation in the budget, as highlighted by the Auditor-General, of \$540 000 had to be put aside until 30 June 1985 to pay for the professional services provided by the department which cost more than the fee structure laid down by the private professionals for those same services.

In other words, if the work had gone out to the private sector for that one department alone and it had paid normal professional fees (which are normally much higher than the fee structure charged), the cost of providing those professional services would have been \$540 000 less than they actually cost under this Government's policy. So, it is cost-

ing more for professional services—\$500 000—and \$7 million more for the manual construction.

I turn now to a table which appears in the Auditor-General's Report and which shows that the percentage of work going out to private consultants in this State is dropping at an alarming rate. In 1983, professional services used by the State Government through this department cost \$2.3 million; in 1984 that dropped to \$1.6 million; and in 1985 it has dropped to \$1.1 million—half of what it was two years ago. We have the Auditor-General highlighting the additional cost of using professional services within the Government, yet this Government is putting less and less work out to the public sector.

In tonight's *News*, under the heading 'Budget bombshell' appears the subheading 'SA faces \$80 million deficit'. This is the red spot edition of the *News*, hot off the street, and it states:

The SA Government probably will be \$80 million in the red by the end of the present financial year according to a bombshell report tabled in the Parliament late this afternoon. This is far from the balanced result predicted by the Premier, Mr Bannon, when he brought down the budget last month.

In other words, it would appear that in the last two weeks the budget has changed from being a balanced one to bring in a deficit to the extent of \$80 million. The article continues:

The deficit comprises \$51 million accumulated deficit and an expected budget short-fall by the end of the current financial year of a further \$26 million.

The apparent conflict in the size of the budget deficit is pointed out in the report of the Auditor-General, Mr Tom Sheridan, tabled in State Parliament late today.

Mr Sheridan points out in his report the Government commenced the 1984-85 financial year with an accumulated deficit of \$84.8 million.

Mr Klunder: Whose deficit was that?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is an accumulated deficit by the Labor Government in this State. It will blow out further despite the predictions made by the Premier. That is an independent authority and an independent source—

Mr Trainer: Who—Rex Jory?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, the Auditor-General.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I invite the honourable member, if he wishes to criticise the figures, to step outside the House and criticise the professional competence of the Auditor-General. I am sure that he will not do that because he knows what would happen. I have made my first point despite the interjections of the honourable member opposite, that the using of Government resources, both professional and construction services within Government, to do all of the work, rather than putting it out to public tender and use professional consultants outside government has cost this State about \$7.5 million under the Bannon Government. We all know that early in 1983, shortly after taking office, one of the first things that the Bannon Government did was issue a statement saying that all Government works should be carried out using the services of the Public Buildings Department rather than putting work out to public tender. In fact, there was a directive that it had to go to the PBD rather than first being put out to public tender.

The second point I wish to raise relates to the maintenance of Government buildings and assets. The House will know that I have in private members' time raised this issue on several occasions. I am concerned at the ease with which Governments in the 1970s and more recently have decided that the easy way out to help balance their budget is simply to cut back on maintenance of Government facilities. It does not show up immediately but, in the long term, it can be a very expensive option for the State. It means that, instead of repainting a wooden school building, one ends up having to replace it completely. If one allows paint to

continue to peel and the wood to continue to rot, one ends up having to replace the timber rather than simply having to put on several coats of paint.

The House will know that my argument in that area has been backed up by school councils, which have been very critical about the lack of maintenance funds in recent years. I have highlighted the danger in many schoolyards of the huge potholes in the asphalt that have resulted simply because the Government would not make money available to resurface those schoolyards. I have highlighted the lack of paint and the rotting of timber. The list goes on and on.

I have given details to this House of statements actually prepared by school councils and letters sent to me highlighting their maintenance problems. Because of that, and because the Premier knew that I had gained much support for the view I presented, he obviously decided that he needed a political gimmick to try to counteract the points I raised. He therefore dreamt up the Jubilee 150 maintenance programs and sold it in the budget as one of the greatest new programs ever as part of our Jubilee 150 celebrations.

There would be a brand new Jubilee 150 maintenance program in which \$90 million would be spent over three years. What has happened? We find that the money allocated this year in 1985-86 is exactly the same as the amount spent in 1984-85. If one takes into account the special allocation given last year of \$3 million and the special allocation this year of \$1.5 million, one finds that the amount for maintenance has been reduced by \$1.5 million. What has the Premier allocated this year—a mere \$23 million, even though \$90 million was supposed to be spent over a three-year program. Of course, if the funding continues to be spent at the level allocated by the Bannon budget this year, the Premier will find that there is a shortfall of \$21 million in that \$90 million.

The facts show that under the Bannon Government money made available for maintenance of Government assets has declined by 30 per cent in real terms in three years—a 30 per cent reduction. It is no wonder that school councils, in particular, are screaming out at the lack of resources available to maintain their facilities properly. It is no wonder that when one walks around those schools one sees the shocking state of toilets and other facilities. So, the special Jubilee 150 maintenance program is nothing but a sham.

I thank the House for the opportunity to highlight just some of those things. However, I point out that I have not yet even started on the State Transport Authority. Time will not allow me to do that, but I shall certainly take that up in the very near future. The State Transport Authority is another classic case of inept management where taxpayers of this State will pay very dearly this year compared with what they have paid already. Last year taxpayers had to pay \$104 million towards the cost of the State Transport Authority. This year it will escalate by at least \$7.7 million; in fact, it is more likely to get closer to \$10 million. I applaud the fact that there is no fare increase, but the Minister of Transport is taking no action whatsoever to curtail the cost.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): That was a very disappointing contribution by the member for Davenport, as indeed was the contribution by the Leader of the Opposition. It is hardly a bombshell. The fact is that the \$51 million deficit had already been disclosed in the budget papers: \$63 million of this so-called reported \$80 million is a deficit left by honourable members opposite when they were in government, because at the end of 1982 we inherited a deficit of \$63 million. Of course, it is a projected —

Mr Becker: That's not true.

Mr GROOM: It is true, and the honourable member knows it. The member for Hanson knows darned well that because members opposite were coming into an election period at the end of 1982 they needed to raise taxes and charges to meet their budgetary obligations. They did not do it purely for short-term electoral gain. As a consequence of that, this Government has had to pick up the tab for the financial mismanagement of members opposite.

It is hardly a bombshell: \$51 million is completely disclosed, and it is a prediction with regard to the revenue position in 12 months' time. We all know that these predictions will vary, depending on the economic climate, on additional receipts from governmental revenues and on a buoyant economy. It hardly ranks as a page 1 story, as depicted in the *News*. What should rank as a page 1 story is the financial incompetence of members opposite: that \$63 million component is their deficit.

Do not forget that members opposite know very well that between 1979 and 1982 they raised State taxes and charges of something in the order of 194 separate items. That is their record in government. What did the member for Davenport say? He talked about their reducing taxation. Anyone can do that if one is borrowing from capital works moneys, because that is what members opposite did.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to that and deal with it in a moment. Members opposite funded their recurrent deficit by borrowing from capital works, because in the 1981-82 year they transferred—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Just listen—\$44.7 million in capital works money. If members opposite will just settle down and listen, I will not talk so loudly, nor will I have to talk above them. I know that it is painful for members opposite to listen to me speaking about their poor performance when in government. I know that they do not like to be reminded of it, but the facts are there. In 1982-83 they transferred more than \$42 million from capital works—a total of \$86.7 million.

Anyone can do that if they want, but the fact is that one runs down the State's resources, and creates unemployment and the recession that members opposite created. The member for Hanson knows darned well what I am talking about. He does not support transferring capital works money to fund the recurrent deficit, and he knows the consequences. That is the record that the member for Davenport was parading in this House. Members opposite ran down the State's economy and built up a deficit which we inherited and over which we had to make hard decisions. The deficit of \$63 million is down to \$51 million in the budget papers as a consequence of very sound financial management.

We inherited that situation and, consequently, from an economic recession, South Australia is now the leading State in Australia in terms of economic performance. Members opposite can pontificate all they like, but that is the fact of the matter. I heard the members for Davenport and Torrens going on about the borrowings from statutory authorities. If one looks at the Estimates for 1984-85, the estimated receipts by way of borrowings from statutory authorities were \$150.5 million. In fact, \$125 million was needed for 1984-85.

If members turn to page 22 of the Auditor-General's Report, they will find the key. The reason for the reduced borrowings was the improved result on the current operations. As a consequence of the favourable economic climate, the Government did not have to borrow a further \$26 million. The estimated amount for this year is \$195 million, but a lot of that will turn on economic performance over the next 12 months. What do honourable members opposite

do? Because we have had a good economic year—which members opposite do not like to admit—we have not had to borrow \$150 million for 1984-85. They compare the good result, which is \$125 million, and then say that there is a \$70 million difference from \$195 million. Statutory authorities are basically owned by the State, in any event. Members opposite should not parade these matters about.

On page 58 of the financial statement South Australia's new money borrowing programs indicate a very favourable situation. I will not go through all figures as they are there for all to see, but they indicate that, in relation to South Australia's money borrowing programs' we are very well placed.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The other reason for the projected borrowings of \$195 million is that the size of the loan council programs has not changed in cash terms. To maintain the overall works program one needs to increase borrowings, otherwise there would be another economic recession. That perhaps is what members opposite want: they would like another economic recession. This Government is not about economic recessions, nor is the Federal Labor Government.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The generosity of the Chair has gone far enough. Interjections will cease. I remind the member for Bragg that he has already been warned once today and he knows the outcome of a second warning. I suggest that he has two options: he either shuts up or takes his name off the list of speakers.

Mr GROOM: The member for Davenport went on about the philosophy behind the budget. Let us look at the philosophy of the Liberal Party and how it would manage the State's affairs, particularly in terms of privatisation. The member for Davenport suggested that putting on contractors would save 10 per cent here and 20 per cent there. How do we save that money? Members opposite never tell us. I will tell members opposite how it is saved: first, by reducing services; secondly, by reducing the take home pay of workers; or, thirdly, by worsening award conditions. They have always been the consequences.

Mr Meier: More efficiency.

Mr GROOM: The member for Goyder can get up later in the debate and tell the House what the word 'efficiency' means and translate it to specifics. He should not go on with vague terms which mean absolutely nothing.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Torrens should look at the consequences of privatisation in Britain. What happened in local government in 1983 when they started to privatise the cleaning service? As soon as it was put over to private contractors, cleaners were offered a wage of—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You look at the contract price.

Mr GROOM: If the member for Torrens will be patient, he can participate in this debate later.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is not a question of whether the member for Torrens is patient or not, but whether the Chair will be patient or not. I can assure the member for Torrens that the Chair is just about running out of patience.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, once again. I repeat that this is painful for members opposite because they do not deal in specifics or tell the truth in relation to the financial affairs of this State and how they would manage them. In the West Midlands, in 1983, 800 cleaners in local government were offered a wage of around £1.30 sterling an hour to do a job that they previously did for an already meagre £1.72 an hour. That resulted in a serious industrial dispute with the unions involved. That is how members opposite cut costs. Never mind this nonsense of efficiency!

They get at the take-home pay of the workers or worsen their industrial conditions.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Glenelg would know more about the English conditions than anyone else. In November 1984, an industrial tribunal in England—again, privatisation—ruled that women cleaners at the Barking Hospital in East London who had been on strike for several weeks were unfairly dismissed when their employer—the private cleaning firm of Crothall—tried to force through a 30 per cent cut in their take-home pay and impose worse conditions. That is what employing contractors means, and make no mistake about it: it means an increase in industrial disputation because one has to take from someone.

Never mind these phantom calls of efficiency: that has never been established. What has been established is that privatisation—employing private contractors—results in the reduction of the take-home pay of workers and a worsening of their award conditions. Members opposite talk about saving money through privatisation! One National Health hospital, which in 1982 put its cleaning out to private contractors, found itself paying £80 000 more than it cost to employ its own cleaners.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I do not know whether they are wets or dries over there: maybe they are in between—half wet and half dry. What was the Thatcher Government's response in England when it found out that it was costing one hospital £80 000 more to employ private contractors? It abolished the Fair Wages Resolution, which since 1891 had required that employees, that is, contractors in this instance, working under Government contracts should receive pay and conditions at least as favourable as those of public employees in the same industry. The recent abolition by the Thatcher Government of the Fair Wages Resolution is to seek to ensure that privatisation cuts costs, but at the expense of the wages and conditions of working people.

Why do members want to privatise? That is the basis of their philosophy. Now they are backing off from privatisation. I heard the Leader of the Opposition on television on Sunday morning calling it 'partial privatisation'. That is a back-off.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to Mr Hall in a moment, but I look now at what members opposite would do and at how they would solve the economic problems in this State. At federal level, they would privatise Telecom, Qantas, TAA, Medibank Private—which is a misnomer because it is governmentally owned—the Australian Industries Development Corporation, the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, the Australian National Line, Ausat, and the Commonwealth Bank. At State level they have targeted the State Bank, SGIC, the State Transport Authority—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member can laugh, but he knows darn well that it is in their privatisation policy. They have also targeted the Central Linen Service, the State Clothing Corporation—which is an essential industry for Whyalla, as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would know—Woods and Forests and the River Murray Irrigation Scheme. ETSA is not exempt, despite a denial from the Leader of the Opposition. He got caught on that because he put power generation in his privatisation list and had to deny it, as he will have to back off a whole range of things.

As a consequence of this privatisation drive, no person currently employed by public authorities in communications, transport, postal services, banking, insurance, hospitals, woods and forests, power generation, construction and

maintenance would have secure employment under future conservative governments in Australia.

One must ask why. This is not a homespun philosophy; it has not come from grassroots level; it has been taken from England, where the economic problems bear no resemblance to our own, either in nature or degree. Members opposite want to try and impose it on Australians. There has been no grassroots call for privatisation.

Mr Lewis: Yes there has.

Mr GROOM: Do not be ridiculous. What is the motive? Let us look at the profit position of the targeted public companies, because that is where the answer lies. In 1983-84 Telecom had a profit of \$309 million, in addition to interest payments of \$597 million paid to the Federal Government, and it has a capital budget of \$2 billion. Last year Qantas made a profit of \$147.9 million (although \$80 million of that resulted from the sale of older stock); its operating profit was increased to \$62.7 million compared with \$58.3 million the year before. What about the Commonwealth Bank? Of course, Steele Hall will not vote to privatise that; but he will vote for others.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Members opposite will be in trouble with TAA and Ansett. If they privatise TAA, Ansett will have a competitor, and then we will see how they will get on with certain interest groups in the community. In 1983-84 the Commonwealth Bank had an after-tax profit of \$236.4 million.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I draw your attention to the line being taken by the honourable member. Nowhere in the budget papers is there reference to the Commonwealth Bank or other Commonwealth statutory authorities.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to uphold the point of order. It is customary in this debate to allow a fairly wide scope. However, I ask the honourable member to come back to the debate.

Mr GROOM: What I propose to do for the benefit of honourable members opposite, because I know they have difficulty in understanding these matters, is to explain that I will be showing the consequence of privatisation on our budgetary position in South Australia and Australia and how the community will suffer as a consequence of the policies of honourable members opposite. Returning to the Commonwealth Bank, it has assets of \$15 billion and savings bank deposits of \$11.5 billion. According to this morning's newspaper, TAA had a 1984-85 profit of \$28.4 million, and revenue of \$758 million.

The State Bank—a magnificent success story in South Australia—combined with SGIC to be responsible for the housing boom, and it has assets of \$4 billion. Recently it announced a 142 per cent leap in profit to \$14.65 million in 1983-84, compared with \$35.3 million for 1984-85. I will not detail every instrumentality because I wish to comment on other areas. SGIC had a profit in 1983-84 of \$4.2 million, and it has investment funds totalling \$446 million. We know how the Woods and Forests Department salvaged this State's timber supply following the Ash Wednesday fire.

Mr Lewis: Using private contractors.

Mr GROOM: Well, so be it. That is the partnership between public enterprise and private enterprise. The honourable member opposite wants to privatise the lot. The Woods and Forests Department is involved in replanting 20 million trees over the next eight years. No wonder members opposite want to privatise that resource. The State Clothing Authority, as you will know, Mr Deputy Speaker, is a vital industry for Whyalla. Honourable members opposite want to sell it off. It has sales of \$1.6 million. It made a trading loss in 1983-84 of \$37 400. However, in 1982-83 (the last year of the Tonkin Liberal Government) it had a

loss of \$153 000. Its 1983 annual report states that despite it being short of work the Tonkin Government continued to place public sector orders with the private sector and not with the State Clothing Authority, to run it down so it could sell it off. It is an essential industry to Whyalla.

We know that the Central Linen Service is one of the most efficient in Australia, but members opposite want to privatise that. Consider the value of the public utilities to the economy of South Australia. Members opposite do not want the losses. The State Transport Authority, for example, has a deficit of \$80 million. If that were privatised, and bus fares increased from 75c to about \$2.30 for an average fare, that would be unacceptable. Members opposite do not want that authority, for example, but they want those profitable public utilities.

I shall not dwell on the situation that occurred in England. We know what happened when Telecom in England was privatised—the public lost £1.3 billion, because it was undervalued. As soon as the shares were issued they immediately doubled in value, and everyone knew that the speculators had got in. In time, Telecom in England will go from being 100 per cent owned by the nation to being in the hands of a few per cent of the people. The public loss was £1.3 billion as a consequence of privatisation. It was undervalued and all the speculators got in. In addition, they paid £190 million in marketing commission payments to their friends in the private sector. It was a great loss to the public.

Honourable members opposite can say that there will be profits from these companies when they are privatised and that revenue can be obtained in that way, but that shows a complete lack of understanding of the way in which private companies work. What will occur is that tax havens will be set up—they will do what most private companies now do, namely, indulge in intercompany pricing and making their profits in tax havens. There will be nothing left to tax in Australia—let us make no mistake about that.

In looking at the budget papers and the value of these public utilities to the South Australian economy, it can be seen that ETSA, for instance, contributed \$28.5 million to the revenue of this State, and that the State Bank, contributed \$12.5 million. That \$31 million offset in our revenue position occurred as a consequence of the benefit of these public utilities. Members opposite want to privatise them, but who under a Liberal Government, will pick up the tab for that \$31 million? Because services must be maintained we all know the burden will fall on the taxpayer: that is the inevitable consequence—either that or a reduction of services.

The new Leader of the Opposition federally—I am told that he is a dry—has had to concede that privatisation would not be enough to allow a Federal Liberal Government to cut taxes because, for instance (and this was on a television debate with the Federal Minister for Communications), the cost of telephone connections in some country centres is estimated at between \$20 000 and \$25 000 (Telecom estimates), but most country subscribers pay a maximum of \$1 350. If Telecom were privatised, I would like to see members opposite telling country voters that the cost of telephone services would be increased by some \$19 000 or \$20 000.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Mallee would be leading a demonstration against such a move. What is Mr Howard's solution to the problem? The subsidies for Telecom total \$500 million, and there is no way that Sinclair and the National Party will allow that subsidy to get away from them, so Mr Howard said that one option would be to meet the subsidy directly from the Commonwealth budget. So, rather than cutting the deficit annually, \$500 million would

have been added to the present Hawke deficit, if honourable members opposite had their way. That benefit would be lost and the cost imposed on the taxpayer. Rather than decreasing deficits honourable members would be responsible for increasing deficits. That is why Mr Howard, in a moment of honesty, conceded that there would not be enough in it to allow a Government to cut taxes. So why do it?

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr GROOM: There was another critic in Mr Hall—someone mentioned the member for Boothby, although as a consequence of the change of leadership he will not rock the boat any more and will try to get back in the good books, so he is lining himself up a bit more with privatisation. However, he did say that he would not be voting for selling off Qantas and the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Of course not—at least he is showing some sense on that. However, make no mistake that he would sell off everything other than those two organisations.

An honourable member: He is a wet!

Mr GROOM: He is an in between—he was a Peacock man but he is back now as a Howard man. A comment made by Mr Valder was the best of all. He said that privatisation was fiddling at the edges of government spending. He said that we would have to cut welfare spending. That was his answer: 'Never mind the subsidy in the country areas, never mind the cutting of taxes, we will cut welfare,' and we know that that is what members opposite would do.

People such as Pirie Madsen, who was visiting here, seem to start getting a momentum of their own. I heard him talking on the radio, and I was lucky enough to get an opportunity to respond on radio 5DN, which gave me something like 20 minutes in which to reply to his comments. People like that get a momentum of their own on privatisation. He was a so-called expert brought out here to tell South Australia how to go about privatising these valuable public utilities. He said that one could privatise the military, too, that there was no reason why a government should run military establishments.

He said, 'Turn all the bases over to private enterprise.' Can you imagine in a time of national crisis having to ring up our enemies and asking them, 'Can we use our bases? Can we move our troops?'. How ludicrous! This policy of privatisation will be the Achilles heel of members opposite, and they know it. The member for Torrens can laugh but he remembers his Party's policy last year of the privatisation of public schools. What happened in all of this? It came out that their Federal Party was going to privatise the public schools, despite the fact there are many hundreds of thousands of voluntary hours put in by the community in those public schools.

The Federal Liberal Party went further (the momentum that this privatisation gathers!): they were going to sell off the public schools—lock, stock and barrel. We know that the member for Torrens has influence and standing at Federal level because telexes and telephone calls—or whatever means of communication he used—were going back and forth all afternoon. He had the policy cancelled, and that is to his credit. In the same way the Leader of the Opposition had to back off on ETSA. He had to issue a denial. He knows this policy is a vote loser; it is not a home grown policy. He stuck his neck out and, with respect to him, he is going to get it chopped off. In time, the community will be alerted to the consequences of privatisation. In England it is conceded that, of the one million jobs that are going to be transferred to the private sector from the public sector, 150 000 people will lose their jobs. Associated British Ports, British Aerospace, Cable and Wireless, all of which have

been privatised in the past few years, have all reported job losses consequent upon privatisation.

When the community in South Australia—and, indeed, Australia—are alerted to the consequences of privatisation under a Liberal Government, of course they will back off, and to their discredit. On the *Sunday* television program I was lucky enough to get home to hear the Leader of the Opposition backing off on privatisation and now calling it 'partial' privatisation. That is a back-off and there will be more. In due course he will have to deny that he is going to privatise the State Bank; in due course he will have to deny that he is going to privatise SGIC; in due course he will have to deny that he is going to privatise the clothing factory at Whyalla, and so on.

Mr Trainer: How are they going to make a profit with the military?

Mr GROOM: They will use efficiency with regard to the military. How ludicrous! How ludicrous to bring that type of person over to South Australia from England to tell us how to run our affairs here! How ludicrous to tell us to privatise our military bases, to have private contractors in! To use the member for Davenport's term, 'We can cut costs by 30 per cent if we just bring private contractors in and let them run our military bases.' What an absurd sort of policy! That is the path that members opposite are going down. It is their Achilles heel and, with other factors, it will cost them the election.

I have not had time to deal with a lot of the positive things I wanted to say about the budget. The Premier has proved himself the most capable economic manager that this State has ever had. Even Ren DeGaris says that. Let the member for Goyder get up in this debate and tell people how the Liberals ran up a deficit. You can laugh like a hyena, if you want to. You get up and tell the people. You did not have the courage in 1982 when you were coming to an election period. You told the people of South Australia you were bringing in a balanced budget. That was an out and out distortion, because it was not a balanced budget.

It was a budget that had an inbuilt \$63 million deficit. The Liberal Party did it for short-term electoral purposes and risked the financial well-being of this State. If it had won the 1983 election it would have had to massively increase taxes and charges in order to pay for its financial incompetence. At the same time, during the same three year period from 1979 to 1982 it imposed 194 State taxes, charges and other imposts. Let us not have any—

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I researched the matter thoroughly. Let us not have any misunderstanding about what members opposite did in office. If you take from capital works, anyone can reduce taxation. You could do that now: you could take \$80 million from capital works and reduce taxation, but the economy would collapse. That is what the Liberal Party did, because it did not have the courage to economically manage this State: it used capital works money and induced a depression in this State. As a consequence the Labor Government had to pick up the tab and make the hard decisions that members opposite were incapable of making whilst in government.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): It is obvious why the member for Hartley is not on the frontbench—his lack of integrity defies even that of the Premier. The member for Hartley did not make a great deal of sense during his speech but, more importantly, he deliberately misled the House. Of course, if he was on the front bench, he would then be subject to dismissal as a Minister, but I suppose fortunately he is not on the front bench and I think it will be many, many years before he gets there.

He mentioned that the SGIC had made a profit. That statement is somewhat different from the report produced by the Auditor. If in fact the member for Hartley can read, he will note that during the last financial year (and I refer to page 452 of the Auditor-General's Report) there was a net loss of \$13.6 million for the SGIC during the year. That is far from making a profit. I would not mind some of the interest on that money.

The other thing about SGIC upon which the member for Hartley placed great emphasis on was the fact that one of the items mentioned by the Auditor was an accumulated loss in the compulsory third party fund in the SGIC of \$30 million at June 1985. I am sure that he as well as the Bannon Government does not want to broadcast to the public at large that that deficit and accumulated loss can no longer continue. That situation places the SGIC and the whole foundation of the insurance industry at risk. The upshot of that is that, unless there is a change of circumstances, some massive increases in third party insurance will result. The Bannon Government does not want to broadcast that fact and I am sure that there are many other matters that have been mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report which will be picked up by my colleagues.

I congratulate the Auditor-General on a fine effort in his scrutiny of the accounts of State Government departments. At the resumption after dinner I intend to address the question of accumulated deficits and, indeed, the headline in the *News* tonight is very timely. Of course, this was the very issue I intended to mention in the House tonight. I am pleased that the press has managed to grasp the nettle and tell the South Australian public the truth about this budget. Just as the member for Hartley was totally deceitful in the way that he presented a number of items in this House tonight, the budget is quite deceitful. It will place South Australia in a very invidious position where it will have very little option to move within the next three years because of the way the budget has been structured.

I have in my possession a publication produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It was interesting to note that the interest paid by Governments increased from \$3.4 billion in 1981-82; to \$4 billion in 1982-83; to \$5 billion in 1983-84; and to \$6.6 billion in 1984-85. In the last financial year under the Hawke Government the increased charges on the moneys that had been borrowed totalled 30 per cent. This is an indication of the lack of willingness on the part of the Hawke Federal Government to come to grips with the underlying problems facing Australia. It is reflected in the state of the economy and in the state of the Australian dollar. I will say why this circumstance has arisen after the break.

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

Mr BAKER: Before the break I was making a few preliminary comments about budget deficits, and I would like to expand on that before talking about the Premier's budget strategy. It is no secret to members of this House that I have made a number of comments about budgeting over the past three years since I was elected as the member for Mitcham. It has been of increasing concern to me that State and Commonwealth Governments have not lived up to their responsibility as far as the organisation of their finances is concerned.

The member for Mawson put a motion before this House today concerning interest rates. I believe that that issue is fundamental. It will affect all home owners who have mortgages—moneys outstanding as loans on their houses. For the edification of members of this House—and obviously members on the Government side need a little edification—I will explain why interest rates rise. Interest rates rise when too much demand chases too little money.

In Australia today we have a combination of factors pushing up interest rates. Principally, there is the pressures of high budget deficits, which are a product of Labor Governments. Labor Governments always spend more than they earn; they always like spending other people's money. For those who need a lesson in elementary economics, it is useful to understand what will happen under particular scenarios. For example, during the 1983-84 financial year the federal budget ran a deficit of about \$11 million. If there is to be no unnecessary inflationary pressure on the economy, that excess money must be taken out of the economy, otherwise our economy will finish up like that of Israel which, at one stage, had an inflation rate of about 500 per cent per annum.

The key to keeping inflation under control is to take the excess deficit money out of the economy, which is always financed through Treasury bills and notes. What the Government does is buy back money from the economy. This places pressure on the amount of money available, as members can readily understand. The other things that place pressure on interest rates are domestic demand in the form of industrial enterprises wanting to expand their businesses; people wanting to build houses; businesses wanting to borrow for whatever reason; and people wanting to borrow for personal reasons. In the domestic sphere, there are two major areas of borrowings: businesses and people.

Coupled with this is the impact of the overseas money flow. We know that if our overseas competitors perceive the Australian economy to be a little rocky, they will devalue our dollar, because it is a floating dollar and no longer fixed. Therefore, there is a monetary outflow from the country, and that has an impact on the amount of money available for lending.

All these factors combined place enormous pressure on interest rates. The pressures, fundamentally, are there because Governments, in this case, are unable to control their budgets—their running deficits. That means that they have to go to the institutions and draw that money out of the economy. In market terms, that places pressure on the available funds, the cost of funds goes up, everyone is competing, and the lending institutions are all trying to compete for a limited number of dollars so that they can borrow or lend and make a profit.

The greatest pressure currently on interest rates is caused by the Federal Government's deficit funding. It has a massive roll over of bills as a result of its former deficits. It has attempted in its 1985-86 budget to reduce the deficit by \$1.9 billion, but there is an accumulated deficit that must be continually rolled over. The only way to break this cycle is to introduce a surplus budget, which means that demand to roll over the former debt and to finance the existing debt is reduced because there is no existing debt—in fact, there is a surplus.

The Federal Government has not chosen to do that. In a time of some economic recovery, it has failed to keep control of its big spenders. It has spent far more than it has needed to and has, in fact, increased Australia's indebtedness. My colleague, the member for Davenport, pointed out to this House that we have an overseas debt of some \$70 billion. South Australia's debt has increased from \$2.9 billion to \$3.8 billion in just two years. All this adds to pressure on money—that reveals itself by pushing interest rates upwards. That is the primary reason why interest rates are on an upward move at the moment. That is the primary reason why real interest rates are the highest on record for the past 50 years—because of the mismanagement of the Federal Government in concert with its henchmen in the States.

It is no good the member for Mawson, or any other member on the Government side, saying that a Liberal

Government would deregulate interest rates. The point is that we have a Federal Labor Government in Canberra and Labor Governments in four States where policies of over-spending are pursued with much vigour. They are contributing to the demise of this country. I mentioned before the tea-break that the Government's interest debt servicing increased from \$5 billion to \$6.6 billion between 1983-84 and 1984-85. Of course, a lot of that increase is Commonwealth Government inspired.

The relative figures for State and local government spheres are quite interesting when one compares 1983-84 and 1984-85: the figures were \$2.1 billion and \$2.2 billion respectively. Some people would say that they have attempted to keep this under control. What has happened, of course, is that the Loan Council has attempted to keep matters under control but, in fact, has left the door open for Governments to borrow from other instrumentalities and on the overseas market.

If one looks at other areas of interest paid by the State Government and local government one sees that they have increased over the same period from \$706 million to \$887 million—that is the debt servicing for that one year—an increase of 13 per cent for the same period. State and Commonwealth Governments are responsible for the debt facing Australia, for the enormous pressure on interest rates today, and for the demise of the Australian dollar—the Bannon and Hawke Governments are equally culpable. It does no good for the member for Mawson to put a private member's motion before this House in relation to interest rates when, if she has any sense at all, she knows that it is her Governments that are responsible for the mess that we are in.

That mess will get greater unless we start to reorganise our finances and call a halt to tax increases. Overseas countries will look at our competitive edge and see that the level of taxation in Australia and this State is becoming unacceptably high. They cannot afford to invest in Australia because of high taxation and they cannot afford to buy Australian dollars because they know that there is every likelihood that the value of those dollars will fall because Australia is a non-performing country that cannot manage its finances in the same way as a household budget is organised.

If anyone wants an elementary lesson in economics, I shall be pleased to enlighten them. This leads to today's banner headline 'Budget bombshell, South Australia faces \$80 million deficit'. In fact, the picture is far worse than that painted in today's *News*. Indeed, I would like to take the House step by step through the budget manipulation of this deceitful Government that has torn every single dollar from Treasury and all possible surplus funds to organise a balanced budget. It is not a balanced budget because, in fact, the Government is using deferred income as a means of bolstering finances for the 1985-86 financial year. I will explain the implications of that shortly.

The Auditor-General has reported on the budget manipulations, and I will refer from his report before undertaking an analysis of special impacts. In regard to the accumulated deficit, the Auditor-General states:

The running of a deficit to meet an urgent and pressing circumstance is an accepted financial management practice, provided its recovery is planned over a relatively short term period. It has a hidden cost and care must be taken to ensure that it does not become part of longer term planning.

The accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account has stood at a high level since 1 July 1983. It has been reduced now for the first time with the aid of improved economic conditions. It is still high and at a level of \$51 million has a hidden cost to the taxpayer of some \$6 million a year.

Further reductions need to be planned, and it would be unwise to rely solely on economic conditions to achieve those reductions. Stringent control over all expenditure is essential.

In that context it is relevant to note that the accumulated deficit could have been reduced by a further \$7.7 million at 30 June 1985 if the necessary regulation had been in place to effect the planned transfer from the Highways Fund. Care needs to be taken to ensure that if the equivalent of two annual transfers are taken into the consolidated account in 1985-86 from the Highways Fund a permanent level of expenditure is not set up which can not be matched in future years by a similar level of funds.

The same principle applies with respect to the housing moneys of \$18.6 million retained in a Deposit Account at 30 June 1985. It is a principle that guards against the creation of an underlying deficit, which would remain dormant in 1985-86, emerge in 1986-87 and each subsequent year—and would only be extinguished by a permanent increase in the revenue base, or a permanent decrease in the expenditure base, or a combination of both measures. The principle takes on added emphasis given:

- the size of the existing accumulated deficit.
- that the Commonwealth special assistance grant of \$34 million in 1985-86 is to be phased out and is likely to erode the benefit of the guaranteed real increase in other Commonwealth general revenue grants in the two subsequent years.

As I said, the precarious situation in the budget is understated. I intend to inform members exactly why there is a crisis in State Government finances induced by this budget. If one looks at the receipts documents one finds a number of items that are referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. Certainly, we have the return of Housing Trust capital of \$18.6 million, which was in fact paid back to the Commonwealth in 1984-85. Trust moneys were held and were to be used as a revenue item for 1985-86. That is disgraceful in accounting terms. If those moneys had been repaid when they should have been repaid, we would have reduced the recurrent deficit. The Highways Fund deficit has been referred to by the Auditor-General, that sum involved being \$7.7 million. Had the Government paid over these moneys in the financial year in which it should have done so, again it would have reduced the deficit.

I would now like to comment on two other interesting items. First, page 5 of the document refers to recovery of debt services. Interest on investments should have been \$21 million in 1984-85, but it was artificially depressed to \$14 million by the operation of an SAFA overdraft with Treasury, resulting in a salting away of a further \$6.7 million.

An artificial overdraft operated with the Treasury during that period, which makes the budget result for 1985-86 far better than it should be. Further, we have the spectre of the Government's creaming off the surplus of some \$20 million from the South Australian Government Financing Authority. That is shown in the Treasurer's miscellaneous line. Also, we have a declared State Bank dividend of \$5.9 to the Government. If we add all those receipt items, we conclude that \$58.9 million has been hidden in the budget that cannot be relied on as a regular revenue item.

I will now explain that process for the edification of members. Some people may be aware of the way in which SAFA is structured. If there is a decrease in interest rates, which is unlikely at the moment bearing in mind the way in which the Federal Government is operating, that would place pressure on SAFA funding. As members may well be aware, SAFA has taken over almost all debts of semi-government and Government authorities.

These debts were incurred at varying rates of interest: some were as high as 15 or 16 per cent and others were as low as 5 per cent. The average was about 1 per cent below the average market interest rate last year. Should interest rates reverse because of their unusually high nature, it will place enormous pressure on the fund. Therefore, the Government is unwise to cream off any surplus from SAFA at this stage, because that \$20 million may well be needed towards the end of next year in order to provide some buffer for the relatively profitless nature of SAFA, remembering the structure of its debts.

People must realise that, if one is paying interest on fixed loans at 12 per cent and the market rate for loans drops to,

say, 11 per cent, SAFA's commitment will not go down, because it will still have to meet the 12 per cent on the absorbed debt. On the other hand, it will be able to get only 11 per cent on its money on the open market, so there will be a deficit of 1 per cent.

There is a certain problem with SAFA's funding. There are two options. Should interest rates lower, the Government can do one of two things: first, it could run a deficit off the recurrent account and get Treasury to prop it up. Secondly, it could then charge above market interest to statutory authorities. Knowing the way in which the Bannon Government operates, in all likelihood, if it were still in office in a year's time, it would probably take the latter course, because it is the easiest. The Government would then have to ask statutory authorities to pay more than market interest rates for the debts that it owes SAFA or, alternatively, accept a lesser interest rate on moneys that it is lending to SAFA.

No other options are available. So, it is dangerous to take \$20 million from the SAFA surplus, because it is only a paper profit at this stage and, until the long-term implications of SAFA's funding and debt structuring become clear, it is wrong to do so. In any event, the Premier has taken \$20 million out of SAFA, and then we consider the \$5.9 million dividend from the State Bank. It is obvious that when an enterprise makes a profit, it should pay a dividend to its shareholders, the State Government being the shareholder in this case.

We know that the State Bank as a Government instrumentality is expanding faster than any other bank in South Australia. It has enormous potential, thus good economic reasoning suggests that, if we are going through a period of high growth, we supply some seed capital to ensure that that growth is not impeded in any way. Instead the Bannon Government has decided to declare itself a \$5.9 million dividend from the State Bank. It is \$58.9 million that I have added up as a deficit item because of the way the funding has taken place. If we add the \$58.9 million to the \$51 million already in train, we come up with a deficit for the year of not \$80 million, as stated in the *News*, but almost \$110 million, because of the way the budget is operated.

I assure members that the Government cannot rely on these same funds, as they are a one-off revenue item, and thus its only option beyond the 1985-86 financial year is to top up the revenue budget through massive increases in taxation. Although I am sure that this matter is difficult for most people to appreciate, I put on record that the State Government is running a \$110 million deficit and is attempting to be quite deceitful in the way it operates its finances. It is totally deceitful in terms of the Premier's statement that he would ensure that the capital items remained in a capital budget. If that were the case, the \$18.6 million, which was the Housing Trust seed capital, should have been paid back into the capital budget.

This Government, in its deceitfulness and the way in which it has operated generally, has seriously affected the construction industry in South Australia. We know that it underspent its capital budget deliberately at a time when the construction industry, other than in the case of house building, was at a very depressed level. The State Government chose not to provide the necessary capital to keep some of our businesses going. We know that a number of businesses have experienced financial difficulty but that the Government decided to adopt a course of setting aside funds for the election year. It is disgraceful that the Government should have done that when it had made a commitment for all these projects to be finished.

If members look at the payments documents, they will understand that the finishing date for a number of the capital projects has been extended in some cases by six

months and in others by 18 months. These projects have been set back, whether it involve the O-Bahn or a number of other projects. The Government has deliberately set back these projects so that it could underspend its capital budget.

Mr Ashenden: Two years on O-Bahn.

Mr BAKER: Yes. That is not good economics; in fact, it is very poor economics at a time when the State needs that impetus of capital. So, according to the Premier, we will see a splurge in 1985-86 when all our dreams will come true at no cost. We will face an enormous cost, because we cannot possibly finance such measures. We have increasing debts this year from \$300 million up to \$370 million. In the space of one year we have a \$70 million debt servicing increase.

How many buildings, including houses, could that finance? It has to come out of the revenue budget. Nobody can trust the Bannon Government to do the right thing for South Australia. It will indeed be a pleasure to have a responsible Government here in South Australia when the Liberal Government is formed on 7 December.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I will address myself this evening to the utter deceit with which the Bannon Government has continued to operate in South Australia since it came to office, unfortunately, some three years ago. One would think that by now the Premier would have learnt that his deceit and dishonesty are well known. With this budget (which he celebrated—we read in the press—with champagne corks popping, but which he was extremely premature in celebrating), he thought that he had pulled the wool over the eyes of South Australians once again. He may have pulled the wool over the eyes of some people for a very short time after he made his budget speech to this House, but once the figures were analysed we could see the budget for exactly what it is.

The headline in today's *News* is indicative of the way in which the Premier has acted since he came to power. He stated when he introduced the budget that it would be balanced. If he calls a deficit, which will be somewhere between \$80 million and (as my colleague the member for Mitcham has just pointed out) \$110 million, a balanced budget his definition of 'balanced' is totally different from the definition that I would use.

Mr Lewis: About as balanced as the Mafia sense of justice.

Mr ASHENDEN: Something like that: I thank my colleague for his interjection. This Premier came to power in 1982, promising that there would be no new taxes and no tax increases. Before he went to the people he was asked by the media how he could say that. He stated—and it is on the record—that he could do that because he was able to get the figures from the Treasury. He knew exactly what was in kitty and could therefore make this commitment to South Australians, that if they elected him he would not have to increase any taxes or introduce any new taxes. We saw what that was worth.

The Premier still has not learnt, because time after time he makes statements which are totally (and can be shown to be patently) false. This budget speech from the Premier is one more example. I will tonight address myself particularly to the way in which this budget has been seen in the north-eastern suburbs. As I am sure that members opposite would be only too well aware, the determination of which Party will govern after the next State election will be made in the north-eastern suburbs, in Unley and in the south-western suburbs. That is where people have the greatest say.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I am glad that we had that interjection, because the member for Price should go to the Premier and ask whether he could please have a look at a copy of the

report on the Labor Party survey that was conducted in the seats of Todd and Newland only a couple of weeks ago. He will find, if the Premier gives that document to him, that it shows clearly that the seat of Newland will be held by the Liberal Party with a very substantial majority and that the new seat of Todd will almost certainly come to the Liberal Party. In fact, I would remove the word 'almost' and state that it will certainly come to the Liberal Party, as will Unley also.

As I have said, I am not so familiar with the south-western suburbs, but the points that I want to make tonight are based on my discussions with many people—individuals, small businessmen and representatives of organisations—in the north-eastern suburbs.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I believe that the member for Unley may have attended a job interview.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. The point is that in the key seats, the marginal seats, or whatever one calls them, with the so-called swinging vote, the voters weigh up the policies of the two alternative Parties and then cast their vote accordingly. As I pointed out to the member for Price, the Government's own survey in the seats of Todd and Newland shows exactly what I indicated to this House when I spoke in the Address in Reply debate: that the residents of those suburbs have seen the Premier's actions for the cynical actions that they are. They have seen the so-called tax cuts as an attempt to buy their vote.

On the very night that the Premier announced his tax cuts I attended two different functions: the annual general meeting of a sporting club and then a school council meeting. At both functions people that I know for a fact have not been associated with any political Party, have never been politically aligned and have never acted in a political way came up to me and made quite clear that they were angry that, after three years of being hit to leg by this Government with the highest rate of taxation that this State has ever seen, the \$41 million so-called tax cut amounted to absolutely nothing at all. They pointed out that this \$41 million was but a drop in the ocean compared to the money that had been taken away from them by this Government in the form of taxation. They could also see that the \$41 million so-called tax cut was in fact equal only to the amount of money which the South Australian Government had been given in the form of various hand-outs by the Federal Government.

Obviously a deal has been done between the Premier and the Prime Minister to try to come up with as much money as they can to buy the electorate. I point out to the Government that this will not happen. We now have in existence the highest taxing, biggest spending and biggest borrowing Government that South Australia has ever had. As the Leader said earlier this afternoon, the Premier's budget is best described as the 'bank-card budget'. In his so-called 'balanced budget' the Premier has increased borrowing for statutory authorities by 56 per cent. That is a huge debt that will be around the necks of all South Australian taxpayers for years to come.

During the Dunstan years we found very quickly that the biggest item in the Dunstan budget was education and that the second largest item was the repayment of debts—debts which he racked up for South Australians in the 10 years of disastrous Labor rule under his premiership. I thought that Dunstan and perhaps even Whitlam were the best at increasing taxes and increasing debts; however, we now find that Premier Bannon makes them look like a couple of schoolchildren.

Mr Meier: Pure amateurs.

Mr ASHENDEN: As my colleague says, they were pure amateurs compared to the way in which this Premier has increased the debt millstone around the necks of South Australian taxpayers. The residents of the north-eastern suburbs have been most affected by the Bannon Government's actions. They have had to fork out so much extra money every time an electricity bill or a water rate bill has come in; and it just goes on and on.

I now turn to stamp duties. In the area that I represent, the value of homes has increased by over 50 per cent in the past few years. People coming into the area or moving house in that area are finding whenever they purchase a home that the stamp duties that they are now required to pay are astronomical, because the percentage which is taken away by the Government in the form of stamp duty on the sale of a house or a block of land is tied to the value of the house or the block of land. This Government talks about tax cuts but, if it were genuine, it would reduce the level of the rate at which stamp duty is taken. However, in the budget, in real terms, the Government will rake in more money this year in the form of stamp duty than it did even last year.

Yet the Government has the gall to maintain that it is providing the community with tax cuts. This just goes on and on, and I will give other examples of the deceit of the Premier and of the Government in relation to the budget. Well may the Premier have used taxpayers' money to buy champagne to celebrate his budget, because it will certainly be the last time that he will have the opportunity to do so. The next budget to be brought into this House will be brought in by a Liberal Government, a Government that will offer the South Australian public real relief from the imposts that have been foisted on them over the past three years.

Despite the massive hike in taxing income for the Government, it has been singularly successful in the way that it has totally ignored the interests and welfare of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. The most glaring example of this is in relation to the O-Bahn bus system. Each year for the past three years the Government has underspent the amount of money allocated for the building of that busway. Had a Liberal Government remained in power after the 1982 election, by 1986 the busway would have been completed all the way to Tea Tree Plaza. However, the position now is that we will be lucky if the busway operates only to Darley Road by February or March 1986, and that is only half the total distance of the proposed busway. The Government has reduced spending on the O-Bahn busway to such an extent that by next year it will be completed only for half the total distance, the distance that would have been completed by a Liberal Government. I can assure the Government that this point has not been missed by residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

I wish I had taken a tape recording of some of the comments that were made to me at an expo which was conducted recently in the north-eastern suburbs and which was opened by the Premier. In his opening speech, incredibly, the Premier referred to O-Bahn, and he made a number of statements. First, he tried to claim credit for the building of O-Bahn. In my Address in Reply speech I referred to comments that the Premier, the Minister of Education and other members had made about O-Bahn when they were members of the Opposition, at the time when the former Liberal Government announced that it would build that busway. Those comments would cover pages, and all of them were derogatory.

The Premier, no less critical of the project than anyone else, said that it would not work, that it would result in something that would have to be thrown away and replaced

by another system, and so on. There is about a page of *Hansard* of negative comments about O-Bahn made by the present Minister of Education when he was in Opposition. However, the Government is now trying to claim credit for the busway, and the Premier's own words at the expo were that the project was proceeding on time. This again shows the total dishonesty of the Premier. He was dishonest in saying that there would be no new taxes and no increases in existing taxes. He has been dishonest time and time again, and he is being dishonest now in saying that O-Bahn would be completed on time, because it will be only half completed in 1986, compared to the distance a Liberal Government would have completed.

In claiming credit for the O-Bahn busway, the Premier does not mention that the Government has underspent by \$6 million the funds which have been allocated to the project. As I have said, the mind boggles when the Premier acts in this way. After he had made those comments at the expo people in the north-eastern suburbs asked, 'Who does he think he is kidding?' These people concerned are not political people, but they are aware of how the present Government members opposed the construction of O-Bahn. I might point out that I have not been backward in coming forward over the years in pointing out (by means of the media and other ways) to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs the truth about O-Bahn.

The residents there are not fools, although it seems that the present Government takes all residents of South Australia as fools. That must be the case, otherwise it would not keep making promises and then breaking them, always thinking that the public will believe the promises. Credibility can be stretched only so far, and the credibility of the present Government has been dented so severely that there is no way in the world that the public of South Australia will again be duped.

The report in tonight's *News*, headlined 'South Australia faces \$80 million deficit', just confirms that, as far as even the most recent announcement by the Premier is concerned, his deceit has been found out. We will recall that almost a fortnight ago, when the Premier brought in his budget, he proudly stated that it was balanced. Of course, his press releases to the media all said that, and initially he received quite a lot of coverage about his balanced budget.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: That is right. Of course, now we have had an opportunity to analyse his figures. Now we have the Auditor-General's Report, which is the finding not of any political Party but of a completely independent public servant.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Whose word do you accept—the Premier's at \$51 million or the Auditor-General's at \$80 million, within a fortnight of one another?

Mr ASHENDEN: The Premier said a fortnight ago that there was going to be no deficit; then he said perhaps it would be \$51 million; and now we find a public servant saying it is going to be \$80 million. There is not much doubt about whose word we have to take. Obviously the Auditor-General has come out and pointed out to the public of South Australia that the so-called balanced result predicted by the Premier when he brought down the budget last month is, in fact, going to be made up of a deficit of at least \$80 million, which comprises an accumulated deficit and a financial shortfall in the current year of \$26 million. In other words, we have an accumulated deficit, we have a deficit that is going to be run up over the coming year, and the Premier says, 'Ladies and gentlemen, in presenting my budget I can give you the good news and that is we are going to have a balanced budget.' As I said, his word on this is just the same as we have seen so many times in the past.

The state of the Treasury by the time of the next State election will be very bleak indeed. It is absolutely imperative that a Government is elected that will take action to ensure that relief is provided to the taxpaying public of South Australia. Not only did my Leader point out this afternoon the massive holes in the budget brought down by the Premier, but he has signalled the approach that a Liberal Government will take when it gains office. Again, I would like to make the point now that I do not care whether the Premier calls his election next week, in a month, three months, or in March next year, it will make absolutely no difference. There is no doubt whatsoever that his Government will be defeated.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, and in so doing point out that there is only one member of the Government in the Chamber.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr ASHENDEN: The Liberal Leader has put forward a policy which, fortunately, can be implemented on the return of a Liberal Government whenever the election is called. As he has pointed out, he will limit Government spending, and I will refer in more detail later to the way in which Government spending has absolutely ballooned under the present Government. He will cut waste, while this Government is proud of its waste. The Minister of Water Resources said this afternoon how proud he was of the way in which costs had escalated at the swimming centre at North Adelaide. He was very proud that it had cost the taxpayer so much more money for a facility that cannot even be used for international competition—but we will cut Government waste!

Additionally, we will implement a privatisation policy, something which I wholeheartedly support, and that is despite the codswallop (and that is the only way I can describe it) that was put forward by the member for Hartley earlier this afternoon. I think he was trying to say that a State Government was going to sell Qantas, TAA, the Commonwealth Bank and the Armed Forces. I do not think that the member for Hartley knows very much, because the Commonwealth Bank, Qantas, TAA and the Armed Forces all come under the responsibility of the Federal Government, so perhaps one day he will realise that, when we talk of privatisation, we are talking of eliminating waste in Government departments and removing areas that rightfully should go to the private sector.

The member for Hartley mentioned something about the fact that we were going to sell the STA and that bus fares would rise to \$2.70 or something like that. I point out to him that my Leader has stated that he would sell the section of the STA where buses are operating in competition with private enterprise through charter operations, and so on. What right does a Government have to interfere and compete with small businessmen who are trying to operate something which rightfully belongs to the private sector? Why on earth should government be dipping its fingers into charter coach services, and so on? That is the area that we are talking about. The sooner that a government gets rid of those areas and returns them to the private sector, the better, because for one thing government can never operate as efficiently or effectively as private enterprise, particularly when we find the size of the Public Service burgeoning as it has under this Government, with thousands—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Seven thousand.

Mr ASHENDEN: I thank the future member for Adelaide (the present member for Torrens) for that figure. Seven thousand additional public servants will be employed by this Government.

Mr Ingerson: And \$80 million—

Mr ASHENDEN: And the cost of that is \$80 million. I thank the member for Bragg for assisting me with that figure. We only have to divide \$80 million by the number of taxpayers in South Australia to see how much the taxes are going to rise yet again to pay for the profligacy of the present Government. At this point I stress that, fortunately, the opportunity for this Government to undertake these actions will be very short-lived indeed.

I was talking earlier about how the Premier has broken promises of no new taxes, no increased taxes and about how his deceit and dishonesty are seen so very often. Let us look at his so-called \$41 million tax cuts. As my Leader pointed out this afternoon, in truth the \$41 million is \$30 million. Of course, we well know that the Premier received far more than \$30 million in a handout (which is a once-off handout) from the Federal Government.

We also know that the generous offer made by him in relation to a reduction of electricity tariffs will result in a \$2 per bill reduction, and that is for one year only. We might ask ourselves why it is that the Premier has offered tax cuts on a once-off basis only. Why is it that he has offered to reduce electricity tariffs for one year only? The answer is obvious—there is an election coming up. The Premier is saying, 'Let us buy the public. We were able to do it in 1982: they are gullible and we will be able to get away with it again.' I can assure him that this will not be the case.

As my Leader pointed out this afternoon, unemployment in South Australia is now higher than it was when this Government came to office. Yet, the Premier states publicly that he has reduced unemployment. Instead of putting more falsehoods to the public of South Australia, the Premier should be looking at the Bureau of Statistics figures which clearly show that unemployment in South Australia is now higher than it was when he came to office. So much for his statement that he has reduced unemployment! Not only is unemployment higher now than when his Government came to office but long-term unemployment in South Australia is the highest in Australia.

Extracts from newspapers over the past few months put to bed any statements that the Premier brings out, as he so often does, saying that South Australia has taken off, that industrial expansion is fantastic and that we are extremely lucky to be South Australians because of the burgeoning economy of our State. The *Advertiser's* political writer, Matthew Abraham, under the heading 'Survey reveals near static job growth in South Australian industry', points out:

A State Government survey of 90 major South Australian manufacturers has shown they employed a total of 86 extra people last year.

So, in 90 big businesses an extra 86 people are employed. At the same time in other areas employment opportunities are reduced. Mr Abraham goes on:

The survey results show an almost static job growth among major South Australian employers.

Of course, he used figures taken from the budget that the Premier was so proud to present almost two weeks ago. He also points out:

The budget papers also reveal the Government has set aside almost \$92 million for public sector wages . . . almost double last year's figure.

When things are not going right in private enterprise it has to look at increasing the costs to the public or taking action to reduce the costs of production. Of course, private enterprise must be efficient and has to ensure that it is competitive. Because no member of the Government has had experience in industry—big business or small business—they do not know that, if budgets do not balance, businesses have to look at reducing costs. What Government members say is,

'Good heavens, let's not worry. We will whack up the taxes again.'

Mr Mathwin: It's only money.

Mr ASHENDEN: They say, 'It's only money. It's only our. It's only the taxpayers' money. We can kid them that we are going to give them tax cuts.' However, when one looks at the budget it clearly shows that there will be very real problems if it is allowed to run. The Premier is always saying how good South Australian unions are and that we do not have problems in this State because of the way the Government consults.

Let us look at the car industry. Mitsubishi, which presently manufactures the Magna, the second biggest selling single model car in South Australia, is three months behind in production because demand for the Magna is so great. This is a success story—a South Australian company that is able to offer jobs and provide income to South Australia. Mitsubishi wanted to meet the demand for the car and wanted a nine-hour day. What happened? The unions—plural—said, 'No way.' The main car union said that it would not accept a fixed longer working day. How about that for cooperation between unions and employers? At the very same time in New South Wales there is the headline 'Unionists declare "no nonsense" at Nissan'. The article states:

A prominent union leader gave an assurance yesterday to one of the worlds biggest car manufacturers that it could look forward to prolonged industrial peace at its new \$6 million vehicle distribution centre in Sydney.

Mr Joe Thompson, secretary of the New South Wales branch of the Vehicle Builders' Employees Union (VBEU), told Japanese executives . . . there would be 'no nonsense' at the centre.

In that case there was only the one union and the example where, in New South Wales, there was cooperation and a desire to get industry back on its feet, whereas in South Australia this Premier says that he has all these agreements, that unions get on well, and so on. The only reason we do not have industrial strife in this State is purely and simply that every time a union comes up with anything, this Government caves in and gives the union exactly what it wants.

Of course, there will not be any disputation. However, at the same time the cost of production in South Australia is skyrocketing along with the taxes that we are being forced to pay in ever increasing amounts. There are other points that I wanted to make but time will preclude that. I conclude by saying that residents of the north-eastern suburbs will show with their feet and by the way they mark their ballot-papers in not too many months—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In June 1984 the present Premier stood in this House and told the Parliament and the people of South Australia that the anticipated budget deficit for 1984-85 would be of the order of \$64.1 million. One would have thought that, having been Premier for a year or so at that time, and having access to Treasury advice, he might have been a little more accurate in his assessment of the real financial position and a little more accurate in his public disclosure on a matter of such significance.

It turned out one year later (indeed, as of now) that the public deficit is \$51.1 million, some \$13.7 million down on what he estimated. We are told that that substantially reduced deficit was a result of unexpected income from the variety of taxation measures introduced in the interim. On the plus side, the Premier claims (and has done so repeatedly in this House in recent weeks) that the reduced deficit was also a result of another ingredient—that, following a thriving economic climate under his Government and increased transaction movements through the various departments (all of

which transactions attracted a fee such as stamp duty, registration or other like charges), income to the Government over the period 1984-85 was much higher than he had anticipated.

The Premier told us in the same breath in recent days that the anticipated State deficit for the year 1985-86, which we have already entered, will be about the same: in other words, it will be unchanged. The Premier has made this claim as a result of his investigations and his understanding of the financial position of the State at this time next year (or, more precisely, on 30 June 1986). On the very same day as the budget debate commenced in South Australia the Auditor-General announced publicly that the deficit on 30 June 1986 will not be \$51 million or even approximately that figure but will be \$80 million. Someone has to be wrong!

As I interjected during the speech of my colleague, the member for Todd, a few moments ago, one of them has to be wrong. Who is it? Is it the Auditor-General, who has access to the figures and who has a staff for the purpose of calculating the real financial position of the State, or is it the Premier? We have heard arguments about the real state of the financial position over the years between political Parties, but in this case we have a massive argument involving a 35 per cent to 40 per cent difference between the Treasurer and the Auditor-General, and it is in the public arena. What must the people of South Australia think now?

They undoubtedly took with a pinch of salt over the years the Party political arguments about who was right and who was wrong. However, when the Auditor-General (unbiased and remote from the political arena) makes a statement so far removed from that made by the elected Premier, then I believe that the whole subject of the real financial position of South Australia needs to be investigated.

Indeed, there must be a full schedule of the facts incorporating the deficits as they apply both within the Treasury central revenue account and the multiple statutory authority accounts that accompany that central order. It is ironic that the subject arises in the way that it does today, because most of the speakers from both sides of the House have referred in one way or another to the massive deficit. They have argued the merits about the real figure. It is somewhat of a coincidence that on 13 August in replying to His Excellency the Governor's speech I spoke on this matter. I make no apology for speaking about the impact of indebtedness in the community at large and specifically about the indebtedness in the rural sector.

It was in that context that I expressed concern on behalf of primary producers of South Australia because they mainly, although not totally, as a result of Government charges—Commonwealth, State and local government—have found themselves in a situation where, thanks largely to the Governments of the past five years, farming costs have increased by 44 per cent, yet farm gate incomes and prices have increased by only 12 per cent. That has led to a 121 per cent increase in farm indebtedness over the period. That figure is demonstrated in the table that I had inserted in *Hansard* (at page 215 on 13 August). I then referred to the situation that had occurred in Argentina, a country of similar agriculture capacity to Australia. I stated:

... the rural community was overwhelmed years ago by Peronist Governments obsessed with the interests of urban trade unionists. The consequence was the neglect of rural wealth creators of that country and its slide into economic oblivion.

And we are indeed heading on that same course. I continued:

The same situation will apply here if people such as the member for Florey continue with their attitude towards the breadwinners of this country.

I expand my remarks beyond the member for Florey now to the attitude of the South Australian Labor Government. They hold the view that there is a subsidised community in the country region of the State: it is a community that has done well or at least well enough when, in fact, it is on its knees. I can cite an example which tells the whole story and which picks up the point about the industrial strife that we are experiencing and its cost to the community generally, and in this case the industrial strife cost wheat exporters \$270 million. Yet, despite their apparent industrial militancy grain terminal workers in Sydney and Newcastle work a 32 hour week, get 30 days paid sick leave annually, of which on average they take over 24 days sick leave, yet they get double pay for all overtime and 100 per cent loading on night shifts.

One might ask what is their take home pay. The average Sydney grain handling worker earned \$36 000 last year, while his colleagues in Newcastle earned an average \$44 000. It is ultimately the wheat grower who pays that bill. I cite the wheat industry and the current position of wheat growers, because they are suffering from an enormous amount of industrial strife, not in growing, packaging or storing of wheat but in the export of the product after it has been delivered and is ready for dispatch. At the same time it is ultimately the wheat grower who pays the bill. We must remember that the average income of the family man on the land is currently \$6 598 a year net.

Those people are on the poverty line. I make no excuses for referring to the plight of people in the rural community. They are the real breadwinners of this country and they are suffering, largely as a result of the increases in Government taxes and charges, which we are experiencing in this State.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House and point out that once again the Government has only one member present.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): There is no need for a speech. It is only necessary for the honourable member to point out to me the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am grateful to my colleague, the member for Morphett, for calling members into the House on this occasion. As he said, we were faced with there being only one member on the other side. In this instance I am more than delighted that the member for Peake has come in. From time to time he has added a bit of colour to the debate. The issue that excites him most is members on this side identifying a few true facts that apply to the rural sector—to the man on the land.

I am pleased that the honourable member has come into the House on this occasion, because I was just about to continue my remarks in relation to the poverty line that most people in the rural community are facing at the moment as a result of Governments substantially increasing charges; the lack of sensitivity on the part of the Labor Party towards those people on the land; the difficulties in relation to exporting overseas some of our more important items of produce; seasonal conditions; and other multiple factors. People are having a hard time, and I would like to hear from the member for Peake if he wishes to contribute.

Prior to that little interference, that is, the calling for a quorum in the House, I was referring to the remarks I made of 13 August. I noted with some interest that a man called John Leard wrote a letter on 22 August, which was inserted in the *Advertiser* and in which he asked, in the national interest: 'Why aren't we told the truth? Why is Australia going broke?' He made a very lengthy statement about his views on what has happened to us politically, industrially and so on.

It is a little difficult to hear, is it not, Madam Acting Speaker, with all the chatter that is going on at both sides

of your desk, in front of you and on the other side of the House in particular, but I will press on regardless. I am used to a fair bit of noise: I am just starting to get some interjections, which I like.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: However, I return to the plight of the rural sector and note with interest that John Leard cited a number of figures relating to community indebtedness, some of which detail has already been referred to by my colleagues. However, on the national scene it is rather disturbing to note that in just 15 years, under Parties of both political persuasions, our foreign borrowings have caused our debt to escalate from \$3.5 billion in 1970 to some \$70 billion in 1985, heading, I gather, towards \$100 billion, which represents something like \$15 000 per Australian family.

It is easy to quote figures and distribute the deficit across the Australian population or families, but quite apart from that calculated figure is the indebtedness that the individual has incurred. It is creeping up at a quite alarming rate on the family structure both in the rural sector and, indeed, in the metropolitan area. This is more especially so when out of the tax revenue these people are expected to pay an interest account of something like \$10 billion per year, a figure that I understand represents close to the amount which we spend on education in Australia in a year and which is in excess of the figure that we spend on defence—just simply in order to meet the interest account on this escalated foreign deficit.

Mr Trainer: Where does that interest go?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The member for Ascot Park interjects and asks where does it go. What does he mean? I do not know what he is talking about.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The interest payments are made to the lending institutions that lend Australia that national debt that it has accrued.

Mr Trainer: Are you aware that 60 per cent of that foreign debt is owed to foreign financiers by private Australian companies?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The member for Ascot Park will refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I appreciate your support, Madam Acting Speaker, but I love the interjections.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Chair does not.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Surely at this hour of the night we can have a bit of interjection just to get a bit of life into the show. The situation is well documented and well understood by those who have a real concern for escalating debts, and indeed I do, because we are getting to the stage at national, State, community, and, indeed, family level where the indebtedness is such that people cannot afford the standard of living which we have enjoyed and which the article to which I referred earlier reflects. We are living beyond our means. A few years ago we enjoyed one of the highest living standards of the world. We have slipped considerably from that position, and we will slip further while we have governments that race around, as does this Government, without any real regard for responsible management.

I return to the situation surrounding the portfolio that I represent on this side of the House, in particular, that of agriculture. When I picked up the estimates of payments document a week or so ago and took it away during the show week, I was thrilled to bits with the total amount that was identified as being allocated to the Department of Agriculture for 1985-86. In fact, it had jumped from the previous year's figure of \$42 million to \$48 million. The \$6

million difference represented some 14.3 per cent increase on the previous year.

It is a long time since we enjoyed a 14.3 per cent increase in revenue in the Department of Agriculture. I was staggered to think that a Labor Government would allocate such a massive increase to this department and to this rural portfolio—the rural arena of which its Minister has been blatantly abusive since taking office. I refer more especially to the recent occasion when the farmers came to town on their march, as well as to many other occasions. Be that as it may, despite the Minister's attitude and despite the Government's lack of sensitivity generally toward the rural community, I picked up this document and found a 14.3 per cent increase in revenue.

I started to do a little homework. I did not pick it up to begin with—in fact, not until we got the Auditor-General's Report today. Then I found the real reason for the 14.3 per cent increase in the allocation for the Department of Agriculture. I look at the personnel who are proposed to be employed by the department in this current financial year. There it is: all of it and more. In fact, the department itself in its ordinary functions and operations, taking away the CPI factor, is back on square one, or behind, and the additional revenue is for the purpose of employing additional personnel.

We do not know at this stage where those extra personnel will go. We do not know whether they will go out on extension services in the big paddock or whether they will be in the black stump. My guess is that they will be back here in dear old Adelaide in the black stump and, as the records reveal, as God made little apples, here it is: back in 1982, when the Liberals left government, there was a total number of salaried and weekly paid employees expressed in full-time equivalents, in June 1982, at 981.

Where have the figures gone from there? This is where the extra money has gone over the period and where it is going this year. The figure expressed in full-time equivalents for June 1983 jumped to 1 087. Where did it go in 1984? It went to 1 097! Where is it going in 1985—for the current year? It is going to 1 141, something like a 15 per cent increase—more than the increase in total revenue for that department! We have had an increase in salaried personnel of more than 20 per cent over the period in question, and we have had a decrease in weekly paid of 4 per cent, leaving the increase in personnel at 16 per cent or thereabouts.

The extra money is going in wages and salaries. At what level are those wages and salaries? In approximately 40 cases in that department they are higher than the salaries of the members of Parliament in this place. How ridiculous! I ask you! Where are the Government's priorities? Why is that money not being earmarked in the budget papers for soil conservation? Why is it not being earmarked for plant research, or extension services out there in the paddock where the department's function really is?

We read all this rot about the role of the Department of Agriculture—and I am pleased to say that under the Liberal Government we observed the objectives of the Department of Agriculture and identified at the time its main functions. The first is to provide advice to the Government to assist in the formulation of agricultural policies. I would like to know where the Department of Agriculture advised this Government on management policies if that is where the so-called increases are going under that portfolio.

Another function is to administer the Government's legislation. We have not seen too much of that as far as the Labor Party is concerned: it set out to destroy the potato industry in one fell swoop and threatened to destroy the egg industry and a number of others of a statutory kind that are functioning and operating in marketing activities

at no expense to the public whatsoever. It is interfering in industrial arenas in that direction and not getting on with the job back in the home office.

The next function is to prevent the introduction of new and control the spread of existing pests and diseases that adversely affect the agricultural industries. I would like the Minister of Agriculture or any member of the Labor Party to demonstrate to me their effectiveness in that regard in recent years. He is hardly in the department to know what is going on, anyway. If one talks to the personnel up there, one finds that they cannot get at him even when he is in the department.

The next function is to provide research, extension and inspection services to ensure that food of acceptable quality and safety is available to the consumer. Where can the Labor Party demonstrate its effort or attention in this direction? It made a whole host of promises when it sought to come back into power in 1982, and I will just cite a few of them in the minutes that I have left. Page 1 of the Labor Party's policy on agriculture states:

We will act immediately to again provide farmers with sensible and well administered carry-on loan schemes.

There is no evidence of the Labor Party's efforts to consolidate the multiple Acts, agreements and arrangements between the State and the Commonwealth in relation to rural finance. The department is in a shambles: it is trying to deal with a whole range of Commonwealth/State Acts or agreements and a whole range of State Acts for the purpose of extending to primary producers funds for grants, loans or emergency assistance in the short term, medium term or long term. Indeed, it is an extremely difficult exercise to administer. I am not reflecting on the officers of the department.

It is up to the Government, and, indeed it was the Government's undertaking, to do something about it. However, it is now at the end of its first term back in office, and it has done nothing in this direction. In government, our attention will be directed forthwith to the consolidation of the rural industry assistance and carry-on finance legislation administered by the Department of Agriculture. The next item that I refer to is on page 2 of the Labor Party's policy promises, as follows:

We will maintain research into more efficient technological aids in agriculture and will place increased emphasis on unlocking existing reserves of knowledge to farmers through the use of audiovisual aids and video film.

What has the Government done about that? It continues to produce little fact sheets which are particularly useful for children's school projects, and in some respects they are useful for farmers when they identify specific diseases by diagram and in the production of articles in bulletin form. However, as far as audiovisual and videotex are concerned, the Government has not got them off the ground.

There has been a little bit of consultation with the private sector but, like Labor Governments generally, this Government is reluctant to get into bed with the private business sector. On the other hand, I am proud to say that the Liberal Party will get into bed with the private sector and will produce agri-data and utilise existing facilities of a technological kind located here in South Australia. We will provide material from the central office of agriculture through private sector distribution units to divisional centres scattered around South Australia at both regional and district level. We will distribute the sort of information which farmers need and to which they deserve to have access, as it relates to marketing, research, Bureau of Statistics information or anything else that can assist farmers in their pursuits on the land. Indeed, in government we will provide farmers with that information. That is an appropriate method for the spread of information. It is a way in which the present

Government in office promised to act. However, it has done almost nothing in that direction. Unfortunately, time is running out. I could talk about this subject for hours.

Mr Plunkett: There won't be a change.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: There will be a change. The member for Peake should not argue like that, because he does not know what he is talking about. There will be a change of government: there is no question about that in my mind and, more importantly, there is no question about that in the minds of the people out in the big paddock to which I have referred.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I cannot hear the honourable member.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The member for Alexandra is not supposed to hear interjections.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I cannot help it, Madam Acting Speaker. I would appreciate it, under normal circumstances, if members opposite knew what they were talking about, but they do not. You know as well as anyone else in this place, Madam Acting Speaker, that, generally speaking, I would be the easiest going fellow in the outfit. But what happens—members opposite come in here and mumble and grumble. I return to an absolute gem on page 2 of the ALP election policy promises as follows:

We will resurrect the negotiations of new projects that have been allowed to lapse and take up many offers that overseas Governments have made for South Australian involvement in agriculture development.

However, in answer to a question a few months ago the Minister said:

No new contracts for development projects have been signed during the period. Many new opportunities are being investigated, and I am hopeful that, despite a downturn in the market for development projects in many countries, these will lead to new contracts. We have undertaken some 11 paid consultancies.

It is the old Public Service back on the job again. The Government is employing more people: it is paying out wages and the costs are going up, but the results are not forthcoming.

Mr Lewis: No runs on the board.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: No. The Government's performance has been dismal in this important direction. The current Minister does not appear to be interested, but he was interested enough to spend something like \$52 000 on overseas touring, although he came back without a contract.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I think the member for Alexandra did a brilliant job, and I am sure that he will be given an opportunity at the conclusion of this debate to participate in the grievance debate. I spend a considerable time moving around the electorate of Morphett, and I keep very close to the people of Morphett: I have always done that and I know what they are thinking. The Government has earned itself a reputation of being a high tax Government. Its members may not be happy to hear that, but a feeling is abroad in my district (and I am sure this is the case in other areas) that the Bannon Government is a high tax Government.

The 1985-86 budget has done nothing to change that perception of the people in the electorate that I seek to represent. The Bannon Government came to power in South Australia promising tax cuts, and it promised that it would not use State charges as a form of backdoor taxation—a ploy that was used back in the days of the Dunstan Administration. Prior to the 1982 election, a pamphlet was circulated in my district, and I am sure that it went elsewhere also. The Labor Party pamphlet contained a photograph of the present Premier, and in relation to taxes it stated:

We will stop the use of State charges—like transport fares, electricity, water and hospital charges—as being a form of backdoor taxation.

Mr Lewis: Who said that?

Mr OSWALD: This was a Labor Party pamphlet which was circulated in the Morphett district before the last election. It further stated:

The ALP will not introduce succession or death duties, and we will not introduce new taxes.

It will not introduce succession or death duties, because its federal counterparts in Canberra will do its dirty work in that regard, and we are now looking down the barrel in relation to the introduction of a form of death duties. I am sure that members opposite would have to agree that it was patently absurd to expect the public to believe that the Government would honour its promise not to introduce new taxes or to use other charges as a form of backdoor taxation. I want to record in *Hansard* the details of some rises that have occurred over the latter period of the current Administration. I compare figures applying at the time of the last Tonkin budget with those applying at the time of the third Bannon Government budget. Stamp duties were \$118 million, and that figure has now risen to \$227.5 million; the ETSA figure has gone from \$19 million to \$28.5 million; gas has gone from \$2.9 million to \$4.8 million; land tax from \$23.6 million to \$38 million; motor costs have risen from \$56.6 million to \$70 million; payroll tax from \$222.8 million to \$262 million; liquor from \$18.9 million to \$31.1 million; petrol from \$25.8 million to \$46 million; tobacco went from \$16 million to \$40 million; while total taxes went from \$549 million to \$852.1 million. It is well known that the Premier broke his pre-election promises with this complete fall back to increasing taxes and introducing new taxes.

We have just gone through some examples. The Premier also has gone on record in the press as saying that he is proud of his achievement as Treasurer in balancing the books. The Premier said:

If I was chairman of a board of directors and came in with this result, I would be given a massive bonus, have a vote of confidence voted in me and my shareholders would have said, 'What are you going to do with the dividend?' and I would have told them, 'I am going to return it to you.'

This is an outrageous statement and underlies the whole socialist philosophy of deceit that pervades this particular Government. Let me explain. A private company has to go out to the marketplace and make a profit to pay its staff and overheads before it can pay a dividend and return some of the profit back to the shareholders. On the other hand, a Government such as the present Government only has to keep raising its taxes and charges to cover its overheads and pay its staff; it does not have to earn money in a competitive marketplace. All it has to do is demand money. In actual fact, that is what it does.

On the other hand, the taxpayers in this State have no option but to pay. They cannot object, because the State Government legislates that they will pay. Even though they may see the Government running an unprofitable and inefficient enterprise, and their money going down the drain, they cannot object; they have to pay up. The bottom line is that the public has to pay up to cover the Government's programs and to pay the Government's salaries and overheads. It is absolutely ridiculous for a Premier to crow about balancing his books and gloating over a balanced budget, when over the past three years he has just continued to increase the taxation on this State so that those books can be balanced. It is the height of absurdity for the Premier to boast that he has balanced the State's books, and as I go around my district this impression comes back to me door after door. The public has had enough and wants it stopped.

All the Premier has done is to keep elevating taxes and charges to cover the inefficiencies of his Ministers, increases in staff and increases in wages that are taking place all the

time. This inefficient Government has no cause to be very proud at all. We have had plenty of examples of individual Ministers not being on top of their departments. The Minister of Recreation and Sport is in constant trouble in trying to get on top of his department. I do not really have time to deal with other Ministers. We are all familiar with the debacle in the parklands in relation to the swimming centre.

The Auditor-General's Report came out today, and it is worth flipping through some of the comments that have been made by him in relation to some departments. I will quote some of his comments. If anyone wants to read it in full, it is on page 11 of the current Auditor-General's Report, under 'Financial Planning', as follows:

Inherent in the process is a natural tendency, in some instances, for functional areas to protect resources rather than to look to their more efficient use.

How about that? Here is another one:

The State Government has addressed this area also. Program performance budgeting has added a discipline which has assisted in identifying resources for reallocation to areas of need. Much more needs to be done.

PPB was brought in back in 1980 by the Tonkin Government, yet the Auditor-General is still saying that much more needs to be done; he is not putting that in just for fun. That indicates that middle and senior management in the Public Service have been slow off the mark in implementing PPB, and I suggest that they take on board the Auditor-General's remarks and get on with the job. On page 12, under 'Use of resources: Management services function', it states:

The opportunity for further savings in this area needs to be addressed.

It will take too much time to go into it, but the Auditor-General is highlighting these points. Under 'Technical and further education', he states:

Last year I referred also to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry which reported in January 1982 that the lecturing contact level in South Australia was low and recommended that indices, which take into account the nature of courses and class sizes, be established and be used as a guide to measure lecturing performances. The potential for resource savings could be substantial. While indices have been determined, it is of concern that effective systems to measure actual performance against those indices are still not established fully.

What is the point of the Auditor-General's making recommendations if the Minister of Education does not ensure that they are implemented in his department? It demonstrates shoddy ministerial control over expenditure. Under 'Housing and construction', the report states:

The audit examination identified a substantial difference between the cost of projects undertaken by the department and the cost of projects undertaken by contract. The department had estimated the difference at \$3 million over each of the next two years. Of concern was an accounting policy change which would mask the inefficiency and overstate the value of assets.

That is an absolutely appalling thing to have hanging over the head of the Minister of Housing and Construction, another incompetent Minister of the Bannon Administration. I repeat the observation in the report which states:

Of concern was an accounting policy change which would mask the inefficiency and overstate the value of assets.

This matter has been referred to the Treasury. Under 'Health Commission', the report states one of the roles of the Health Commission as follows:

To discharge that responsibility the commission has the support of a central office. The following comments relate to the central office, excluding public health and mental health services.

At 30 June the staff of central office was 296. The total operating cost of the commission was \$13.2 million and that represents \$45 000 for each member of staff and each member of staff averages \$28 000 in salary, so there is a difference between those two figures. The report further states:

There are a considerable number of committees.

It also states:

During the year an audit examination was undertaken of computing development in the commission and at the major health units. A report on that examination is also contained in the section of this report referred to above.

I am concerned by four matters arising out of that examination—

- the development over three years of a stores and inventory control system (operating for one hospital only) at a cost in excess of \$1 million;
- the expenditure of \$430 000 on two systems which have not proceeded to implementation;

That means that it has spent \$430 000 on two computer systems which it has put in and scrapped, because they did not reach the required parameters. Computing equipment worth \$430 000 was scrapped. I understand that Hillcrest Hospital was one of the hospitals involved. That is a disgrace. Of course, that situation has been covered up. So far we have heard nothing from anyone in the media or Government admitting that Hillcrest Hospital, through inefficiencies in administration, scrapped and lost computers worth a six-figure sum. The report goes on to state that further areas of concern were as follows:

- an approval process which is slow and time consuming; which on occasions can take in excess of 12 months to authorise proposals submitted by health units—without any significant variation to the original proposal;
- the lack of accountability with respect to the development of some projects.

I have been a member of the Public Accounts Committee since 1979. In that year we were completing an inquiry and making the point then that this time lag in getting these systems up and running was costing big dollars. Here we are in 1985 and the Health Commission has not come to grips with that fact. I can go through this volume and find over and over again instances in which Ministers have just not come to grips with their administrative duties. Under 'School cleaning' (and this is an area that should be of interest to the Minister of Education), the report states:

Since 1979, the Education Department has been progressively phasing out, wherever practicable, petty cleaning contracts.

The report continues:

The Auditor-General has gone to the trouble of costing the difference between an industrial contractor and a departmental cleaner.

Presently an industrial contractor is being paid \$6.85 for every square metre cleaned and the departmental work force figure is \$11.01 to clean the same square metre. I could go on. When one goes through the report in detail one will find that the administration of departments is costing mega dollars. The 1985-86 budget continues the trend of an upward escalation in taxes and charges. It gives no respite to the long suffering taxpayer, and that is what we are looking for—some respite from this constant upward spiral of State taxation.

The Premier thinks that he is squaring off with the electorate with this \$41 million tax cut, which includes the \$11 million ETSA levy. The Premier has publicised that the result of this tax cut will be lower power bills. Despite this \$41 million that the Premier alleges he is returning to the taxpayers, the bottom line is that there is no basic restructuring of the tax system or of State taxes. That is really what I am on about. Until such time as there is a basic restructuring of the tax system and of tax scales we will not see real tax relief for the taxpayer.

This \$41 million is a cosmetic attempt, at election time, to counter the State Government's high tax image. It is nothing else. It is meant to deceive the public once again. It was tried in 1982 and it is now being tried once again in order to deceive the public. The tax rates have not changed, and no taxes have been reduced or removed. Next year the public can expect to pay more tax to prop up the big

spending socialist Government presently in power in South Australia.

Let us look at what really happened behind the scenes when it was announced recently that the Government would give a 2 per cent rebate on the ETSA levy. First, in 1984-85 the Government reaped \$25.6 million by way of the ETSA levy, which was about \$1 million more than planned. If one takes into account the \$11 million rebate this figure becomes \$14.6 million—a reduction from \$25.6 million to \$14.6 million. In 1985-86 the Government is budgeting to receive \$28.5 million by way of the ETSA levy. This means that it will recoup its \$11 million, which is the pre-election handout, and still achieve a \$2.9 million increase in tax from the South Australian public.

This is a total rise of 10 per cent, or 2 per cent above the expected inflation rate of 8 per cent. I would like people to bear that in mind. We have heard that we will get a 2 per cent reduction but, in actual fact, we will not get that at all. However, the pamphlet that was sent out states that the Government will not use State charges like electricity as a form of backdoor taxation. Last year it ripped \$25.6 million off the South Australian taxpayer, and this coming year it is budgeting to rip another \$28.5 million off the taxpayers, giving back a measly \$11 million. It is grossly untrue to say that it will not use electricity as a form of backdoor taxation.

Every member of this House knows that the electricity rebate is a once only rebate. The Government is doing everything it can to ensure that this story is not told in the electorate—but it is a fact that this is a one off rebate. This budget shows to what extent the Premier will go to deceive the public about his economic management.

I would like to spell out in detail, as I did with electricity charges, what the Government is doing about the Jubilee maintenance fund for schools. It is an absolute disgrace when one sees what the Government has done and how it has dressed things up so that to all intents and purposes it looks as though it is going to do something about maintenance in schools. It is not putting up much more than single figure millions of dollars, although it is trying to make it appear that it is putting up \$90 million for a school maintenance fund for the Jubilee year.

If this Government is fair dinkum about genuine tariff cuts in power bills it must reduce the percentage rate of its levy. When it does that I will stand in this House and publicly acknowledge that it is starting down the track towards genuinely attempting to reduce power costs. Until that percentage levy rate is reduced the public in this State will not have relief from high power bills. Unfortunately, the Government has not indicated that it is heading down that track.

The Premier claims that he has made bold cuts in land tax, so let us talk about land tax. He has gone so far as to say that what he has done is the boldest change to our land tax system in South Australia's history. That is absolute nonsense! I would like to spend a few minutes with the Treasurer to enlighten him about the Tonkin Government's abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence. I think that it is generally accepted in the public arena that that was the bold benchmark in land tax reduction by a State Government.

I return to the main theme of my argument: the Government has done nothing to restructure tax scales or to give future relief to taxpayers. Without that we are in big trouble. Those two criteria must be realised. Let us return to the alleged bold cuts in land tax and see what is in store for next year, because it is quite interesting. The Government has made some concessions, but it still expects to take \$38 million in 1985-86, a rise of \$5 million or 15 per cent—nearly twice the inflation rate. We see our socialist Government once again in full flight, because in 1985-86 the expected

stamp duty take is \$227.5 million, a rise of \$20 million or 10 per cent. Inflation is 8 per cent, so stamp duties are up, and once again the Government is running away with a big tax program.

Let us look at the overall estimated tax yield for the Bannon Government in 1985-86, of \$852.1 million, a rise of \$58.1 million, or about the rate of inflation of 8 per cent. However, if land price (or any other prices) rise and taxes are levied on them according to gross turnover, once again we will see increases in revenue receipts rise and the taxation base flow into the Treasury. Therefore, while the estimated rise of \$51.8 million is running at the inflation rate, if the economy continues to pick up as forecast then the Government is looking forward to accepting another real increase in overall State taxation.

The time is well past when the Government should have adjusted tax rates to reduce revenue flow into Treasury. I know that I am talking against a brick wall, because this Government is one that will never reduce tax rates: its whole philosophy is to cream in as much tax as it can and to redistribute wealth. If honourable members opposite did not believe in that system I suppose they would not be members of a democratic socialist Party. The fraud put abroad by members opposite (particularly those in marginal seats) is one in which they are trying to project themselves as moderates (as small 'l' Labor people), and as people who believe in reduced taxes, but the whole thing is a sham.

Out in the public arena they do not believe in small government or in relief from taxation. The aim is to increase taxation as much as they can and as often as they can. I would now like to put on record a few figures concerning receipts of a recurrent nature. The following table shows the actual receipts for 1984-85 and those estimated for 1985-86:

	Actual Receipts 1984-85 \$m	Estimated 1985-86 \$m
Taxation	813.5	852.1
Public undertakings	240.9	248.7
Recoveries of debt services	87.1	77.1
Departmental fees and recoveries	153.8	352.1
Territorial	30.5	55.9
Commonwealth	1 314.2	1 381.6
	2 639.9	2 967.6

The main increases in proposed taxation receipts include \$5 million from land tax; \$4 million from casino operations; \$3.5 million from hospital fund contributions from lotteries, TAB, etc; \$7 million from motor vehicles; \$8 million from payroll tax; \$2 million from financial institutions duty; \$20 million from stamp duty, and \$5 million from the State Bank payment in lieu of income tax.

If we did not have this present type of administration, those receipts could be well down. I know I am talking to a blank wall, but I plead with the Government to forgo at least for a period, if it has to, its socialist philosophy and give South Australia some taxation relief. If the Government could reduce the tax scales and the percentages of levy, it could give the public some relief. The Labor Government will lose the next election, as the public in South Australia desperately needs tax relief. The Government should take that position on board. It is a fact of life outside.

The last three Bannon budgets illustrate one clear indisputable fact: the democratic socialists in this State have prevented any economic recovery by the very nature of their high taxation policies. Everyone now knows that this is a high tax Government. Its own future projections, despite the rhetoric we have had during the budget debate from Government members, are for a further dose of high taxation in 1985-86. This Government has to be replaced by a low

taxing Liberal Government that will govern in the interests of all South Australians.

Finally, I would like to look at some of the absolutely outrageous promises which were made by the Labor Administration in 1982 and which the Government has not attempted to keep. In regard to health, in which I have some interest, the Labor Party stated:

A Bannon Labor Government will stop any further funding cuts to our hospitals.

What happened? Last year the Labor Government instituted a 2 per cent cut in funding to Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That was a cut in real terms of 2 per cent and it was quite outrageous. Under the heading 'Jobs' is the statement:

A Bannon Labor Government's goal in office will be to get South Australia back to work.

I point out that more people are out of work in South Australia today than when the Labor Government took over in 1982. Despite the Federal and State Governments collectively spending \$100 million on work creation programs, more people are now out of work than in 1982.

The socialist philosophy, big government, big taxation philosophy does not work in this country or in South Australia. The sooner we move to a small tax, small Government with highly efficient ministries to administer those departments the better it will be for this country.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): The Government has lived up to the public's expectations. The public believes that it is due for high taxation, and, of course, this Government has done that: the Labor Government always has and it always will. It is well known that under the socialist philosophy the Government believes that it can spend your dollar better than you can spend it yourself.

This means that the Government can rip off your money by way of taxation to pay for bigger government so that it can spend more. Members opposite are not managers: they have no business acumen at all. In fact, there is not one member on the other side—with the exception perhaps of the member for Hartley—who has conducted a business.

Those members on the Government benches comprise a few academics, a mass of trade union bosses and a few other also-rans. That is the Government make-up. Of course, mainly they are union secretaries, union organisers and union bosses who have been given the plum to come in here; one way into this place is through the South Terrace entrance. That means that they have to be subservient to the bosses in Trades Hall on South Terrace. In other words, the Government could not manage a hot dog stall and come out in front.

If I were involved in a small organisation such as a tennis club, I would not say for one minute that those members would be able to manage it. It is a matter of high taxation. When the Premier presented the budget to this House he was very gleeful and said that it was marvellous: we will give back so many million dollars; we have a lot of money now; we will get the State out of the red; we are sailing well.

Of course members opposite are sailing well if this is the way they do it, because they have taxed the public of South Australia to the hilt on every possible aspect: 188 different charges from a Government that took office and said at that time that it would not bring in any extra taxation or charges during its first term. However, immediately it started putting up charges for transport and many other things. Here we are, nearly at the end of its three-year term, with 188 extra charges and taxes. So be it for the word and the credibility of the Government and the Premier's saying the Government would not do that. It did precisely the opposite.

When the Premier brought in the budget he said that the Government was going very well; everything was all right;

at the end the books would balance very well indeed. Yet today, in the last edition of the *News*, we have an article headed 'Budget bombshell: SA faces \$80 million deficit', which reads, in part:

The South Australian Government probably will be \$80 million in the red by the end of the present financial year, according to a bombshell report tabled in the Parliament late this afternoon.

This is far from the balanced result predicted by the Premier, Mr Bannon, when he brought down the budget last month. The deficit comprises \$51 million accumulated deficit and an expected budget short-fall by the end of the current financial year of a further \$26 million.

The apparent conflict in the size of the budget deficit is pointed out in the report of the Auditor-General, Mr Tom Sheridan, tabled in State Parliament late today. Mr Sheridan points out in his report the Government commenced the 1984-85 financial year with an accumulated deficit of \$64.8 million.

The year's operations resulted in a budget surplus of \$13.7 million, reducing the accumulated deficit to \$51.1 million. But he points out the deficit could have been further reduced if \$7.7 million from the Highways Fund and about \$18.6 million in housing funds had been paid into general revenue in the past financial year.

These transfers of housing and highways funds have been normal procedure in the past. A study of the 1985-86 budget papers shows the 1984-85 and 1985-86 funds from the Highways Fund have been included in the budget for 1985-86.

For housing, \$18 580 million from last year has been included in the Treasurer's receipts for 1985-86, but it is not clear what has happened to the 1985-86 housing receipts. They could be included in the Housing Minister's receipts, which have increased from \$400 000 last year to \$35 million this year.

That refers to receipts in relation to the Minister of Housing and Construction. A rise from \$400 000 to \$35 million is a fair increase in receipts. The article continues:

In other words, the money from both funds for the two years have been absorbed in Government spending for the current financial year.

That tells the tale. That is what it is all about and it is plain from the Auditor-General's Report tabled in this place today. The Auditor-General's Report also refers to contracting for cleaning, to which I will refer later. I now turn to some areas of Government spending. Some of the larger increases referred to are as follows: first, a 44.6 per cent increase for the Legislature, for which payments for 1984-85 were \$6.5 million, the proposed allocation this year being \$9.4 million. The allocation for the Premier's own department has increased from \$14.1 million to \$20.7 million, or 46.8 per cent—a fair sort of increase. And the Premier is supposed to set the example for his Ministers and for other departments. Yet, he has boosted his allocation by 46.8 per cent. The Treasurer, who of course is the same man under a different hat, has an increased allocation—from \$167.6 million to \$400.6 million, or 139 per cent.

That is a massive increase in the area that is supposed to show an example to the rest of the Public Service. The other larger increases are for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Ethnic Affairs (23.7 per cent)—the allocation will increase from \$13.1 million to \$16.2 million; and the allocation for the Minister of Corporate Affairs, although a smaller matter, will increase from \$3.5 million to \$4.5 million, that is, 28.6 per cent.

The allocation for the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Public Works will increase from \$43.9 million to \$81.6 million, or 85.9 per cent—a massive increase in anybody's language. Another area about which I know a fair bit and which I have criticised on many occasions in this House is correctional services. The allocation for the Minister of Correctional Services increases from \$26.3 million to \$34.5 million, or 31.2 per cent, which is colossal.

The allocation for recreation and sport will increase by 37.2 per cent. I would probably bear with that. Money is well spent in sport, it is an incentive, and its benefits should be shared with the correctional services and community

welfare lines. I am a great believer that sports should be encouraged, particularly in relation to juveniles and young people, because a young person who is interested in and has a commitment to sport very rarely gets into serious bother. The Treasurer, as I mentioned earlier, has a massive increase of 139 per cent. They are some of the increases that the Government proposes in its budget.

The Auditor-General's Report refers to the Department for Community Welfare, a department to which I regularly draw attention because, particularly in the area of correctional services, it leaves a lot to be desired. It does not seem to be improving at all over the years. I was asked a few years ago to lay off, because I was putting a lot of pressure on that department. I have done that now for quite a few years, hoping that it would show some improvement, but from what I read today in the Auditor-General's Report I believe that the situation this year is much worse than it has been over the years.

At page 57 it is stated that the net cost of recurrent operations, including grants and concessions, was \$77.6 million, an increase of \$6.7 million, or 9 per cent. I have criticised the area of residential care for many years. As I said earlier, it does not appear to have improved much. I refer to the number of community service orders, which were introduced by the previous Liberal Government, that have been issued. In recommendations that I brought back from a study tour nearly eight years ago, I explained to Parliament that not only is the cost advantage considerable but also that the advantages to the offender are equally considerable and well worth the effort. However, the Community Welfare Department is still limping along in the area of community service orders.

It has taken a long time to get community service orders going in the juvenile area. In fact, they have been surpassed by the adult Correctional Services Department, where the operation of community service orders is far in advance of the juvenile area. However, the advantages to be gained in relation to juveniles are very great indeed. The chance of releasing an habitual criminal back into the community after succeeding in making him into a good citizen is pretty rare indeed. If we want to save persons from a life of crime, the earlier in life that we get to them, turn them around and perhaps point out the error of their ways, the better. It is perhaps too late when they have adopted a criminal way of life, when they believe they are professional criminals and they take a chance on being caught (which is supposed to be the chance that they take).

The net cost of occupancy rates for residential care in the Community Welfare Department in 1983 was \$2.578 million; in 1984 it was \$2.485 million; and in 1985 it was \$2.606 million. The average cost per child in cottage homes and hostels in 1984 was \$42 000, and in 1985 it was \$47 000. In the other area, the more hardened juvenile offenders are housed in what was once called Borstal (but that term is now frowned on and we now give it a fancy name); they are now housed in the South Australian Youth Training Centre, which was once known as the McNally Training Centre. I do not know what they are being trained in, but it is a training centre. The average occupancy in the South Australian Youth Training Centre in 1983 was 60; in 1984 it was 48; and in 1985 it was 42. Therefore, it has gone down. The average cost of running the institution in 1983 was \$3.427 million; in 1984 it was \$3.525 million; and in 1985 it was \$3.860 million. In that time, from 1983 to 1985, the number of inmates has been reduced by 20, but the cost has risen by many thousands of dollars.

The Hon. G.J. Crafte interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I am referring to the Auditor-General's Report, and I cannot do better than that.

The Hon. G.J. Crafte interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, it has been pretty well hidden, and it was pretty hard to sort out. I admit that to the Minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not take notice of the Minister of Community Welfare, who is interjecting out of his seat, anyway.

Mr MATHWIN: He did draw me out, Sir. The report indicates that the average cost of keeping a young offender in the South Australian Youth Training Centre was, in 1983, \$57 000; in 1984, \$73 000; and in 1985, \$92 000. In relation to younger children, and girls, kept at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre (formerly Vaughan House), in 1983 the average occupancy was 25; in 1984, 18; and in 1985, 17. It would be interesting to know how many staff are at that centre.

The net cost of running the centre was \$1.836 million; in 1984, \$1.876 million; and in 1985, \$2.045 million. There are now fewer inmates, with the average occupancy being 17 children, yet the cost was \$2.045 million—that is really heavy stuff. On working it out, in 1983 it cost \$73 000 per head to keep a child at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre; in 1984 it cost \$104 000 per head; and in 1985 it cost \$125 000 per head. It is certainly costing a lot to remand and assess those children.

Eight years ago I recommended to the Department for Community Welfare the benefits of getting young people to work on community service orders. In the report that I submitted I outlined the benefits and savings involved as well as aspects of helping juveniles. However, this was practically ignored. There are now only a few working, some eight years later, yet the Government is willing to spend some \$120 000 per head on each inmate. That is disgraceful.

As my time is limited, I will confine my comments to correctional services matters. I wanted to refer to education matters, but I do not think I will have time to do so. I refer to page 67 of the Auditor-General's Report, which gives details of costs in relation to adult prisoners. At Yatala the net cost per prisoner in 1982-83 was \$28 000; in 1983-84 it was \$50 000; and in 1984-85 it was \$67 000. Yatala is no hotel, but that is what it cost per head. In relation to adult prisoners, at least community service orders are in operation.

The officers seem keen enough to do it and to do a good job, which is far better than the Department for Community Welfare in relation to juveniles. Cadell is far cheaper; the cost is \$27 000. But the net cost of keeping Yatala in operation is \$10.254 million per year. The Northfield prison complex, which is another extension, costs \$1.738 million, or \$39 000 per head. However, search as I may through this list in the Auditor-General's Report, I cannot find any reference to the naughty ladies of South Australia. I cannot find out how much it costs to keep the ladies in their prison. From memory, at one stage last year I think it cost about \$47 000 per head to keep the ladies in the complex at Northfield. Perhaps the Northfield prison complex is the ladies' section. I do not know. I suppose it may be. I thought it might be the new section which has just been completed and which has been operating for about 12 months. Of course, there are not as many ladies in gaol as there are men, which is understandable, as I believe the courts are a little easier with the fairer sex than with the males.

In the little time I have left I would like to talk about education. At page 78 the Auditor-General brings to the attention of the House and the public contract cleaners. The cost of wages and salaries for contract cleaners in the Education Department in 1983-84 was \$14.183 million, and in 1984-85 it was \$14.015 million. The Auditor-General states:

The use of industrial contractors is clearly the most efficient method of cleaning departmental property. As at 30 June, the average cost per square metre of the three methods utilised by the department was—

and this is the difference—
industrial contractors . . .

That is, private enterprise. We do not want to say it because it upsets members opposite when we talk about private enterprise. However, that is what it is—private enterprise. Per square metre the cost for industrial contractors was \$6.85; the cost for petty contractors, people who have other jobs within the department but who do cleaning as well, was \$10.64 per square metre; and for weekly paid cleaners the cost was \$11.01. There is a difference between \$6.85 and \$11.01—a difference between private enterprise and weekly paid cleaners.

In my book there is no argument at all and yet the Government hates those words; it hates private enterprise—it is no good at all. The proof is in the pudding. As at July 1985 industrial cleaning contracts were let covering 273 schools and 16 branches with a total value of \$4 million, and there were 1 101 petty contractors covering 584 schools and 41 weekly paid cleaners covering 12 schools. A number of schools utilise a combination of weekly paid staff, and petty and industrial contractors. That is the story in that regard.

Since 1979 the Education Department, wherever practicable, has been progressively phasing out petty cleaning contracts as they expire. In June 1985 industrial cleaners were responsible for cleaning 587 000 square metres of departmental property. The cost effectiveness of this management change is illustrated in the table from which I quoted previously. The report goes on to state:

Based on present contracts the estimated annual savings in using industrial cleaners is \$2.2 million.

In other words, using private enterprise just on school cleaning, without hospital cleaning, it is \$2.2 million.

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

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In the House this afternoon the Minister of Recreation and Sport read a prepared statement concerning the multisport complex for Glenelg North, and he said:

Mr Speaker, on Thursday 29 August the member for Hanson asked a series of questions about a proposed multisport complex this Government plans to build at Glenelg North.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport then quoted his reply, as follows:

I wish to make the observation that these were not merely questions but yet another attempt by the Opposition to create obstacles in the path of a positive and constructive project to benefit South Australia's sporting community.

Might I just ask why should not the member for Hanson, in whose electorate the multisport complex is to be constructed, ask such questions? He is perfectly entitled to do so. It is his electorate, and I would have thought it was very right and proper for him to ask questions. As the member in the adjoining electorate, I am also going to ask some questions, because the people in Glenelg North are concerned about the location of this project.

We are not saying that the project should never be built anywhere, but rather that constructing the project at the E&WS site in Glenelg North and the West Beach Trust area creates some difficulties. I want to now air some of those

difficulties. Going to the ministerial statement, I think it is interesting to see that the Minister says that the proposed \$4.4 million multisport complex at Glenelg North was formally approved at last week's Cabinet meeting. The project was announced in the press. Indeed, it had a big press release that was no doubt designed to give the Minister some mileage in order to boost his flagging popularity, but it has really been at most an exercise that has not been given much thought.

The Government states that the Department of Aviation now says that there is no difficulty and that there will be no objections to the complex—that the department does not see the construction of the complex involving any problems relating to safety and the height of the lighting towers. As some years ago a drive-in was not allowed to be located in that vicinity, it is hardly likely that this complex will get off the ground. It is annoying that the Minister should say that the questions asked by my colleague, the member for Hanson, are yet another attempt by the Opposition to create obstacles.

We have had a succession of projects imposed on Glenelg over the years with which I have been involved, particularly since 1982, where the Government of the day has just, as a *fait accompli*, announced that a project is to proceed. The first one was the tramcar barn. It was decided to relocate the tramcar barns from the Victoria Square site so that the Government could cash in and boost STA revenue by selling off the property. It was decided, before it was announced in the district, that a tramcar barn would be built on SAJC land at Morphettville.

A deal was done with the jockey club. I got wind of it and let it out of the bag as soon as I could to the local residents because they were entitled to know. I fronted the Minister and officers from the State Transport Authority and was told, very clearly, that the decisions were all made and it was pointless for the Marion council to object because it could be overridden. I was shown plans and there was no doubt that it was a *fait accompli*. The local residents of Glengowrie had a public meeting and although some very worthwhile objections were put forward, it really did not matter what they thought about the tramcar barn because the Government had decided that they would wear it, and to hell with what they thought.

That is just not on. It is totally unacceptable administration. I suspect that, if it had been 1979 and a marginal seat that I was contesting against the now member for Hartley, in those days the Labor Party was very susceptible to pressure and the tramcar barn would never have gone ahead. Now the situation has changed. The Government has bulldozed it through and is saying to the residents of Glengowrie and me, 'It doesn't matter what you think. It doesn't matter what the Marion or Glenelg council thinks. The residents will wear a tramcar barn.'

The same thing occurred in relation to the decision that the Government took to widen Tapleys Hill Road. The residents fought the issue right to the end. However, the Minister of Transport led the action committee to believe that he was sympathetic to their cause to widen the road on two sides. That committee went to the extent of going to the local newspaper and saying that it had the support of the Minister. An article appeared in the local *Guardian* saying that the local action committee had won. Within perhaps five days—it was no more—the Minister went the other way and announced that the Government was going to acquire all the properties on the eastern side of the road and bulldoze the homes.

Once again, it did not matter what the local residents thought; and the Government went ahead and bulldozed this project through. We now have another project about to be foisted on us, that is, the multisport project at Glenelg

North. I do not think that the Government gives a damn about what the Glenelg North residents think and about what will happen to traffic patterns along the North Esplanade. The Government has made a decision and will bulldoze it through to the best of its ability. If I or, say, the member for Hanson in the adjoining electorate raise any objection we will be told that we are being obstructionist. That is already starting to evolve.

Anyone travelling down Military Road on the weekend, turning from the Patawalonga frontage over the King Street bridge and trying to get to the St Leonards Hotel will find it absolutely impossible. On Sunday afternoon it took me 20 minutes by car to get from the King Street bridge, down Anzac Highway to the sailing club, which would normally take about one minute to walk. If we superimpose the traffic from the sports stadium on the north peninsula and if this Government bulldozes through the Jubilee Point project and we superimpose that traffic on the peninsula, it will create enormous problems. One should also bear in mind that the roads in the Glenelg area do not go anywhere, they go down to Glenelg, do a roundabout and go out again. The whole area is clogging up with traffic.

In relation to the sports stadium, we know that the Minister released this project before it went to Cabinet. We also know that officers of the E&WS Department at Glenelg North were not consulted about what was coming up; they read about it in the newspaper. That raised the question of what will happen to the tailings from the existing plant. Presently all tailings are buried where the sports stadium is to be built. The plant has been told that it cannot now bury its tailings and has to spend \$100 000 on a new incinerator. That raises the question of when the plant will be allowed to burn the tailings?

We have clean air legislation, and I am damned if we will allow sewage tailings to be burnt and blown back over the district—it is just not on. The Government does not care—it will bulldoze this thing through and we will have to wear these tailings being burnt. Another thing that the Government has not considered is the fact that all the major sewer trunks run along Military Road from the Henley Beach and West Beach area into the area of the sports stadium. It will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to relocate all of those trunk sewers.

Although it was originally a great idea to build a sports stadium there, one can see that there are a lot of problems such as traffic problems, disposal of tailings by a different method, rerouting of the sewer mains, and a lot of other problems. I am not convinced that the Government has approval from the Department of Transport. It is said that there was consultation with all appropriate authorities—that is absolute, arrant nonsense! The Glenelg council has not been consulted—nobody has been consulted! It may be that the West Beach Trust has had some input, but there has not been wide consultation.

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I rise tonight to talk about two issues—one the opening of The Second Story by the Premier, which took place yesterday in the Rundle Mall Arcade opposite Regent Arcade. I had the privilege and pleasure of being present at that opening, as was the Minister of Health. I wish to record publicly my congratulations to the Minister because I believe that he has put an enormous amount of personal time and energy into establishing this centre. I am sure that members of this House know the background of this centre and the fact that the Minister of Health visited The Door in New York where he saw the sorts of adolescent support services and facilities provided for young people in that city. While of course we do not—

Mr Meier interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: If the honourable member listens he might have his questions answered.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I will get to that, if the honourable member gives me an opportunity to finish what I want to say. Although this facility is modelled on the concept of providing this most necessary support for a certain group of young people, it has been refined to suit Adelaide conditions and needs. Having been present at what was a very positive, supportive and exciting opening of this centre, which is very badly needed in South Australia, I was absolutely horrified (in fact, I felt really saddened) when I picked up the paper this morning and read some of the negative comments being made to describe these facilities.

I draw members' attention to some of those comments. The Opposition spokesman on legal matters, Mr Griffin, said he was concerned that the centre provided a soft option that could turn children away from going to their parents to seek advice. All I can say is that that demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the problems that exist in Adelaide in 1985. For the honourable member's information, I can tell him that it is estimated that there are about 5 000 homeless young people in South Australia. Let us add to that the thousands of young people who come from other States, in a transient situation, for a certain period and then move on.

I have not plucked that figure from the air; it was estimated by groups who deal with young people, groups such as youth shelters, homeless persons' shelters run by the St Vincent de Paul Society and the Salvation Army, the police and youth accommodation services like the one in my own southern area.

Mental health programs have also provided evidence that many young people in our community have nowhere to go and no-one from whom they can seek the sort of advice, support and counselling that they desperately need. They need health and counselling services. In many cases those services bring about a reconciliation between the young person and their family. If these people are not to be afforded the progressive type of service that The Second Story will provide, I ask members of this Parliament who will provide that service and who will care about these young people?

It is important to look at what is happening in Hindley Street now, because the Community Welfare Department actually sees 60 young people an evening. They come to Hindley Street and need a form of support service presently provided in Hindley Street. Indeed, it is one of the most valuable services being provided in Adelaide.

I would like to continue to look at some of the comments of Mr Griffin, who also said that there were certain areas (and he raised the matter) such as contraception in which parents must accept responsibility. No-one suggests that in an ideal world every child should not be able to have the sort of information at the time in their life when they need that information in a supportive, loving and caring family where the mother and father give that sort of information. However, we all know that this is not a perfect or ideal world. Many young people are denied that information by their parents, so how then would the member who interjected force parents to accept that responsibility? Is it by not providing any information, by not providing support services, or by denying young people all sorts of support services?

I do not believe that any thinking sensitive member of Parliament would seriously suggest that that is an alternative. I hope that no-one would think that. We have also to look at the comments made by Mr Griffin, when he said:

Young people should not be encouraged to ignore parental and family advice.

For heavens sake! Who is suggesting that? Anyone who knows what is being offered at The Second Story would never consider that young people were being encouraged to ignore parental advice. The exact opposite applies. If students or young people present themselves, counselling techniques are used often to include families and other members of the community in which these young people are involved. There is not some kind of setting up of an antagonistic situation between the family and the young person. I find that an offensive statement which shows no understanding of the kind of dedication and hard work that people in such places as The Second Story are willing to offer.

Indeed, I suspect that not many members of Parliament would last long working in such areas, which are extremely emotionally draining. They are thankless jobs, and when I hear members like the member for Goyder making that kind of inane interjection, it makes me feel sad about the kind of community we have. Mr Griffin then went on and the Minister, in his own inimitable manner, was able to categorise clearly what the shadow Attorney-General was saying. Dr Cornwall said that he believed Mr Griffin was taking the art of knocking to its absolute pinnacle. I can only agree with that statement, which shows a complete lack of understanding of young people. It shows a complete lack of understanding of their needs, and anyone who has taught adolescents, who has lived with adolescents and who knows adolescents, knows that there are services needed for a range of people. Young people are not all the same.

They are not a homogeneous group of people any more than are adults. To suggest that everything should be solved in the family ignores completely the reality of the situation. I was delighted to hear Dr Cornwall refer to a report that will be released next week, a discussion paper dealing with the child sexual abuse task force that has been established. No-one seems to realise that this wonderful loving family that is being referred to is not in every case such a wonderful loving family. Once again, I refer members to the child sexual abuse report that clearly identifies who are the sexual molesters of children.

Is anyone seriously suggesting that a child who has been sexually molested in his or her own home should go to the same parent and seek advice or information about sexually transmitted diseases? Of course, no-one is suggesting that. Are members opposite saying that we should not provide access for information and counselling to young people in an environment which is 'user friendly' (to use a jargonistic term), in which they feel comfortable, which will not set up a whole lot of barriers and make value judgments and which will encourage them to get their lives in order?

I conclude by saying that, surely, if we can save one single young person from becoming a drug addict, from throwing their lives away through abuse of alcohol or some other form of abuse, that \$700 000 has been very well spent. I put it to the House that the Minister of Health should be supported and congratulated for the dedication and hard work that he has put into this project, and not be receiving the sort of knocking that very shortsighted members opposite have wanted to mete out to the Minister.

I am saddened and disgusted with the comments. I would have expected much more from the member for Goyder. Perhaps I have misjudged him. I thought he was a sensitive and caring man. Obviously he is not, but that is my own misjudgment of him. I believe that The Second Story will provide the needs of young people in our community and I congratulate the Minister for his initiative.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I take this opportunity to talk a little about the history of the Whip's position and about the current situation. I read that on 13 July 1891 a Mr Edward Ward stated in a letter to the editor:

There is a touch of the ludicrous in the debate on the question of 'parliamentary Whips', and to persons outside the walls of Parliament such debates are like turning Legislature procedure into ridicule. That valuable time should be wasted in the discussion of an old worn out custom is what the electors have a right to complain about. Members are not sent to Parliament to ride hobby-horses but to legislate for the general good; judged by this standard such debates are for nothing less than a frivolous and wanton waste of time. Assuming, however, that Whips are decided upon it becomes a fair question—who are to pay the costs? The public exchequer, or the members of the Assembly by their own private subscriptions? If the former then it must be assumed that there will be strong objection, but if the latter then the public will not trouble themselves, as they well know that on such basis the office will soon collapse owing to want of funds; but in any case it is undesirable to create such an office here. It is hoped, therefore, that the Cabinet will resist the proposal and be no party to the creation of a foolish and useless office, such as the appointment of 'parliamentary Whips' would certainly be.

At that time, or during the previous year before, a motion was moved before the Parliament to create the position of Whip. In 1891 a Mr Parsons moved the following resolution:

That in the opinion of the House the appointment and recognition of parliamentary Whips would conduce to the better conduct of parliamentary business . . . The existence of such officers in connection with the Parliaments of countries enjoying responsible government might be fairly said to have arisen in the interests of Parliament itself, and as the whole system of Government was carried on by the command of the majority it was exceedingly important in the discussion of all questions that the full opinion of members should be expressed. All members could not at all times attend the House, and he supposed the need for the appointment of parliamentary Whips could be actually traced to that circumstance.

There was much debate on the matter, to the point where it was clearly shown that Whips in those times were not recognised as individuals: they were somewhat sneaky and crawly kinds of individuals who went around finding out how people would vote, then reporting back to the Government or to the Minister of the day.

They were never recognised: no-one knew who they were. The idea was that these people would listen to the chatter in the corridors, bars, or whatever, and indicate to the Government how it was going with the numbers. In those times the Party system was not as dominant as it is today. In other words, everyone had a view to express. In the final vote on this issue, to which I will refer later, it was clearly shown that that was the case. Perhaps I should refer to one or two other references in the debate that took place at that time as follows:

Mr Johnson said that . . . it would be a great convenience to honourable members to have someone on whom they could rely to acquaint them of the state of the business of the House.

That was greeted with 'Hear, hear!' It continues:

Parliamentary Whips were recognised in the neighbouring colonies.

He was then asked what status would a person have as Whip and Mr Brooker interjected, 'Will you give him a seat in the Executive?' The reply was:

No. It was undignified, and often inconvenient, for a member of the Ministry to act as Whip.

That just shows what sort of respect was held for the Whip in those days—virtually no respect at all. Another document states:

Commencing in 1908, an annual amount of £5 000 was provided for payment of the Ministry, comprising five paid Ministers and one honorary Minister.

I do not know how they decided who the honorary Minister would be. The document further states:

In practice, the latter Minister was not honorary, but each of the paid Ministers submitted to a deduction from his salary as a contribution towards the amount to be paid to the so-called honorary Minister.

So, he got something anyway. It continues:

In addition, there was a deduction from the salary of each Minister for the purpose of making a payment of £200 to the Government Whip, the result being that Ministers at that time received £833 per annum: this continued until 1921.

The practice was that the Ministers paid the Whip, or the private members, and that was the practice up until 1960, when Parliament recognised Opposition and Government Whips and they were then considered to receive a salary. I made the comment to the press that the present allowance is around \$7 000. That is not correct—it is \$8 000 but, after paying 60 cents in the dollar tax, one has about \$60 a week in expendable money.

I have served in the position for a long while—15½ years. I came here not by design initially. As I walked into the Party room my Leader, Premier Hall, said, 'Vote for yourself'. I asked, 'What for?' and he said, 'As Whip'. That was in April 1970 and it was the first I knew of it. During the years of the LM controversy it was not easy for a Whip, as most people would realise. Old debates referred to cliques in Parties and the Parliament and to different forces within the Parliament. That period was a test for me and I suppose it developed the character necessary to carry on the job.

I thank Alan Rodda, who sits behind me, for the advice he gave me when I took over as Whip to never give in on any commitment. I am grateful that when my Premier Hall tried to make me withdraw pairs I refused to do so. The same applied with Premier Tonkin. When he asked me to break my word I did not give in and in the end did not have to, because the two Leaders bowed. I did not have that problem with any other Leader.

I appreciate the support that I, as Whip, have received from my colleagues over the years. In 1979, my present Leader and Deputy Leader, when I wanted to step down as Whip, encouraged me to continue, and I did so, because we had so many new members coming in. Just before this session started, my present Leader approached me and suggested that some people were fidgety in the Party about my position as Whip, about the salary connected with that position, and my being able to promote myself; we had a discussion about that situation. I was never told that I should resign. My Leader was frank and fair in that discussion, and I explained to him that I would like to continue. That I did until this time.

A letter went to a group of trustees who were looking after some money that was left in an account from the original branches; this was for me to use as the sitting member in the electorate. It was suggested that the money might be improperly used and that I had an electorate allowance to use if I wanted to work within the electorate to counteract any other advertising that might be undertaken or to promote any issues, be it on Craighburn or other matters.

That caused me some disquiet because it put some pressure on five people who work untiringly for the Party to which I have belonged for longer than any other sitting member of this House has and for longer than anybody who belongs to the executive of the Party has.

So, with the Leader's comments earlier that there was some disquiet about my getting the salary as a Whip and being able to use that money to campaign, I decided that it was time for me to bow out. In doing that, I say 'Thank you' to the Government Whips for their cooperation over the years, particularly to Glen Broomhill, who was an absolute gentleman. We never had to sign any documents: we always just accepted the word of each other.

I also thank the staff for their support over the years because they have been a great help to me. In bowing out

as from tonight, I say to everybody who supported me while I was on the job, 'Thank you very much'. I could not go on with that sort of niggling behind the scenes to a small degree by one or two people; that has made my position difficult. A Whip must be trusted at all times. I tried never to use the position to promote myself. It is fair that I bow out so that nobody can say that I have used the position to

promote myself, and I can fight for whatever position that I wish to then.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 September 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WELFARE GRANTS

14. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: What amounts were granted to the following during the past financial year:

- (a) Community Services for the Aged—Senior Citizens' Centres;
- (b) Child Care Services;
- (c) non-governmental children's and youth homes;
- (d) welfare activities; and
- (e) women's shelters,

and how do these amounts compare with the previous year and what was the number and total amount of applications in each category?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

	Expenditure 1983-84	Actual Expenditure 1984-85	Applications Number for 1984-85	1984-85 Requested Amount
(a) Community Services for the Aged—Senior Citizens Centres & Welfare Officers				
• State	32 000	64 018	29	158 973
• Commonwealth	591 681	712 405	—	1 450 693
(b) Child Care Services				
• Family Support Services	438 000	493 502	10	487 000
• Child Care in Women's Shelters	191 000	230 936	12	231 000
• Community based Child care				
(i) Playgroups, Early childhood Family Services Parent/child Centres	222 833	309 103	16	337 000
(ii) Child Care Centres (Capital)	4 622	668 131	—	—
	(recurrent funding is supplied by the Commonwealth)			
(c) Non-government Children's and Youth Homes				
• State		1 260 080		
• Commonwealth	1 313 000	275 000	37	2 018 000
(d) Welfare Activities (Community Welfare Grants Fund)	1 270 986	1 751 975	282	4 728 000
(e) Womens Shelters				
• State	1 005 000	1 085 000	12	2 187 000
• Commonwealth	315 718	472 716		

PEST PLANTS BOARD MEMBERS

16. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Who are the members of the Pest Plants Board, when were they appointed, what are their specific qualifications or reasons for appointment and what remuneration and allowances are they paid?

2. How many meetings were held by the board in the past 12 months?

3. How many boards have been established under sections 18 to 26 of the Pest Plants Act, where are they located, and who are the respective members, what is the income of each board and what is the date of the last annual report of each?

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

1. Members of the Pest Plants Commission:

Names	Date of Appointment	Qualifications
P.M. Barrow	15.8.85	Director, Department of Agriculture, with a wide knowledge of agriculture.
N.P. Newland	15.8.85	Manager, Operations, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment and Planning. Currently acting Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.
R.D. Brockhoff	15.8.85	Orchardist and grazier with extensive experience in agricultural safety and the usage of herbicides.
D.G. Ross	15.8.85	20 years experience in local government. Presently President, Local Government Association of S.A. and of Australia.

(Note: The Pest Plants Act provides for six members. One member, Mr M.J. Groth, retired on 21 July 1985 and a recommendation for his replacement is under consideration.)

One other member, Mr A.F. Tideman, Director of the Department of Agriculture, resigned in September 1984 to take up an overseas posting. His reappointment will be considered upon his return later this year.)

Remuneration

Public Service members (including Chairman of the commission) receive no remuneration or fees for their services

on the commission. They are paid travelling allowances in accordance with Public Service Board administrative instructions.

Non-Public Service members receive remuneration in accordance with directions of the Chairman, Public Service Board, dated 20.9.82, namely, \$85 per half day, and allowances in accordance with Public Service Board Administrative Instructions.

2. Number of Meetings in the past 12 months—11.

3. Number of boards established under sections 18-26 of the Pest Plants Act—58.

Multi-Council Boards	Member Councils	Delegates
Alexandrina	Port Elliot/Goolwa	C. Harding T. Reid
	Strathalbyn	R. MacDonald M. Eckert (Chairman)
Barossa Ranges	Angaston	B.M. Hurn I.C.R. Zander R.J. Radloff (proxy)
	Barossa	C.K. Oliver (Chairman) D.W. Gordon A. MacLachlan (proxy)
Burra Eudunda Robertstown	Burra	G. Kellock J. Quinn
	Eudunda	W.T. Hage (Chairman) P.A. Schiller
	Robertstown	J. Neindorf P. Neinz
Central Adelaide Plains	Gawler	D. Bombardieri G. Forgie
	Light	D. Fyfe G. Martin (Chairman)
	Mallala	J. Lush W. Forby
	Tanunda	T. Sheer R. Schiller
Cowell Kimba	Franklin Harbor	R.A. Rehn K.D. Olsen
	Kimba	C.E. Lienert (Chairman) K.J. Joyce
Eastern Eyre Peninsula	Cleve	D.W. Turnbull (Chairman) Mrs V.N. Siebert
	Lincoln D.C.	W.P. Mickan J.E. Reid
	Tumby Bay	R.S. Schunke H.M. Baillie
Elliston LeHunte	Elliston	W.E. Hitchcock P.C. May (Chairman)
	LeHunte	T.D. Schulze T.D. Mullan
Kangaroo Island	Dudley D.C.	D.R.W. Buick M.J. Wilson
	Kingscote D.C.	J.K. Anderson J.A. Waller
Loxton Waikerie	Loxton	E.P. Jackson (Chairman) P.M. Shannon B.J. Vowles
	Waikerie	I. Oliver M. Collins K. Schmidt
Mid Hills	C.C. Happy Valley	C. Spiel (Chairman) G. Curtis
	Mt. Barker D.C.	R. Norris P. Secker R. Rothe
	Onkaparinga	S. Camac C. Pfeiffer C. Wegener
Mid-North	Kapunda	R.S. Klemm R.A. Giles
	Riverton	D. Molineux (Chairman) D.M. Hannaford
	Saddleworth/Auburn	B.R. Rowett H. G. Benger
	Wakefield Plains	T.J. Gordon D.G. Ross R.J. Morris
Murray Lands	Brown's Well	V.W. Argent K.C. Maple C.E. Schwarz
	Karoonda-East Murray	D.J. Fullston (Chairman) J.F. Boughen J.R. Cattle
	Peake	B.J. Cross M.J. Prior (Chairman)
Northern	Gladstone	J.R. Nicolson A. Murray
	Georgetown	R.G. Harding (Dep. Chairman) F.E.H. Adams
	Hallett	G. Dawes
	Jamestown D.C.	G.T. Ashton
	Jamestown Corp.	D. Agg T. McGuire
Riverland	Laura	T. Schiller
	Spalding	M. Schmidt (Chairman)
	Barmera	E.W. Lacey
	Berri	
	Morgan	
Paringa		
Renmark C.T.		

Multi-Council Boards	Member Councils	Delegates	
Talunga	Gumeracha D.C.	W.A. Cornish (Chairman) G. Corgiou L. Holmes R. Amber	
	Mt. Pleasant	M.T. Manning F.S. Heaslip	
Upper North	Carrieton	G. Mead M. Dunstan	
	Corporation of Peterborough	N.S. Solly (Chairman) T. Shute	
	Hawker	N. Bury C.A. Hilder	
	Kanyaka-Quorn	A.A. Teague W.H. Cottrell	
	Orroroo	P.J. Malycha D.S. Cook	
	Peterborough D.C.	I. Hunt B. Watkinson	
		T.A. McCormack J.P. Wharff (Chairman) P.G. McInnes (Proxy)	
Western	Murat Bay	T.A. Woodard R.E. Bishop	
	Streaky Bay	G.R. Barlett (Chairman) G.R. Mayfield	
Yankalilla Willunga	Willunga	I.M. Venning (Chairman) R. Crouch K.W. Noll G. Leve T.C. Roocke (Deputy Chairman)	
	Yankalilla	C.A. Noble B. Crouch	
Lower Flinders	Crystal Brook	J.W. Maitland S.W.J. Brennan	
	Mount Remarkable	D.S. Lehman A.C. Smith R. Arbon R. Hewett	
	Pirie	J. Pilkington H. Wheaton	
	Broughton Districts	Blyth	J.G. Ashby (Chairman) J.D. Nicholls N.D. Newbold L.R. Daniel
		Clare	G.A. Male R.J. Drage
		Port Broughton	W.G. Bagshaw K.J. Correll
		Redhill	B.C. Eden (Chairman) M.H. Stevens I. Polgreen C.T. French
Northern York Peninsula	Snowtown	F.D. McIntyre R.L. Schultze L.B. Treleoar S.H. Cook (Chairman)	
	Northern York Peninsula	Warooka	R.H. Fooks D.G. Ramsay
		C.T. Wallaroo	G.B. Sherriff R.D. Bishop
		Clinton	J.B. Varcoe D. Chilton M.R. Williams
		N.Y.P.	G.R. Daniels (Chairman) W.D. Ogilvie F. Boylan
Southern Yorke Peninsula	Central Y.P.	J. Clothier H. A. Bawden (Chairman)	
	Minlaton	R. Engler P. Magarey M. Hill	
	Warooka	C.L. Lamond R. Hinton (Chairman)	
	Yorketown	A.O. Schutz B. Rowley A. Glynn	
Beachport Robe	Beachport	J.S. Mathews (Chairman) R.A. Johnson K. Schultz	
	Robe	J.P. Schinckel J. R. Brooksby N.R. Smith P. Bramsen	
Lucindale Penola	Lucindale		
	Penola		
Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell	Mount Gambier		
	Port MacDonnell		
Naracoorte and Districts	Naracoorte D.C.		
	Naracoorte Corp.		

Multi-Council Boards	Member Councils	Delegates
Mid Murray	Mannum	C.W. Eichler A.H. Rosenz M.J. Kluge (Chairman) E.R. Graetz B.M. Howard J.M. Anderson
	Ridley	
	Truro	

Single Council Boards (In these cases the council corporation acts as the board. Therefore the name of the board is the same as the council, and the board members are the current elected members of the council/corporation.)

Brighton	Payneham	East Torrens	Tatiara
Burnside	Port Augusta	Enfield	Tea Tree Gully
Campbelltown	Prospect	Henley & Grange	Thebarton
City of Mount Gambier	Salisbury	Hindmarsh	Unley
City of Port Lincoln	Stirling	Marion	Victor Harbor
City of Port Pirie	St Peters	Millicent	Walkerville
		Mitcham	West Torrens
		Munno Para	Whyalla
		Murray Bridge	Woodville
		Noarlunga	

Board	1985 Budget ^(a)	Date of Last Annual Report ^(b)
Alexandrina	67 720	6.3.85
Barossa Ranges	39 747	15.2.85
Beachport Robe	42 285	14.3.84
Broughton Districts	57 700	17.2.84
Burra Eudunda Robertstown	42 600	8.3.85
Central Adelaide Plains	66 680	14.3.85
Cowell Kimba	26 400	13.2.85
Eastern Eyre Peninsula	111 576	4.3.85
Elliston LeHunte	73 469	14.2.85
Kangaroo Island	36 473	18.3.85
Lower Flinders	74 450	21.6.85
Loxton Waikerie	57 985	22.2.85
Lucindale Penola	53 280	7.3.85
Mid Hills	93 310	3.5.85
Mid Murray	31 235	1.2.85
Mid-North	77 395	20.1.85
Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell	57 832	17.2.84
Murray Lands	67 219	6.1.85
Naracoorte and Districts	37 000	11.3.85
Northern	79 329	6.5.85
Northern Yorke Peninsula	61 065	22.3.84
Riverland	46 596	15.1.85
Southern Yorke Peninsula	34 290	6.3.85
Talunga	39 000	14.6.84
Upper North	51 669	19.3.85
Western	56 188	15.8.85
Yankalilla Willunga	57 680	31.7.85
Brighton	— ^(c)	6.8.85
Burnside	6 960	18.2.85
Campbelltown	1 840	25.1.85
City of Mount Gambier	6 300	15.1.85
City of Port Lincoln	4 182	3.8.84
City of Port Pirie	525	24.5.84
East Torrens	33 000	18.5.84
Enfield	—	—
Henley and Grange	5 350	11.5.84
Hindmarsh	830	29.6.85
Marion	—	7.5.84
Millicent	34 550	12.7.84
Mitcham	300	13.9.84
Munno Para	36 930	18.2.85
Murray Bridge	37 230	7.3.85
Noarlunga	15 966	19.6.84
Payneham	—	7.8.85
Port Augusta	12 246	15.8.84
Prospect	400	—
Salisbury	45 384	11.5.84
Stirling	39 995	26.3.85
St Peters	—	8.8.85
Tatiara	73 270	28.2.85
Tea Tree Gully	15 895	7.2.85
Thebarton	—	18.5.84
Unley	—	3.8.85
Victor Harbor	35 210	26.7.84
Walkerville	—	21.2.85
West Torrens	—	10.8.85

Board	1985 Budget ^(a)	Date of Last Annual Report ^(b)
Whyalla	32 355	12.7.84
Woodville	21 150	31.5.84

(a) These budget figures do not include recoverable costs for work carried out by the boards. Budget funds are provided by State and Local Government in accordance with Sections 30-32 of the Pest Plants Act.

(b) Annual reports for board year 1984 are currently being forwarded by Boards.

(c) No budget figure indicates that the metropolitan councils concerned include pest plant operations in their normal gardening/grounds management operations.

DEPARTMENTAL THEFTS

24. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What items were stolen from all sections of each department under the Minister's control in the year ended 30 June 1984?

2. What action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

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

1. The following items were stolen from departments under the control of the Minister for Environment and Planning in the year ended 30 June 1984.

Department for Environment and Planning
National Parks and Wildlife Service Division:

- 2 pairs binoculars
- 1 fire extinguisher
- 1 electric fence energiser
- 1 chainsaw
- 1 portable radio
- 1 electric drill
- 1 traffic counter

Development Management Division:

- 1 tripod
- 1 projector
- 1 screen
- 1 steel locker

Country Fire Services and Auditor-General:

Nil

Police Department:

- 1 camera
- 2 radios
- 1 radio aerial
- 1 rear vision mirror
- 1 motorcyclist's helmet
- 1 motorcycle patrolman's suit
- 1 handcuffs
- 1 pistol
- stationery

Metropolitan Fire Service:

- Steel plate
- Carpet tiles
- Vacuum cleaner
- Salvage sheet
- Portable radio
- Uniform

2. The Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning, has drawn to the attention of all Divisional Directors the need for all staff to be aware of their responsibilities regarding the control and security over items of plant and equipment. Adequate precautionary measures to ensure the safe custody and control of Police Department equipment

are already in force and very few instances of loss of equipment from secured police premises occur. However, the nature of police operations is such that from time to time members in the field are placed in situations where they are unable to protect departmental equipment; for example, arrests, emergency situations, etc.

Security difficulties at the Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters complex during reconstruction resulted in some of the above thefts. SA Metropolitan Fire Service policy is to immediately report any items of stolen property to the Police Department. Security at all metropolitan fire stations is being progressively upgraded with electronic automatic door closing equipment to improve security when the premises are unattended when operational crews are absent attending emergencies and training. All equipment carried on appliances is subject to daily stocktake during serviceability checks by on duty staff.

TEACHERS: COUNTRY SERVICE

34. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What are the criteria for exemptions for teachers in the Equitable Country Service Scheme?

2. How many exemptions have been granted in the past 12 months?

3. Are teachers allowed to nominate a time when they will be available for country service?

4. Is it intended to allow teachers who have already done country service to take leave without pay for child care, etc., and, if so, for how long?

5. Does the Education Department recognise that it is undesirable for teachers to uproot their children in years 11 and 12 and are deferment periods adjusted to cope with this?

6. Are nearby hills towns to remain designated as areas for country service?

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

1. (i) Where a teacher has personal commitments or difficulties and the placement may have detrimental impact on the teacher's life, for example:

- Where the placement denies the teacher reasonable access to required regular medical treatment for an ailment;
- Where a teacher is involved in protracted legal and/or custody proceedings;
- Where a teacher is committed to and has a major responsibility for some community service which cannot be relinquished at short notice.
- Where the presence of the teacher is essential to protect a right or an interest;
- Where a teacher is dependent on physical support systems for participation in society;
- Where a teacher is involved in study at a tertiary institution to complete basic academic requirements for (for example, studies for a diploma in teaching, or its equivalent) the next promotion position or study relevant to the teacher's field of work;
- Where a teacher is dependent on child care for pre-school children.

(ii) Where the teacher has the responsibility for the care of 'dependants'. 'Dependant' is defined as a teacher's spouse

or partner in an established relationship; child, step-child, ex-nuptial child; invalid relatives for whom the teacher is the provider of essential care, for example:

- Where the placement denies the teacher's dependants reasonable access to essential medical treatment.
- Where the placement denies the teacher's dependant child reasonable access to satisfactory continuous secondary education or where there are requirements for special education.
- Where a teacher's dependant needs physical, medical and/or psychological support systems to participate actively in society.
- Where the appointment of a teacher to the country can be shown to disrupt the family, where a family is defined as a social unit comprising at least one adult living with one or more children and responsible for their essential care.

(iii) Teachers who undertook national service on a continuous basis over a period of two years from 1966 onwards are exempted from country service in their substantive positions held as at 24 November 1981, provided that it was immediately prior to or during their teaching service with the South Australian Education Department.

This exemption extends to:

- (a) those National Servicemen discharged after 18 months following the National Service Act of 1971;
- (b) those National Servicemen discharged after one year following the termination of national service under the National Service Termination Act of 1973; and
- (c) those National Servicemen who were discharged as a result of injuries or illness attributable to that service.

2. No exemptions from country service were made in the last 12 months.

3. Teachers on the Equitable Service Scheme List who take accouchement leave (including leave to adopt a child) or leave for child rearing may elect to take leave without pay for the following three years, to a total of four years, notwithstanding that they have not been identified as required transferees. This period of four years will count as country service.

4. All teachers, male and female, may apply for parenting leave, which is of one year's duration.

5. Deferrals are allowed to teachers whose children are about to undertake matriculation studies.

6. As the metropolitan area is the area which is defined as the Greater Metropolitan Area by the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics, towns outside that area remain designated as areas for country service.

AGRICULTURAL STUDIES

35. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it the intention of the Minister to appoint:

1. a representative in the Curriculum Directorate concerned with the development of policy, resources and curriculum in agriculture studies;
2. an area superintendent in charge of agricultural studies; and
3. an area adviser for Western, Eastern and Central?

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

1. A centrally-based project officer will be appointed to the Curriculum Directorate in 1986. The duties of that officer will include the development of policy, the development of curriculum materials, and the evaluation of resources.

2. In each of the five Education Department areas, a Superintendent of schools will be identified who will have the responsibility of overseeing the implementation of agricultural studies curriculum. Within the Curriculum Directorate a Superintendent of Studies will have the responsibility of supervising the work of the agricultural studies project officer.

3. An area adviser will be appointed on a .5 basis in the Western Area in 1986. Other areas will be serviced by networks of key teachers who will maintain close liaison with the centrally-based project officer. That officer will be charged with the responsibility of inservicing and training those key teachers.

AGRICULTURAL STUDIES CONSULTANT

36. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the position of Agricultural Studies Consultant for South Australian schools to continue in 1986?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Education Department will appoint for 1986 a centrally-based project officer in agricultural studies to replace the present position of adviser in agricultural studies.

KINDERGARTEN ETHNIC ASSISTANTS

37. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it the Government's intention to downgrade the role of ethnic assistants in kindergartens and, if so, how is the multicultural program to be modified under the Children's Services Office?

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

1. It is the Government's intention to support the continuing role of ethnic assistants in kindergartens.

2. The Children's Services Office has undertaken a new initiative in the appointment of a Senior Multicultural Project Officer. This initiative will give the multicultural program under the Children's Services Office a higher profile than it has had in the past. It is expected that this role will be an important one in the development and co-ordination of multicultural services and resources in the children's services area in South Australia; therefore, multicultural aspects of the program will be extended.

STAMP DUTY

38. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What are the full details of the contra transactions amounting to \$19.566 million under the line 'Stamp Duty on documents related to financing transactions of Public Sector Authorities' as reported in the February 1985 Statement of Consolidated Account (Niemeyer Statement) and is this amount included in Treasury estimates of additional Stamp Duties receipts of approximately \$15 million as outlined by the Treasurer on 12 March 1985?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: SAFA, ETSA and the LGFA issued securities to four major Australian institutional investors and one British owned institution in the period between late September and early December 1984. There were seven separate transactions altogether; four with SAFA, two with ETSA and one with the LGFA. The total cash proceeds from the transactions amounted to \$510 million and formed part of the State's Loan Council global limit financings and refinancings. The "all-up" costs of the financing for the authorities were substantially below the then current market interest rates.

Because of the innovative nature of the transactions which provided considerable savings for the authorities, it was necessary to structure the transactions so that equitable interests in a trust were transferred between parties other than the statutory authorities involved. Such a conveyance was technically dutiable under the Stamps Act but it was appropriate for the State to meet the cost of the stamp duty involved in the transaction because:

- (a) if the stamp duty was not paid the transaction would not have taken place and the benefits to the statutory bodies would have been lost;
- (b) the issue and transfer of conventional debt instruments of statutory authorities is, in any event, exempt from stamp duty; and
- (c) there was no loss to the State's net stamp duty receipts by the State paying the duty because, otherwise, the transaction would not have proceeded and no duty would have been paid.

The amounts paid to and from the Consolidated Account with respect to the above matter have been separately identified on the receipts and expenditure side of the monthly Receipts and Payments Statement and will be so treated in the State's annual financial statements. In that regard comparisons between individual lines in the estimates can still be sensibly made without distortions because of the above items. The amount included in Treasury estimates of additional Stamp Duties receipts outlined by the Treasurer on 12 March 1985 did not include the above amounts.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

45. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: To which department or agency does Government vehicle UAP 704 belong and on the evening of Saturday 6 July 1985 were the four occupants utilising that vehicle to attend an official Government function?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The vehicle is owned by the Highways Department. It was not used for official purposes on the evening in question and disciplinary action has been taken against the employee involved.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

84. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: When is it anticipated that the 'Outdoor Advertising Supplementary Development Plan' and draft regulation will be finalised?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is anticipated that the proposed 'Outdoor Advertising Supplementary Development Plan' and the draft regulation amendment will be finalised in November 1985.

SOUTH-EAST WETLANDS

86. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What specific action is the Government planning to take to implement the recommendations contained in the report prepared by the South-East Wetlands Committee?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:

1. With the completion of its final report, the South Eastern Wetlands Committee has been dissolved and the South Australian Wetlands Co-ordinating Group, a broadly based body formed by the Government in 1984, has been given the general responsibility of implementing the Committee's recommendations.

2. Some important progress was achieved prior to the completion of the final report. Poocher Swamp and Butchers Lake have been acquired under the National Parks and Wildlife Act as Game Reserve and Conservation Park, respectively, while negotiations for the acquisition of Naen Naen Swamp are under way.

3. Appropriate action for the implementation of other Committee recommendations is currently under consideration by the South Australian Wetland Co-ordinating Group. Some of the major recommendations and relevant comments are:

Purchase of areas under National Parks and Wildlife Act:

This, as stated above, is already being acted upon. Reservation of wetlands as native forest reserves under Forestry Act:

The Woods and Forests Department has accepted recommendations on these aspects, and legislative changes are planned to increase the security of native forest reserves. The department has conducted surveys of wetland areas under its jurisdiction.

Establishment of Heritage Agreements over privately owned wetlands:

It is planned that negotiations with relevant landholders will commence shortly.

Wetland Studies:

Studies of Big Heath Conservation Park, Lake Frome and Mullins Swamp have already been completed.

The Committee's main recommendation for further study is for an investigation of wetlands along the Bakers Range and Marcollat watercourses to provide a basis for effective conservation measures. The Wetland Co-ordinating Group has prepared a brief for this work and funds are currently being sought to enable the study to commence in the 1985-86 financial year. Other studies are likely to occur as resources become available.

Formation of Regional Advisory Authority:

In order to assist the implementation of the Committee's recommendations and to optimise the level of community involvement, it is planned that a South East Wetlands Advisory Group will be established to provide feedback and advice to the main Wetland Co-ordinating Group. Membership and terms of reference for this local group are currently under consideration and its establishment can be expected shortly.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

90. **The Hon. D. C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health:

1. Why, after having had their working week shortened by two hours, has it now become necessary for paid employees of the St John Ambulance Service to work Saturdays and Sundays?

2. Will the introduction of the 38 hour week result in a direct increase in cost to the St John Ambulance Service of \$500 000 for the current financial year and, if not, what is the estimated increase.

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

1. Paid employees of St John Ambulance in the metropolitan area do not work on Saturdays and Sundays so it is assumed this question relates to the country areas.

Prior to 1 April 1985, nine country centres operated on a seven day roster while eight manned a five day roster. As the latter were being penalised in terms of their conditions of employment, the decision to standardise country operations on a seven day roster was taken on 19 April 1985. Following some initial difficulty at one of the eight centres, now resolved, the new seven day roster is proving effective.

As a result, staff in the eight centres previously working a five day roster now have to work weekends. However, that has nothing to do with the 38 hour week.

2. The introduction of the 38 hour week will result in a direct cost to the St John Ambulance Service of approximately \$400 000 in 1985-86.

ACCIDENT TOWING ROSTER

97. **The Hon. D. C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. For the first six months of 1985, what was the average number of accident tows per roster position for each of the zones under the accident towing roster scheme?

2. Has the Government any plans to adjust the zones to ensure an equal number of tows per roster position, irrespective of the zone?

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

1.	Zone	Total Average
	1	5.2
	2	3.8
	3	15.8
	4	17.2
	5	11.3
	6	12.7
	7	7.3
	8	10.9
	9	9.8
	10	25.2
	11	22.0
	12	10.1
	13	10.9
	14	24.5
	15	14.0
	16	17.0

2. The Accident Towing Roster Review Committee is examining this matter.

CRAIGBURN FARM

101. **Mr. S. G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the Minda Board Inc. or any of its board members or agents indicated to the Government that Minda does not require all or any part of the Craighburn property situated north of Sturt Creek and, if so, which parts, and has the Government offered to purchase the land not required?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A working party to report on the most appropriate use of the land known as the Craighburn Farm was established following an application by Minda Incorporated to subdivide the land. That application was subsequently withdrawn. The working party includes representatives from Minda Incorporated, the Mitcham council and the Department of Environment and Planning.

It is believed that Minda Incorporated representatives have indicated that they will not require some of the land in the foreseeable future, and that they may not need any of the land in the longer term. It is expected the State Government, the Mitcham council and any other interested organisation or person will be presented with the opportunity to purchase the land, in part or in whole and in stages. The deciding factors will be the cost to the Government when weighed against the benefits and other priorities for funds, and the timing of any possible purchases.

SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT TASK FORCE

105. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier representing the Minister of Labour:

1. What was the composition of the Special Employment Task Force set up by the former Minister of Labour?

2. Were the composition and the terms of reference of SETF determined in consultation with the Director of the Department of Labour and, if not, how were they determined?

3. What were the estimated additional costs associated with creating two new portfolios of youth affairs and employment compared with maintaining these functions within the Department of Labour?

4. For what period did SETF meet and what was the cost of salaries involved?

5. How many man hours were devoted by SETF to generating youth and employment policies for the next State election?

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

The task force on employment and unemployment formed by the Premier and former Deputy Premier comprised the Deputy Director of the Department of Labour, the Deputy Director-General of the Department of Technical and Further Education and a senior finance officer of the Treasury Department.

2. The composition and terms of reference of the task force on employment and unemployment were determined in consultation with the Director of the Department of Labour.

3. No estimates were made. Minor costs have been incurred for stationery.

4. The task force was established on 22 April 1985. It commenced its work on 29 April 1985 and completed its work by 14 June 1985. The officers involved in the task force continued to receive their normal salary.

5. None. The task force was asked to formulate proposals for the 1985-86 budget.

SCHOOL ADVISORY TEACHERS

106. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Was the Minister aware of the proposal to reduce the number of school advisory teachers when he announced the teacher training program on drug education (initiated by Rotary)?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There is to be no reduction in the number of school advisory teachers delivering services to schools in 1986.

GRAND PRIX PROGRAMS

119. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Which South Australian printers were given the opportunity to tender for printing the programs of the Australian Mitsubishi Grand Prix?

2. Why was Messenger Press not invited to tender?

3. How many programs have been ordered and at what cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Quotations were obtained from Largs Bay Printers, Stock Journal and Messenger Press.

2. Tenders were not called—quotations were obtained on specifications of publications required.

3. For commercial reasons, an alternate approach was used whereby a company would be licensed to produce and sell this product. In this way, the Australian Formula One Grand Prix organisation gains a significant financial return.

No South Australian companies approached by the office could offer the same returns.

It should also be pointed out that several printing jobs for the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Office have been let to South Australian companies. Largs Bay Printers and Finsbury Press in particular have had considerable work, and are still doing work for the Grand Prix.

COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER SCHEME

121. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Correctional Services: Has the operation of the Community Service Order Scheme been evaluated and, if so, is the Government satisfied that the scheme is being fully utilised, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: When initial planning for the Community Service Order Scheme was undertaken, provision was made for the collection of adequate data on the scheme. This data has formed the basic mechanism for monitoring and evaluating the scheme. Since the scheme was commenced in July 1982, data from all centres has been collated and is available to the department, the local Community Service Order Committees, the State Community Service Advisory Committee and the Minister of Correctional Services.

In May 1984, the Office of Crime Statistics published a report titled 'Evaluating, Rehabilitation: Community Service Orders in South Australia'. The report examined the first 12 months of operation of the scheme. Early in 1985 the State Community Service Advisory Committee received a report which it had commissioned, titled 'Report of an Interdepartmental Working Party on the use of Community Service Orders by the Courts'.

Both reports indicated two significant factors. The first was that the Community Service Order Scheme was a highly successful non-custodial penalty. The second factor was that the growth of the scheme was slower than anticipated. The second of the two reports cited, suggested that re-examination of the legislation might be useful.

Following discussions with the Chief Magistrate, and receipt of feedback from the Magistracy, the department is now examining the legislation. A report will subsequently be presented to the Minister of Correctional Services which will address these issues and offer recommendations in relation to possible legislative change.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY

124. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What action does the Minister intend to take to improve the quality and supply of water at Hawker?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are no major difficulties with the supply of water to Hawker. However, the District Council of Hawker has for some time been advocating an improvement to the quality of the water supply.

Following a request from the district council about the cost of desalination processes applicable to the town's water supply, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is undertaking a technical assessment. It is envisaged that this assessment will be completed by November this year. However, tests on the availability of alternative sources of better quality groundwater by the Department of Mines and Energy will continue.

BUILDING SAFETY REGULATIONS

126. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government: Have the present building safety regulations been evaluated to determine whether they adequately provide for the safe construction and habitation of multi-level mud brick houses and, if so, were they found to be satisfactory and, if not, what action is proposed?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is stressed that the 'building safety regulations' referred to by the member, must be those contained in the document entitled 'The Building Regulations, 1973, as amended'. The Building Regulations, 1973, as amended, contain regulations which deal with the safety, health and amenity of the occupants and the public. Regarding safety, all buildings are required to be structurally sound.

With particular regard to a multi-level mud brick house, the requirements of regulation 37.2 would be applied. The requirements are not specific in what exactly is required with respect to mud brick construction, which is a specialised form of construction, but it is considered that a certificate of structural adequacy from a practising structural engineer is sufficient to ensure that adequate structural standards are achieved.

BAIL HOSTELS

128. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Has the Government received any advice from the Department of Correctional Services regarding the establishment of bail hostels and, if so, what is that advice?

2. Is it intended to establish bail hostels and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Department of Correctional Services has established a task group to examine the implications, both for procedures and resources of the Bail Act. In particular, the terms of reference require that a recommendation be made on the need for a bail hostel. That group is to report to the Executive Director by 30 September 1985 with a set of cost estimated alternatives. Upon receipt of that report a recommendation as to the need for, and possible form of, a bail hostel will be made.

MOBILONG

129. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Will the new prison be built at Murray Bridge if approval is given by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works?

2. What consultation has there been with the present District Council of Murray Bridge on the siting of this prison?

3. If the prison is to proceed, how many prisoners will be housed in it, what is the current estimated cost and when is it expected that it will be functioning?

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

1. Yes.

2. The proposed site was visited by representatives of the District Council of Murray Bridge, Department of Correctional Services and the then Public Buildings Department in October 1983, and the proposal to build the Mobilong Prison was discussed. The use of the site for the prison has also been discussed with the State Planning Authority.

On Thursday 13 June 1985 senior officers from the Department of Correctional Services and the South Australian Housing and Construction Department met with the District Council of Murray Bridge. General discussion centred around the proposed site, building design and proposed construction period.

On Monday 12 August 1985 the Executive Director, Department of Correctional Services was asked to address the District Council of Murray Bridge on the proposed Mobilong Prison. This meeting was also attended by senior officers from the South Australian Housing and Construction Department. The department displayed a scale model of the prison, artists impressions and scale drawings of the prison and site. A meeting is scheduled on Monday 26 August 1985 for a public meeting as requested by the Public Works Standing Committee.

3. The prison will accommodate 160 medium security prisoners. Anticipated cost on completion in October 1987, based on an escalation rate of 12 per cent per annum, is \$21.25 million.

WASTE TRANSFER DEPOT

130. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Did the South Australian Planning Commission approve an application for a waste transfer depot to be built on the corner of King William Road and Mary Street, Unley and, if so, did the Minister overturn that decision and, if so, for what reasons?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. The Minister for Environment and Planning overturned the decision as he did not agree with the recommendations, in light of the Waste Management Commission's proposals.

ROADSIDE VEGETATION

131. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Are new procedures being considered to ensure that there are adequate environmental safeguards to protect roadside vegetation and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is intended that the vegetation clearance controls under the native vegetation management legislation will encompass roadside vegetation.

PRISONERS ON REMAND

133. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Correctional Services: What has been the average number of daily prisoners on remand during the past twelve months?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The daily average number of prisoners on remand during the 12 month period August 1984 to July 1985 was 171.

PETROL SNIFFING

153. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Does the Minister intend to provide the information requested in Question No. 474 from the past session and, if so, when?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The South Australian Woma Committee operates two alcohol and drug rehabilitation centres in South Australia, viz Baroota farm near Port Augusta and the Nunga farm near Murray Bridge. Both have in the past accommodated petrol sniffers for the pur-

pose of rehabilitation. Negotiations re a housing/rehabilitation facility for petrol sniffers at Yalata are near completion.

Some outstations in the North West of the State already perform a minimal part of the function of rehabilitation of petrol sniffers, although this may not be readily apparent when viewed from the European concept of 'rehabilitation'.

COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS POLICE STATION

155. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Does the Minister intend to provide the information requested in question no. 566 from the past session and, if so, when?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is envisaged that the implementation of the Metropolitan Policing Review will see the closure of the Colonel Light Gardens police station. However, the Government will not be moving precipitately in this regard and will ensure that the proper implementation of the new policing strategy is carefully considered before the overall reallocation which has been announced takes place.

COMMUNITY WELFARE COMPLAINTS

162. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. In the absence of a Deputy Ombudsman has the Ombudsman's office been able to cope adequately with complaints against the Department for Community Welfare?

2. How many of the 40 complaints listed at page 53, Appendix A, of the Ombudsman's Report, 1984-85 against the Department for Community Welfare are the result of the Minister's announced appointment of a Welfare Ombudsman and how many of these are among the 15 cases listed as 'still under investigation'?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This question refers to the activities of the Ombudsman's Office. I therefore suggest that the honourable member refer the question to the Ombudsman.

OMBUDSMAN

163. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Did the Minister appoint a Community Welfare Ombudsman in 1984, or was this work delegated to the State Ombudsman's Office?

2. If the matter was simply one of delegation, was not the Department for Community Welfare already within the ambit of the Ombudsman's investigation and, if so, what was achieved by the delegation?

3. Is it expected that the Ombudsman personally, or a specific officer, should investigate complaints against the Department for Community Welfare?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister of Community Welfare established a welfare appeal system to be operated through the office of the State Ombudsman. This system commenced operation on 26 September 1983.

2. The establishment of a separate appeal system from that of the Ombudsman's Office would not have removed the existing power of that office, and would not have prevented appeals to that office. Therefore the use of the Ombudsman's Office for welfare appeals:

- avoided duplication of effort and the potential of the decision of a separate appeals board being subject to further challenge.
 - avoided any suggestion of partiality which an internal appeals system could have been subject to.
3. The Ombudsman's Office has acquired considerable familiarity with welfare issues over the past 10 years; this has been further strengthened by a degree of specialisation within the office, which enables the office to deal effectively with appeals against departmental decisions. It is not expected that the Ombudsman personally or a specific officer will always investigate complaints against the department.

STATE BANK

165. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does the Government support the current aggressive marketing practice of the State Bank of South Australia in acquiring major clients such as John Martins?
2. Did the bank offer to fund John Martins Christmas pageant up to \$500 000 per year for the next five years and, if so, why?
3. Will John Martins Christmas pageant name be changed to include the bank and, if so, why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No. John Martins Retailers Ltd. approached the bank. Details of the transaction between banker and client are confidential.
3. No. The event will still be known as John Martins Christmas pageant, but some acknowledgement of the Bank's support will be given, e.g. John Martins Christmas pageant, presented in association with the State Bank of South Australia.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

168. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government: When will section 178b (4) (c) of the Local Government Act, 1934, be reviewed, and what is the reason for the delay?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Section 178b (4) (c) of the Local Government Act, 1934, enables a council to assess for rating purposes 'any pieces of rateable property subject to a single valuation that are separately owned or occupied', provided that the Valuer-General has certified that it is not practicable for him to make an assessment in accordance with a request from a council. There has been some concern expressed on the ability of councils to create separate assessments where separate occupations exist in a single property such as flats and units.

However, as the above section is only part of the general assessment and rating provisions, it is felt that an isolated change would be inappropriate. The section will be considered in the general review of the assessment, rating and financial provisions of the Act. It is anticipated that following consultation with local government, a Bill to consider these provisions will be tabled in 1986.

HILLS FACE ZONE

171. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Is it the Government's intention to rezone any areas in the present Hills Face Zone and, if so, which areas, to what classification and when in each case?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government has no current proposals to rezone any areas in the present Hills Face Zone. However, as the honourable member is no doubt aware, the major portion of the current Hills Face Zone boundary was defined in the first instance on engineering criteria, relating to the ability to supply water. Today, of course, the policy and the public expectation relate much more closely to the question of aesthetics. As a consequence, it is realistic to expect that some areas are inappropriately zoned. The current investigation into the second generation of parklands, which the Government initiated last year, is likely to identify areas where some boundary adjustments, would be appropriate. Any such changes would, of course, be subject to normal procedures involving exhibition and public comment. It is expected that any possible changes in the future would involve more and not less land being included in the Hills Face Zone overall.