

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 September 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Agent-General Act Amendment,
- Clean Air Act Amendment,
- Government Financing Authority Act Amendment,
- Legal Practitioners Act Amendment,
- Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery (Indenture) Act Amendment,
- North Haven (Miscellaneous Provisions),
- Oil Refinery (Hundred of Noarlunga) Indenture Act Amendment,
- Planning Act Amendment,
- Planning Act Amendment (No. 2),
- Racing Act Amendment (No. 2),
- River Torrens (Linear Park) Act Amendment,
- Roads (Opening and Closing) Act Amendment,
- Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2),
- Roseworthy Agricultural College Act Amendment,
- South Australian College of Advanced Education Act Amendment,
- South Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment,
- Statutes Amendment (Analysts),
- Statutes Amendment (Rural and Other Finance),
- Supply (No. 2).

DEATH OF Hon. D.W. SIMMONS

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

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. D.W. Simmons, a former member of the House, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service; and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It is with considerable regret that I move this motion, but that regret is tinged with great appreciation for the life and work of Don Simmons, our colleague and friend. I can do no better than pay a tribute to him by quoting the words used by my colleague the Deputy Premier at the very moving memorial ceremony that many of us attended. The Deputy Premier said:

Don Simmons was a great human being. He was loyal to his principles and to his friends, which to Don amounted to very much the same thing. He gave a lifetime of community service, service which did not end with his formal retirement and, had he been spared, would have continued for many years.

That statement in many ways sums up the elements of Don Simmons, his life and work, which made him so respected and revered by so many who were associated with him.

For the record, it is worth tracing our former colleague's career. He was born 68 years ago, the eldest son of a railway man, and educated at Adelaide High School. Don Simmons worked in the Savings Bank for many years but, of course, World War II intervened early in his life and he became a member of the RAAF: he was a bomber pilot and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. After the war he continued his education while working. It is interesting to note that in the course of academic studies, which Don

Simmons undertook largely in a part-time capacity, he obtained a Bachelor of Arts, a Bachelor of Economics, a Diploma of Commerce, and a Diploma of Public Administration, and in 1948 he won the Economic Society prize. He was certainly someone who developed tremendous intellectual and academic expertise, which he applied to his work.

Don Simmons was always an active and involved member of both the Labor Party and the industrial organisations that he was entitled to join: he served both the political and the industrial wing of the Labor movement. He was a foundation member of the South Australian branch of the Australian Bank Officials Association and subsequently he was made a life member of that organisation. Leaving the bank, Don Simmons started a job in charge of computing services at the University of Adelaide, the position he held immediately prior to his becoming a member of Parliament. In that position, he transformed and substantially upgraded the computing capacity of the university and I believe that in so doing he provided an example of the capacity and drive that he exhibited in all aspects of his life, also setting an example to both the private and the public sectors in the way in which those computing services were developed.

Don Simmons became member for Peake on 30 May 1970 and entered the House with a large number of members—the 1970 group—many of whom are still with us and many of whom have made major contributions as Ministers, in Government, and in Opposition. He served until September 1979. His career in Parliament was, as we would expect from his background and preparation for that career, one in which he took an active and involved part in all areas offered. Right from the beginning, he was involved in Parliamentary committee work, particularly as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, which he chaired for about three years. When the Public Accounts Committee was established, he became, very appropriately, its first Chairman and I believe that there was universal recognition that his skills and abilities fitted him very well for that inaugural examination by Parliament of public accounts. Don Simmons held that position until he entered the Ministry in October 1975.

He served for the next four years as Minister for the Environment and Chief Secretary, and for much of that time he was also Minister Assisting the Premier. His work in environment included the beverage container legislation, one of his most notable achievements in that area. His work as Chief Secretary included extensive examination of the correctional services system (a recognition of the neglect from which it had suffered), and many of the subsequent reforms that took place, even to the present time, can be traced back to initiatives that commenced in the period of Don Simmons's administration. Incidentally, he was an active member of the Howard Society for Penal Reform: he was involved in that area and it was something that interested him for many years.

One would have thought that, having had such a career in so many fields of activity and such a full participation as a member and Minister in this Parliament, on retirement Don Simmons might have been expected to scale down his activities. On the contrary, he effectively embarked on a number of new interests and careers, building on what he had done before. At the time of his death he was a director of the State Bank and a council member of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Incidentally, for more than 20 years he was President of the High and Technical Schools Councils Association of South Australia. He was also a member of the State Libraries Board. In all those positions he worked assiduously and actively. He

maintained his political interest and involvement at the grass roots of the ALP, including the office of President of the Hindmarsh Federal Electorate Council.

The person whose life and career I have just described obviously brought considerable distinction to this place. We are fortunate that he was a member here and served this Parliament. We are even more fortunate that he gave such service to the State and the community: a great human being, as I said at the beginning. To his wife Betty and their four children—Bruce, Jenny, Neil, and Pam—we offer our condolences, our respects and our appreciation for a life well lived.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the condolence motion before the House on the recent death of Don Simmons. As the Premier stated in speaking to the motion, Don served the people of this State as member for Peake for nearly a decade between 1970 and 1979. During that period he also served as a Minister of the Crown, commencing as Minister for the Environment in 1975—a portfolio which saw a great deal of change following his appointment to that position. He was also Minister Assisting the Premier from 1976 to 1979 and was Chief Secretary in 1977—a position he held until his retirement in 1979. I support the view put forward by the Premier that during Don's period as Chief Secretary he did initiate in our penal system in South Australia many reforms that were long overdue and brought some of our correctional institutions into this century.

Don was extremely well equipped in the academic sense to carry out his work as a member of this House and certainly as a Minister of the Crown. He was educated at Adelaide High School and gained a Diploma of Commerce in 1939. Later he was to add a Bachelor of Economics and a Bachelor of Arts to his qualifications, as well as a Diploma of Public Administration. Few people would have served in this place with such high and broad qualifications as Don Simmons brought to this House.

His involvement in and contribution to public life did not end with his retirement. Don was able to make a further significant contribution as a member of the board of the State Bank of South Australia. It is interesting that he started his working career as a member of the Savings Bank of South Australia and was on that bank board at the time of his untimely death. The Council of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the State Libraries Board were two other organisations to which he made a significant contribution—a contribution that was recognised earlier this year when he was awarded an AM in recognition of his long and commendable involvement in public life in South Australia.

I understand that he passed away as he was recovering from recent heart surgery, and that must have been sudden—a shock to his family and friends. That difficult time when grief is brought on by the sudden loss of a member of the family I hope will at least be tempered by the recognition of this House of the respect in which he was held in the community. I ask that you, Mr Speaker, pass on our personal condolences—mine and those of the Liberal Party, the Opposition in this Parliament—to Don's widow Betty and his family.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I add my support to the motion before the House, both as a colleague of the late Don Simmons in the class of '70 and also because of a considerable number of opportunities that he and I had to share committee workloads and other interests. Don's interests in so many matters of education were shared by his

wife. In fact, as recently as yesterday I was able to welcome Betty back to the table of the Roseworthy Agricultural College Council. Although the loss is so recent she made the simple statement, which I will share with members, that it was the least thing Don would have of her that she return to carry on the work that he no longer could. I think that it is an indication of the spirit that both of them showed to matters of education and community effort. I add my condolences to those expressed by other members.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Very briefly, let me say that I was associated with Don Simmons from the time when he and I were both elected, with the member for Light and others. I served on the University of Adelaide Council with him very early in 1970 and I was a member of the original Public Accounts Committee, which Don Simmons chaired. It is in those sorts of forums that we get to know one another as members of this place and I had a respect for Don Simmons which I have never lost. I would like to be associated with this tribute to him and to extend my condolences to his widow and his family.

The SPEAKER: Of all the qualities associated with Don Simmons, I think the most outstanding was that of humility. My first meeting with Don Simmons was when I was a teacher at the Underdale High School in the early 1970s. Don Simmons, as the local member, hosted a school visit, which I organised, to Parliament House at that time. I remember the favourable impression that he made on my students when he explained how years before, as a very junior public servant, he had run messages to Parliament House, never envisaging that one day he would be a member of this Parliament. He drew an analogy between his situation and that of the late Frank Walsh, who was a stonemason on this site in 1939 when the building was being extended, and who, likewise, never dreamt that he would be Premier in this building.

Don was a loyal servant of the people of South Australia. He served with great humility and great dignity. I will ensure that the remarks of members, as recorded in *Hansard*, are conveyed to his family as a sign of our appreciation of the comradeship and service that he gave to this House and to the State of South Australia.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.17 to 2.25 p.m.]

PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

Petitions signed by 50 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Beverage Container Act to provide for non-refillable, recyclable bottles to be removed from point of sale and returned through a marine stores central collection system were presented by Messrs Keneally and Slater.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 420 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Blevins, Gunn and Keneally.

Petitions received.

PETITION: TRAIN REFLECTOR STRIPS

A petition signed by 238 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to make representation to the Federal Government to request Australian National night trains to carry reflector strips or paint in order to increase their visibility at level crossings was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: VEGETATION CLEARANCE

A petition signed by 88 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Browns Well District Council and the Department of Environment and Planning to review regulations concerning the clearance of native vegetation and drift sand from property boundary lines was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4, 12, 17, 18, 23 to 31, 48, 51, 53, 55 to 57, 64, 78, 92, 98, 107, 108, 110 to 119, 121, 122, 126, 129 to 132, 134, 135, 140 to 142, 144, 146, 151, and 154; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

O-BAHN BUS

In reply to **Ms GAYLER** (14 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The questionnaire distributed to O-Bahn passengers at Paradise interchange on Wednesday 13 August 1986 was part of an operational review of the busway being carried out to determine requirements when the busway is extended to Tea Tree Plaza. The questionnaire was directed at park'n'ride passengers to determine future requirements for park'n'ride facilities, both at Paradise interchange and at the future Tea Tree Plaza station. The overwhelming popularity of the busway has exceeded all expectations, resulting in a huge demand for parking at Paradise interchange which cannot be adequately met without further costly expansions of the car parking area. Many of those parking at Paradise live beyond Tea Tree Plaza and will, therefore, wish to park at the latter when the interchange is built there.

With regard to overcrowded buses on the inward journey, I am advised by the State Transport Authority that there were many cases of this in the early days of operation of the busway, but that this has generally been overcome by adjustments both to the services and by the passengers changing their travel habits. In general, most busway services operate within the loading standards set by the State Transport Authority for all of its services and it would be expected that most buses would be full in the morning peak period as that is the way that the State Transport Authority schedules its services.

Unfortunately, day to day fluctuations in patronage levels on all public transport services, which the State Transport Authority has no control over, mean that on some days particular services are underutilised while on other days there can be overcrowding and some passengers can be left

at stops. While the State Transport Authority considers the issue is under control, its officers are always keen to learn of particular instances on which individual buses are consistently leaving passengers behind so that it can take steps to rectify these situations.

POLICE INTERVIEWS

In reply to **Mr OLSEN** (27 August).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Gazette is the official document for promulgation of instructions and advice to teachers concerning their professional duties. It is published on the authority of the Minister of Education, but obviously it is impractical for the Minister to personally sight every proposed item. Authority for publication has therefore been delegated. Provision also exists for the production of the administrative instructions and guidelines which amplify Government departmental policy.

The gazette notice regarding police interviews in schools resulted from the acknowledgment that there were deficiencies in two former passages in the administrative instructions and guidelines entitled 'Cooperation with Government officers' and 'Police action and interviews at schools' (section 3, paragraphs 84.3 and 84.6). This led to a series of discussions with the Education Department's Child Abuse Steering Committee, officers of the Community Welfare and Police Departments, and officers of the Crown Solicitor's Office, which culminated in the production and publication of the notice in question.

It seems that attention has focused on the reference to interviews being conducted without parents present, and the right of a student above the age of 10 years to request that his/her parents not be present in certain circumstances, subject to the Principal being satisfied that the student is capable of mature judgment consistent with his/her best interests. The general rule is that parents be present at interviews. However, the concept that this need not necessarily occur is nothing new, and is mentioned in the passages referred to above.

In practice, there are very few instances of police interviews at schools. However, occasions do arise where it is deemed to be in the child's best interests (such as in cases of suspected child abuse where the offender is alleged to be a parent) for interviews to be conducted as a matter of urgency and without parental presence. In such cases parental involvement may be prejudicial to the student's best interests and/or subsequent criminal investigation.

STREETWIZE

In reply to the **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (27 August).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have been advised by the Director-General of Education that the Legal Services Commission made available a copy of this comic and discussed with him its intended function, which is to offer legal advice to young people in a form which they will read and understand.

The Legal Services Commission advised that the publication is not aimed at school students, but will be sold to young people who have already left school in most cases, and have often also left home. The Education Department does not intend to use or distribute this publication in schools.

ONKAPARINGA RIVER

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (21 April).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Following announcement of the survey of the Onkaparinga River, arrangements were made with a consultant to carry out the survey. The survey was timed to obtain a spring/summer/autumn/winter sequence for 1985-86, and achievements to date are:

- Definition of catchments and subcatchments to the estuary and their significance.
- Preparation of a water balance model under various conditions.
- Review of land use within the catchments.
- Literature review of land use impact upon water quality of run off.
- Collection of monthly water samples at five sites.

The project is expected to be completed in October this year.

FRUIT JUICE

In reply to the **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (12 August).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Minister of Agriculture made strong representations to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry on behalf of the citrus industry with regard to the sales tax on fruit juice containing more than 25 per cent Australian juice. He also met with representatives of the citrus industry to discuss the issues raised by the honourable member. The Minister of State Development has presented a preliminary submission from the State Government to the Federal Treasurer. Of course, I cannot give a guarantee that the Federal Government will change the sales tax on fruit juice. However, the Industries Assistance Commission is currently examining the citrus industry and the State Government has submitted a position which would assist the Riverland citrus industry.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report, together with a report of the operations of the Auditor-General's Department, for 1985-86.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—
State Bank of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.
South Australian Government Financing Authority—
Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Carrick Hill Trust Act 1985—Regulations—Motor Vehicle and Public Control.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Rule of Court—City of Adelaide. Planning Appeals Tribunal—City of Adelaide Development Control Act 1976—Costs and Appeals.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Daylight Saving Act 1971—Regulation—Extension of Daylight Saving.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Geographical Names Board—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of State Development, for the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1977—Regulations—Contributions to Fund.
Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—Conveyancing Fee.
Trustee Act 1936—Regulations—Authorised Trustee.
Education, Director-General of—Report, 1985.
Elections, General—Statistical Returns—1985.
Friendly Societies—Amendments to General Laws—
Friendly Societies Medical Association Inc.
United Friendly Societies' Council.
State Revision, Commissioner of, Schedule of Alterations Made—Parliamentary Superannuation Act.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Drugs Act 1908—Regulation—Dispensing of Prescriptions.
Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulation—Prescribed Body (Amendment).
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulation—Registration Establishment Fee.
Pharmacy Act 1935—Regulation—Controlled Substances Act Substitution.
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Vehicle Defect Notice.
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Inpatient Fee.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Electrical Articles and Materials Act 1940—Regulations—Fees.
Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—
Fifty-ninth General Report.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Shop Trading Hours Act 1977—Regulations—Service Station Trading Hours.
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Stock Diseases Act 1934—Regulation—Destruction of Stock.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
Western Zone—Abalone Fishery—Quotas.
Marine Scale Fishery—Licence Renewal.
Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Licence Renewal.
Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Renewal.
Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Licences.
Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Licences.
River Fishery—Licence Renewal.
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Licences.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—Licences.
Miscellaneous Fishery—Licence Renewal.
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Licences.
Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licences.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT BORROWINGS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier confirm that the State Governments of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria are in collusion to finance borrowings which will circumvent Loan Council limits, involve a form of tax avoidance and result in South Australian taxpayers being liable in eight years time to pay out more than \$300 million to repay \$100 million borrowed to help fund this year's capital works program? The Opposition has received information that the South Australian Government Financing Authority is currently negotiating a loan of \$100 million in the form of a deferred annuity. What this means is that SAFA will enter into an agreement to receive \$100 million as a capital payment this year on the basis that it will be repayable as a deferred annuity in 1993-94. Victorian and New South Wales State Government authorities are also involved in this scheme, which is being designed and marketed on their behalf by a major foreign bank.

The Opposition has been informed that institutional investors being invited to participate in the scheme have been advised to form nominee companies with a view to maximising taxation advantages. In South Australia's case, the \$100 million being sought by SAFA is expected to cost about \$325 million to repay on the due date in 1993-94. In the same year a deep discounted financing arrangement undertaken by SAFA in November 1984 also becomes due. On present exchange rates, this will cost a further \$153 million in 1993-94. Advice to the Opposition is that the use of a deferred annuity in the form intended by the Labor Governments amounts to encouragement of tax avoidance and a deliberate attempt to escape Loan Council constraints by improper means, not to mention the massive additional debt saving cost and liability on the State.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is particularly out of order to interject when the Chair has already called the House to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no question of collusion. The Leader of the Opposition obviously had great difficulty in even reading the text of his question as he staggered over some of those concepts which are obviously totally foreign to him in terms of high finance. First, anything that SAFA does is within the tax laws as defined at the particular time, and so it must be. Secondly, SAFA has a brief to ensure that, in handling the money of South Australia, it maximises the benefit to the South Australian taxpayer. That is its brief and that is what it will continue to do. I commend members' attention to the SAFA annual report that I have just tabled; they will see how successfully it has been doing that. Thirdly, in relation to foreign exchange exposure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has been tabled today. In relation to foreign exchange exposure, one of the guidelines under which SAFA operates is that it shall not be exposed to foreign exchange risk, and that has proved to be part of the reason why it has been so singularly successful. To the extent that legal and proper financial arrangements can be made to maximise the benefits of SAFA's money management, they will be used.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not tolerate interjections, even those that come from the Leader of the Opposition. The Chair is normally fairly tolerant of interjections, provided that they illuminate, elevate or alleviate. If they illuminate the argument, elevate the debate or alleviate the boredom, the Chair is prepared to exert some tolerance.

NEW RIGHT

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Labour say what steps the Labor Government will take to safeguard and protect the interests of working people, and indeed the community as a whole, against the offensive now being waged by the so-called New Right? The Minister is no doubt aware of the recent emergence of the H.R. Nicholls Society onto the Australian industrial and political scene. The clearly stated objectives of the society are the elimination of trade unions and the abolition of long-held established procedures for determining wages and conditions of workers, as well as the reduction of established conditions of, and wages for work.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question. There is no doubt that the emergence of the so-called New Right has given a significantly different complexion to the political debate within South Australia and, indeed, Australia. I do not want to go through all the policies (if one could call them policies) or principles espoused by the New Right. However, it is interesting that, just as Mr Howard and certain employers are distancing themselves in varying degrees from the New Right, the South Australian Leader of the Opposition, in a masterly piece of timing, even though Joh says 'Stay away from them; they're crazy' (and he should know), is jumping on the band wagon and saying that he is a strong supporter of the movement when everyone else is getting off. I am concerned that an organisation such as the H.R. Nicholls Society is openly saying (and I give it full marks for honesty) that it wants to destroy the system of industrial relations that we have in this country. I am not sure whether that is the entire policy of the South Australian Opposition or of part of the Opposition, be they the dries, the wets, the damps, or the limps—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —or the whimps. However, I see serious repercussions for the industrial scene in this State. In particular, we have claims that have been prompted by the New Right to do away with the 17½ per cent annual leave loading.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Members opposite may say 'Hear, hear!' and thus indicate, without any apology, that they are against the leave loading but, as members of Parliament do not get it, that is an easy position to take. Why did not Opposition members, when in government, do anything about the leave loading? They did nothing at all. I am disturbed that some employer groups, supported by the New Right and members opposite, want to do away with conditions such as the annual leave loading and long service leave. I understand that long service leave has come under their microscope, but what they do not say is what they will put in its place.

An honourable member: Prosperity and hard work.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Members opposite may say that, but I will tell them what they will put in its place: they would go back to the law of the jungle, and members opposite and most employers would be screaming for mercy within three days.

The Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union, for instance, has said, 'We are outside the accord. We don't want anything to do with it. We will put in claims on employers and we will win.' What happens then?

Mr Lewis: Sack them.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 'Sack them', says the honourable member. The employees are screaming already. During the last years of the Fraser Government, when we heard 'Let the employers and the employees negotiate among themselves and come to some agreement', wages increased by an average of 16 per cent, and there was a massive increase in inflation. Is that what members are seeking? At present we have an industrial relations system that has given employers, on average, the highest level of profit for 20 years, but it has resulted in a real wage decrease of about 7 per cent over the past three years. If that is deemed to be good for the country, I believe that the present system is certainly delivering.

Mr Lewis: Delivering a disaster!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I bet that the honourable member has done very well out of it. Another thing that amuses me about the New Right is its proponents. One of its great proponents is John Stone.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He is very active in telling us how to run the country. As far as I know, John Stone has never done anything but work in the public sector, and he has been very well remunerated for it. Katherine West, another one who berates us daily in relation to how to run the country, is an academic, and as far as I know, has always worked in that sphere on the public payroll. The member for Mitcham, Stephen Baker, one of these two bob capitalists who feel they must have something to prove and are more right than the right, is a darling of free enterprise. I do not know whether the member for Mitcham has ever worked in free enterprise in his life: I believe that he has lived off the taxpayer since the day he was born, but now all of a sudden it all has to be solved by private enterprise. These people who are telling us what to do are doing so from very secure positions within the public sector.

The New Right has no relevance to South Australia or, indeed, Australia, and this Government will protect South Australians from these people by fighting the battle of ideas. And we will win the battle of ideas, because these people have nothing at all to give to the people of South Australia. All they promise is confrontation and industrial strife, and the people of South Australia do not want that: they will not have it, and they will dispose of the New Right and their champion, the Leader of the Opposition, in due course.

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Federal Treasurer has been informed of the proposals of the South Australian, New South Wales and Victorian Governments to raise funds for capital works through selling deferred annuities and, if so, does he agree with the scheme?

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would have thought that this was a relevant question. I asked whether the Federal Treasurer knows whether there is a scheme afoot to subvert his tax laws. In presenting this year's Federal budget, Mr Keating said that reductions in State borrowings and the reduced budget deficit would dramatically lower Government demand for borrowed funds and therefore ease

pressure on interest rates. In Brisbane on 25 August, the Prime Minister urged the States to exercise restraint in their budgets to provide scope for interest rates to decline. However, today, exposure of what is going on—of this new scheme—totally conflicts with national economic policy.

Deferred annuities are in fact being designed to meet exactly the same objectives as the deferred interest Government securities—a device to raise capital funds but defer repayment, circumvent Loan Council and offer tax advantages to investors. Members opposite exhibited a lot of anger about the bottom of the harbor schemes so I would have thought that they would be particularly interested, if this sort of thing was occurring. The Federal Treasurer ruled out the use of deferred interest Government securities in December 1984, but not before the South Australian Government Financing Authority had raised, through this means, borrowings which, at today's exchange rate, will cost \$153 million to repay in eight years time. Now the State Labor Governments are seeking to achieve precisely the same results in a way which deliberately flouts the Federal Government's policy on borrowings and interest rates. Will the Premier reveal to the House whether the Federal Treasurer knows of the scheme?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad to hear that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is joining the Leader of the Opposition as some sort of advocate or spokesman for the Federal Treasurer and his policies. It comes as a surprise to me, but I suggest also that they ought to consider that, in their advocacy along these lines, perhaps they are ignoring the interests of South Australia which I thought they had a paramount duty to protect. That is the interest I have to protect. Providing we are operating within the law, as we must do—and it is up to the Federal Government to lay down the rules at any time (and it will so do)—then SAFA must act as and when it can in order to maximise the financial advantage to the taxpayers of this State.

If it is the case that those members opposite have decided that in some way they want to protect other interests, perhaps they had better say so. I know their problem, Mr Speaker—they are absolutely appalled that the Government has so successfully established a financial instrument that is effectively earning money for the essential services in this State in the way it has. The Opposition cannot disguise its complete despair at the way in which this has been done, and it has simply blown a hole in its strategy. It is extraordinary that we are being asked these sorts of questions, quite clearly aimed maliciously against the interests of South Australia in this way. I can only repeat what I have said, namely, that SAFA is proceeding on the basis of what is possible in terms of financial transactions and is doing so in a fully authorised way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader and Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: To the extent that any instrument becomes non-operative or there is a change in the law, obviously that will have effect or be complied with. With the restrictions on us at the moment we must find every way and means we can to raise money in order to lower the tax burden on the people of the State. I thought that the Opposition would have applauded any action so to do.

Finally, we are in no way getting around the overall requirements laid down by the Federal Government. On the contrary, we have complied. In fact, our borrowing level is well below the level that would meet any Federal criteria. We have reduced in real terms public sector borrowing over our period in Government and even now, with the increase

in borrowing in the current budget, we are still below the 1982-83 level. The debt per head has been progressively reduced in the State throughout the period that we have been in office. We are the only Government in Australia to publish in full trends in indebtedness and make some analysis. We have nothing to hide—it is laid open.

If Federal Treasurer Keating or anyone else wants to submit our accounts to that sort of scrutiny, let him do so. It is interesting to see that in so doing he would have the active support of members opposite who want to constrain and restrict whatever we are trying to do in the interests of South Australia. They had better come clean and admit that that is their purpose.

TEXTILE, CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR INDUSTRIES

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology advise which of the several options presently being canvassed for assistance to the textile, clothing and footwear industries the Government favours? Many members would have received literature from unions involved in the textile, clothing and footwear industries suggesting a number of measures that the Federal Government might wish to take to protect jobs and employers in those industries. Members would also be aware that the IAC has made a number of recommendations on the subject. Which of the options canvassed does the Government presently favour?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise members that the current assistance arrangements with respect to the textile, clothing and footwear industries expire in December 1988. So, the IAC has issued two reports—an interim and a final one—for discussion suggesting options that could be considered by the Federal Government.

Not quite in accord with normal practice, on this occasion it has indicated a series of options that could be pursued with respect to further assistance to those industries, and has identified one option that it particularly favours. The options would amount to progressive reductions in assistance to those industries involved over a period of some seven to 10 years. The options are: (1) a reduction to 50 per cent tariff equivalent; (1a) 25 per cent; (2) 25 per cent; and (3) 75 per cent. Clearly, each one of those options, because it involves a reduction in the assistance available, implies some restructuring of the industry, and that restructuring of the industry may imply some job losses and some company amalgamations.

The information given by the IAC is that the option (1a), which involves a reduction to 25 per cent tariff equivalent over a seven year period (and that is the one favoured by the IAC), would see a fall in the output of the textile, clothing and footwear industries in Australia of some 21.2 per cent. That is by the IAC's own assessment. It would see a fall in employment in that same range of industries of some 27.5 per cent. To provide more meaningful figures, in other words, in terms of actual jobs lost, it implies an estimated loss of 30 300 jobs by the end of that seven year period. The equivalent for South Australia would be a loss of 1 962 jobs.

The State Government does not support that option, and we have sent two submissions to the IAC. In the final one we have indicated that we support option (3), that is, a reduction in protection to tariff quota assisted activities to a maximum tariff equivalent of 75 per cent in 1996. We have also suggested that no additional positive assistance be provided to those industries but that additional adjust-

ment assistance be provided for textile, clothing and footwear employees, such as under the LATA (Labour Adjustment Training Arrangements) scheme.

The option that the Government supports would significantly reduce the seriousness of the impact on the industries in question. For example, the output would fall by only 5.6 per cent over the period of time involved; employment would fall by 7.3 per cent; and, Australia wide, employment would fall by some 8 000 in total numbers. The figure for South Australia would be 511. The Government recognises that there will have to be readjustment in these industries, that some restructuring will have to be undertaken and that that restructuring will require some reduction in tariff assistance to require the industries to compete more in the international arena. That is why the Government favours an option which involves some reduction in tariff assistance. But I might say that we do not see that the industries can cope with more than the option (3) levels. We believe that the figures quoted in options (1), (1a) and (2) in fact are conservative estimates and that the job losses would be much more serious than indicated.

I can advise that, with respect to the approaches that the honourable member has received from his constituents (and certainly approaches that have been made to other honourable members in this place—I, too, have received many from my constituents who are employees of these industries), I will communicate with honourable members to indicate the position that the Government has taken. The Government has done it on the basis that the industry does need restructuring and that it does need to adjust to a tightened tariff regime but that the Government does not accept the IAC recommendation. The Government has put strongly the proposition that the least draconian of the options submitted by the IAC for public discussion, namely, option (3), should be supported. The Government stands firmly by its decision to ask the Federal Government to provide additional adjustment assistance to employees involved in these industries so that they have the opportunity not to be thrown on the scrap heap of unemployment but rather to find opportunities in other industries or in other aspects of those same industries where they were previously employed.

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Premier. What advice has the Government sought about the validity of the deferred annuities scheme to fund capital works, and will the Premier make the advice available to the House? The Opposition has been informed that this scheme has been designed in the belief that it will be upheld as a *bona fide* use of section 27H of the Income Tax Assessment Act in that the States claim they will be selling *bona fide* annuities rather than raising funds by way of borrowings.

It is understood that the South Australian Government is being required to give participating institutions an indemnity against any other interpretation being adopted by the Taxation Commissioner or the courts, and that further broad indemnities are also provided to underpin all the major assumptions upon which the scheme is based. The major foreign bank involved in marketing the scheme is also understood to have requested an indemnity from the State Government suggesting that, in financial circles, considerable doubt exists about its validity.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The highest level of technical advice is obtained, and I certainly do not intend to publish

advice tendered to SAFA in relation to its commercial activities. The honourable member is quite—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is worth a try. Well, he has tried and failed.

OLIVE TREES

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate what steps can be taken to control the growth of olive trees in bushfire prone areas along the hills face zone and in conservation parks? The Happy Valley council has approached me to express its concern about ground fuel. It has been put to me that ground fuel levels should be reduced throughout the State in order to reduce the probability and intensity of another Ash Wednesday type of wildfire. The council believes that the major component of ground fuel in the Adelaide Hills is olive trees and argues that, since olive trees contribute to the passage of a fire through understorey, there is significant ground for this matter to be investigated as a matter of urgency. They believe that this matter has become even more imperative as a result of the extremely wet winter which we have just experienced—one which they believe would have contributed to an extremely high fire danger for the coming summer.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If we review legislation, section 51 of the Country Fires Act is used by local government authorities in the late spring to ensure that landowners remove, wherever possible, unnecessary fuel loads from the blocks that they own. The problem with this, of course, is that the legislation is not specific. I believe that one local government authority sought advice on that matter in relation to olives.

The second piece of legislation would be, I think, the fifth schedule of the Pest Plants Act. I wonder whether the honourable member is in a position to say whether or not the Happy Valley council has followed the lead of Mitcham council. I think East Torrens council, and one or two other Hills and foothills councils, where there has been a specific proclamation under the fifth schedule in relation to this species. I understand that there are some problems about this, because the proclamation could only relate to propagation and spread rather than to existing stands of this form of exotic vegetation. However, I would urge that course of action on that council if that has not already happened. They are the only two pieces of legislation that immediately come to mind.

There is simply the matter of getting out there and physically doing the work. Again, Mitcham comes to mind because I am aware that a year or so ago there was a good deal of activity on the part of the neighbourhood fire control groups which involved people who were prepared to get out, chop down the olive trees and poison the residual stumps. That seems to me to be a very worthwhile voluntary activity and one that—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am sure that it is very hard on lots of things, but it is one that I guess is necessary. I also find in those areas that there is a very high degree of willingness on the part of people to involve themselves in that sort of activity. It is a community minded activity, but it also helps to preserve the property of the people involved. So, I think that the formation of those sorts of committees would help considerably.

Where the Government authorities are landowners, they have a responsibility. In my position as Minister for Environment and Planning I try to ensure that, wherever pos-

sible, resources are available for national parks to have a reasonable chance of being able to keep noxious weeds under control.

Finally, those areas which are the most immune from noxious weeds are those that have had the least human impact on them. Generally, we find that the invasion has occurred around the boundaries of the parks. The noxious weeds are not able to take root further in because the native species are in occupation.

ASER PROJECT

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier say what is the anticipated final cost of the ASER project? The Premier has consistently refused Opposition and media requests to reveal the latest estimated completion cost of the ASER project. This information is of considerable interest to taxpayers because the agreement that the Premier signed with the project developers means that the Government will lose revenue and incur additional costs if the project is delayed or some of the construction costs escalate. The Government must sublease the convention centre and car park at an initial rental of 6¼ per cent of the capitalised cost of construction. Rental at this rate is also payable on 30 per cent of the public areas within the development. The State Government may also be required to sublease up to half the office block.

Another aspect of the Government's commitment is that no water and sewerage rates are payable until five years after the hotel's completion, and no land tax is payable for 10 years. Continuing delays in the completion of the project will therefore postpone the date when the Government will benefit in this way from the project. This could involve a considerable loss in revenue to the State, in addition to the extra costs that it may face if the construction cost of the convention centre and office block blows out. It is being suggested within the building industry—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Just listen. It is being suggested in the building industry that the final cost of the ASER project may well now approach double the Government's latest estimate of \$180 million. If this is so, it has considerable implications for taxpayers, and I therefore call on the Premier to immediately say whether continuing delays in the project are forcing a blow-out in costs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, figures that have been given in the past relate to values in the dollars of the day, and there are a number of factors as well as inflation that can influence those costs. I am not in a position to give any definitive figures to the House. However, I make the point that, when discussing the project, it has to be divided into a number of components. As far as the hotel is concerned (and that was included in what the member for Mitcham was saying), we are not financially liable. It is certainly true that we stand to benefit in the longer term from the successful operation of that hotel. I take it that the last thing that those members who have been less than enthusiastic about this proposal (in fact, in a fairly underhanded way they have worked to undermine it right from day one and that has not changed) want to see is this hotel opened and operating.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, we stand to gain. There will be an enormous long term benefit to the State. However, we are directly liable for the convention centre. I have already said that, if the cost of that escalates beyond certain levels or it is delayed in opening, it can have two

effects: first, it will mean that we forgo bookings that are made, in other words, revenue that we expect to earn from the convention centre; secondly, in order to meet the increased costs, we must pay a lease, because we are the lessors of that area, at a higher rate. Those figures can be determined only when the actual project is ready for hand-over and completion. We expect them to be more than initial estimates, because factors such as inflation, some technical problems, interest and holding charges and, in the case of the convention centre, something in the order of 19 days delay through industrial disputation, to some degree add to the cost of the project. That will certainly have to be taken into account when the final lease arrangements are struck.

Against that, we must set the earning capacity of the convention centre and, to the extent that we are successful in letting that centre and going above budget (and already there are encouraging signs regarding bookings), we shall be able to mitigate that cost. As to the office block and our commitments there, tenders have not been let as yet and they will be let only when the contractors are satisfied with the cost estimating that has been done and with the level of the tenders received. Only then will we know the actual rental lease obligations for the space involved.

CHRISTMAS CAKES

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of State Development comment on the import drive being conducted by the American Express company urging Australians to buy their Christmas stocks of the 'Original De Luxe Fruitcake' from a United States bakery? American Express is promoting throughout Australia a so-called 'unique fruitcake' at prices, according to weight, ranging from \$A14.50 to \$A34.21 plus packaging and postage. It has been put to me that Australians should be urged to boycott this undermining of our baking abilities, and especially that this is an appropriate area for import substitution to boost the domestic economy. I am informed that the retail prices of quality local Christmas cakes are as follows: Aunt Nellie's, \$10.80; Balfours iced \$9.65; Balfours uniced \$6.45; and Lyons uniced, \$5.95. With 134 years tradition behind it, Balfours also sells a top quality 'Christmas Ring' decorated with fruit and nuts similar to the US product, the Balfours product selling for considerably less than the comparable import.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As a card carrying member of the American Express group I, too, receive similar brochures, and I was concerned to note the very brochure referred to by the honourable member. Immediately on noticing its source of origin, I threw it in the bin, because I agree with the honourable member that it is insensitive, at this time of great concern in the Australian community, when we should buy Australian products and especially when they are of such good quality, that we should be encouraged to buy excessively priced overseas products. I believe that members should be making their point of view known simply by not taking up such opportunities to buy imported products when the Australian quality products not only equal but dramatically surpass the imported product. The honourable member referred to some local products that rate highly in terms of quality and price competitiveness. By interjection, another company (Ditters) was added to the list, and that company would rank equally as well.

Indeed, Australian companies are exporting fruit cake overseas and those who choose to look in Singapore and other such places will find Australian made fruit cakes available in stores. So, if it is good enough for other people to buy the Australian product, it is good enough for us to

buy it. The Australian companies operating in this area are aggressive and keen to widen their market and product range and to improve the productivity of their manufacture. One such company, Balfours, has won considerable praise for its work improving its manufacturing process by developing a new software package alongside the baking process, which will be exported because it is such a successful product. The importance of 'Buy Australian' should be high in our minds, but that program will succeed only if consumers themselves take the opportunity to make those choices and reject the advice that we should buy inferior products from overseas at high prices.

Another matter that has been drawn to my attention recently is a South Australian issue rather than a national issue. Last week, when I went into an Adelaide duty-free outlet with my parents, who were leaving for overseas and wished to take with them a bottle of South Australian port, they and I were dismayed to find that no South Australian port was available. One brand of South Australian wine was there, but otherwise all the wine and port on display were Victorian products. It is a pity that, in a State such as ours which produces the best quality wines and ports, one of our duty-free outlets should not choose to recognise that fact and display those products.

Reverting to the honourable member's question, we should encourage 'Buy Australian' and do so in a critical way by choosing the best quality products. Where the Australian products are not good quality as against overseas competition, we should make that point known, too, so that Australian manufacturers should have the chance to improve the quality where that is considered to be at risk. I commend the honourable member for asking her question. I will certainly communicate our concern to the American Express company and point out the good quality products that are made here. Then, maybe those South Australian companies could have their products listed in future letters from American Express.

BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Labour initiate deregistration proceedings against the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation in South Australia, more commonly known as the Builders Labourers Federation? Over many months of industrial disputation in South Australia, the Minister and the Premier have stood idle against the tactics of this union. As the Minister is well aware, members of the BLF have once again brought major construction projects in Adelaide to a halt to support their Secretary, Ron Owens, who is currently in gaol in New South Wales. Press reports today indicate that Mr Owens will remain in custody until a further court hearing on 23 February next year—some five months away. In view of the declaration by BLF members that they will not return to work until the charges against Mr Owens are dropped, I ask the Minister to say whether deregistration proceedings will now be initiated; and, if they will not, will he explain to the South Australian construction industry exactly what miracle it is that he is waiting for?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Builders Labourers Federation was deregistered federally and also in New South Wales and Victoria. That was a judgment that those Governments had to make, and that is their business, not mine. No doubt, the Builders Labourers Federation has not had a history of industrial disputes in this State anywhere near the history of such disputes that it has had in the eastern States, and we are pleased about that. The Federal Govern-

ment recognises that fact and has not included South Australia (or Queensland or Western Australia) in its deregistration proceedings, as there was no reason to do so. To deregister a union is a serious step and I expect that even Liberal members opposite would recognise that good reasons for deregistration must be established. I say 'reasons', not 'impressions'. I point out to the member for Hanson and other members opposite that the Master Builders Association in this State has not called for the deregistration of the Builders Labourers Federation.

Only last week there was a report in the press quoting Peter Gasteen, of the Master Builders Association, as saying that many of the things that had been attributed to members of the Builders Labourers Federation had not been their fault. He made that clear. Therefore, members opposite should be a little more understanding of the problems of the trade union movement and realise that, when talking about deregistration, one must have a case. I should have thought that that was only basic justice. In conclusion, this Government and the builders in this State have tried hard to ensure that the problems experienced on building sites in the eastern States and in the Australian Capital Territory with the Builders Labourers Federation and other building trade unions have not been imported into South Australia.

We have done our bit, the Government has done its bit, the builders in this State have done their bit, and we expect the builders labourers to do their bit as well. I am not one to panic over a two day dispute involving the builders labourers and the gaoling of their Federal Secretary. I have made perfectly clear to the builders labourers that I understand their anger at this action. I make no comment at all about whether or not it is justified, because that is none of my business: it is the business of the builders labourers, the police and the owners of the building site in New South Wales. I make perfectly clear that, while I understand their anger, I believe that they have made their point and I would not like to see their point pressed home. It was an action that was entirely within the confines of New South Wales—it was nothing to do with this State. If the builders labourers felt it necessary to make a point, they have done that, and there is no necessity for them to pursue it.

I will have discussions again tomorrow with the building unions and other unions in this State in relation to the ASER site, and I can assure members opposite that the question of any further delays caused by the builders labourers taking protest action against the gaoling of their Acting Federal Secretary in New South Wales will be discussed, and the Government's view will indeed be put very strongly to that meeting and the builders labourers.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr FERGUSON: I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question which, quite by accident, is supplementary to the question asked by the member for Newland. Will the Minister inform the House whether his department has undertaken any investigations into replacing imported agricultural products with South Australian produced products? Australia is importing millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs that could be replaced by Australian products. Mr John Joseph David of the David Holdings group, a company that has sales estimated at \$2 200 million per year, is reported to have said (page 59 of the *Australian Business Review Weekly* of 15 August):

It seems damn crazy to me that we're importing, for example, over \$250 million a year in frozen fish and fish products, over \$225 million in fruit and vegetable products, over \$65 million in vegetable fats and oils, over \$23 million in pet food and so on.

The challenge is for our industry, government and agriculturalists to find a solution . . .

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously, this matter is of concern to everyone, particularly to South Australians, but I am sure that all Australians are concerned about imports. In most cases, those same foodstuffs are produced locally—in this State or in other States of Australia. The short answer to the question is that the department is continually looking at the whole aspect of replacement of these imported products and considering the biological, physical, social and economic aspects of existing and potential products that can replace imported goods. Research staff work in this area constantly, and there is continuing discussion between officers of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State Development and other departments in determining replacement goods to fill the gaps when and if imported goods are taken out of the market.

The situation is often not as simple as the public and the press present it. We cannot immediately replace goods. The honourable member referred to the fishing industry, and in many cases our fishing resources are under extreme stress. In order to maintain the present catch, we are constantly having to review (as members would know) the stress on the resource and its management. It is not so easy to immediately replace \$250 million worth of imported frozen fish which, in many cases, is of low value and high output. We have problems in finding alternatives to some of these imported foodstuffs. Particularly in the horticultural and related areas, we will examine alternatives that can be provided to the Australian and South Australian markets.

Mr RON OWENS

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Does the Minister of Labour consider that the reappointment today of the State Secretary and Acting National Secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation, Mr Ron Owens, to the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board is appropriate? The Minister, on behalf of the Premier, has announced in the *Government Gazette* the appointment of Ronald George Owens to this board from 16 September. In view of this gentleman's contribution to the demise of the South Australian construction industry and his subsequent detention behind bars in another State, I wonder whether the Minister might not concede that a more suitable person should be appointed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I consider it totally appropriate that Ron Owens be appointed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Ron Owens has served on that board for a number of years and to the best of my knowledge he is a very highly respected member of the board and does the job extremely well. He is a nominee on that board of the United Trades and Labor Council, and I believe that his appointment is totally appropriate. The member for Mount Gambier, when explaining his question, said that Ron Owens had contributed to the demise of the construction industry in this State, but the construction industry in this State is alive and well and I do not think it has ever been better. I do not have the figures in front of me, but I will be pleased to respond to a question from one of my colleagues tomorrow to outline the level of construction activity in this State between 1979 and 1982 compared with the level since we came to office in 1982. Furthermore, I will compare the level of industrial disputes occurring in 1979-82 with the level occurring since 1982.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think we will find two things: first, that the construction industry in the latter period—the period of this Government—was booming compared to the previous situation. We will also find that the level of industrial dispute in the same period is very significantly down compared to the level between 1979 and 1982.

The gratuitous comment about Ron Owens is quite uncalled for.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Ms Cashmore—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Minister that it is the custom in the House to refer to members by their district.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The honourable lady has interjected constantly saying 'Gaalbirds for Government boards.' Again, that is a contribution that is unworthy of a member of this House, one that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If the honourable lady feels it necessary to refer to the Acting Secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation as a gaolbird, she should have the guts to stand up and in a more substantial way state that fact and justify it, and not sit here in a cowardly manner muttering, hoping no-one hears, and hoping it is not recorded in *Hansard*—'Gaalbird, gaolbird, gaolbird.' If the honourable member feels it necessary or gets some kind of satisfaction from throwing garbage like that around the House, she should have the decency to stand up and say it quite openly so that it is on the record, rather than call people names behind their back.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the House is of the view that we should have Standing Orders which allow for supplementary questions, the Chair is sure that the House can, in due course, formulate Standing Orders to allow for that. In recent weeks there seems to have evolved a *de facto* arrangement of supplementary questions whereby a Minister—usually the Minister of Labour—is asked a question, and we then have a very lengthy answer provoked by a whole series of supplementary questions disguised as interjections, which are, in any case, out of order.

COOPERATIVE HOUSING

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House about action being taken to implement the Government's election pledge to support the development of cooperative housing in South Australia? I have been approached by constituents in Salisbury who are interested in the Government's election commitment to foster the establishment of cooperative housing associations for low income tenants. These constituents tell me that they would like to be involved in cooperative housing provided they could be guaranteed privacy, secure tenure and be fully involved in decision making concerning their homes.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. Members would be aware that the State budget has been extremely hard to put together, with the cutback in the public sector taking hold and housing having had no shielding from this process. Members will also be aware that at the Loan Council meeting in early June this Government was successful in nominating 100 per cent of our capital grants to housing, and for that I thank the Federal Minister, Stewart West. It was due to

cutbacks in the whole program that we lost \$30 million. In fact, that was \$30 million lost to low income housing for this State. It has had its impact in my housing budget. In fact, I have had to rearrange priorities, defer needed development and adjust certain programs within the budget. The result will be a constrained housing budget, a budget of transition to leaner times, a budget which meets community needs, industry needs and the commitments of this Government. It is also a budget with little room to move and it has some constraints on future options.

The member asked specifically about cooperative housing. Shortly I will be making the cooperative program known when the entire housing budget is released. The cooperative program is designed to allow tenants to become more involved in meeting their housing needs and in exercising their housing rights. This Government's program as announced at the election is 1 200 units over the four year term. I anticipate that that will occur, as I believe that cooperative housing is essential to future housing provisions within this state. I advise the honourable member to go back to his constituents and get them involved in cooperative housing, because it is a form of housing tenure that this Government supports. It gives those people who want to go into cooperative housing a chance to have a say in how their tenure should be met and, importantly, it provides money from the private sector thus placing no drain on Government funding. The honourable member can tell his constituents to get their cooperative up and running, and I am sure it will be a great success.

Mr D.A. DUNSTAN

Mr D.S. BAKER: Did the Premier ask the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, Mr Chris Schacht, to have discussions last week with the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, about a Government job for Mr Dunstan in South Australia? Mr Dunstan and Mr Schacht spent several days together last week at Falls Creek snowfields, in Victoria. At one stage, in a bar, they discussed at some length Mr Dunstan's contribution to South Australia and compared it with the present Premier's performance. Mr Schacht was to say that Mr Dunstan had performed in the job with a flair which the present Premier does not have.

In view of today's statement by Mr Dunstan that he wants a full-time job back in South Australia, the Premier may feel threatened by this revelation. However, given the current speculation about Mr Dunstan's future, it appears to have been more than just a coincidence that Mr Schacht and Mr Dunstan spent last week together. In asking the Premier whether he had any knowledge of their meeting and whether he arranged to have Mr Dunstan sounded out about a job, I point out that the Premier should be aware that response to talk-back programs over the last two days suggests that most South Australians would regard it as 'grossly improper' for Mr Dunstan to be given a full-time Government job, especially at the salary level he has been talking about.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was reluctant to get to my feet—I was hoping for more details of this conversation in the bar at Falls Creek. The short answer is, 'No' I was not aware of the secret assignation at Falls Creek nor the subject of conversation. It is obvious that the honourable member has some great sources of information, whether direct or by hearsay. I have no knowledge of this. What I have said about Mr Dunstan I have already stated in this House. I believe that South Australians would welcome Don Dunstan back.

I thought that it was interesting that the Leader of the Opposition accused Mr Dunstan of deserting South Australia. I seem to recall, in this House and in another place, a motion that was just part of an ongoing campaign to try to force the former Premier, in the most disgraceful circumstances, out of this State. It is not a question of desertion. The charge was laid by someone who called himself the Attorney-General at that time and who, unfortunately, is still chivvying around in the Legislative Council. The charge was led and supported by a number of members sitting opposite in this place, and its whole purpose was to discredit, undermine and in any other way suggest to someone who had served with great distinction as Premier of South Australia that he was not welcome any more in this State and should leave. Far from desertion, he was driven from this place, and it is a great pity and a great blow to South Australia that he was.

Having said that, I repeat what I have already said: if Mr Dunstan is to return to South Australia he will be most welcome. If he is to get a job, no doubt he will apply in the normal way. I do not know why there has been such concentration on Government jobs. It could well be that appropriate jobs in the private sector could interest the former Premier. In regard to service on boards or committees or other honorary or part-time positions, I would have thought that Mr Dunstan was appropriately qualified. At this stage it is pure speculation and nothing more.

Mr Rann: The leader of the Opposition will be looking for a job pretty soon.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Briggs is out of order.

DEATH OF Mr G.R. WILSON

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): By leave, I wish to make a few remarks about the late Mr Geoff Wilson. It is my unfortunate duty, for the second time today, to stand to make a few remarks following the untimely and tragic death of a person who worked in the Parliament—in the first case a former member and colleague, the Hon. Don Simmons, and in the latter case Mr Geoff Wilson, the Second Clerk Assistant of the House of Assembly. It is also the second time within a matter of weeks that we have had to refer to the death of a serving officer of the Parliament, the previous remarks concerning the death of Mr John Cherry, a former Attendant in this House. On this occasion it is again certainly a most unhappy duty.

Geoff Wilson was a young man who had had an extremely successful career in the Public Service. Following his Matriculation from Brighton High School in 1965, he commenced work in the office of the Minister of Local Government, subsequently moving to the Department of Agriculture, and in 1973 he joined the House of Assembly staff as Clerk of Records and Accounts. Since that time he has served this House in that capacity and as Second Clerk Assistant. I can well remember the first select committee on which I served after having become a member of the House. Mr Wilson was the Secretary of that committee and I remember being most impressed with his grasp of the matters before the committee and the drafting work that he did on its behalf in preparing its eventual report. That exercise and that work was repeated on many occasions, of course, by Mr Wilson in the course of his parliamentary duties, and he did it with distinction.

As Secretary of the Parliamentary Bowling Club, he was an active playing associate member and thus he forged with a number of members of the House personal relationships which went beyond his duty as a servant of the House. In his life outside his work, he was active in the church, the Scouts Association and in sailing. So, he was an activist. He was involved in his work, he served this House well, and no doubt in the best of all worlds he could have looked forward to many more years working in the environment of Parliament House and making a contribution to its work.

So, it is with regret that I record his passing, and to his wife Wendy and their children, Sarah and Anthony, I say that the members of the House have lost a friend and fellow worker in Geoff Wilson and we are going to miss him.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the comments of the Premier following the death of Geoff Wilson. It is a particularly sad occasion for all members of this House that the life of someone so young was terminated in this way. There is no doubt that while he served in this House as a member of the staff he was obliging, courteous and helpful to all members and as a result he earned the respect not only of his workmates but certainly of the members of the Parliament. Geoff's career, after the 13 years service that he gave to this Parliament, commencing, as the Premier has said, in 1973 as Clerk of Records until 1979, when he was promoted to Second Clerk Assistant, was cut short by his untimely death from cancer. It was a career of quiet diligence and service to this Parliament. It is always tragic to witness the death of someone whose life is far from complete, particularly so in relation to Geoff, who had a young family and who was so active in community pursuits—his local church, the scouts and sailing.

On one occasion of my serving on a select committee, I can well recall Geoff's reference to sailing and I remember his obvious enthusiasm and dedication to that sport. I know that he participated not only in those sporting and community activities but in the administration of them. I know that he did his bit towards helping the community organisations with which he was involved. Mr Speaker, I ask that you pass on the condolences of the Opposition to Geoff's widow, Wendy, and his children, Anthony and Sarah.

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I knew Geoff Wilson in three capacities. First, when I came into this House in 1982 he was very helpful in all aspects of my learning what I had to do in this place and how to get it done effectively. He was always there to answer questions on that aspect of the work to be done here. The second way in which I knew Geoff was as a constituent in my previous electorate of Brighton, and Geoff was always readily able to give me information about something that needed to be attended to in my electorate. For that on many occasions I was grateful, because it meant that something could be done about the matter drawn to my attention. The third way that I knew Geoff and Wendy was through their commitment to the school their children attended. It was a very serious commitment and much time and effort was spent at the school ensuring that their input as parents of children attending that school was put forward. So, Sir, I would like you to pass on my condolences.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to add my thoughts on this message of condolence, as the member who was responsible for elevating Geoff to the position that he held at the time of his death and also as President of South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club, of which Geoff had become the Secretary. As recently as January this year, when

for its sesquicentenary South Australia was host of the bowling carnival, and only a few weeks before he had to leave the service of the Parliament, Geoff officiated in a most efficient way, as was his normal habit. I have noted that thus far no mention has been made of his contribution to the Joint House Committee. In the early stages of my involvement as Speaker of the House, Geoff was the Secretary of that body, having held that position for a considerable time, and even after he had left the service of the Joint House Committee his knowledge of and his information on records associated with that committee were often called for.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Premier have mentioned Geoff's involvement with select committees. I had the pleasure of sitting with him on a number of them and I am in complete accord with the statements made about his work on those committees. Geoff's attitude to life, right to the end I believe, is something that must be commended. As recently as six or eight weeks ago he was going to 'beat it', and he had that commitment to living and to his family. I know that that spirit which he had has been a great help to both Wendy and the two children in these recent trying times.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to pass on my condolences also to Geoff's family. As Whip I had cooperation from the staff of the Parliament, and Geoff was no exception to that good service and help that was given. One could class all the staff as friends and Geoff certainly was in that category. Sometimes the trials on Whips or those in office are difficult, and staff can make it easy. I am sorry that I was not able to attend Geoff's funeral. It is a practice that I have always adopted since I have been a member, and I regret that on this occasion I had to ask that an apology be extended. I asked a senior staff member to pass on the message to other staff. I say now publicly that I am sorry that I was unable to attend Geoff's funeral, and I trust that his family will accept that when these notes are forwarded, expressing regret from members and staff of this House.

The SPEAKER: Geoff Wilson, who passed away a few weeks short of his thirty-ninth birthday, leaving behind a young family and a thousand friends, will be sorely missed. As a cheerful, good natured and conscientious Second Clerk Assistant to the House of Assembly he was popular with all of us, though particularly so with those in the Bowling Club fraternity. It is worthy of mention that his work in maintaining the photographic records in the members' lounge will be appreciated for generations to come.

It is hard to find words to express the sorrow and regret felt by members at this loss. We were all greatly concerned to hear of Geoff's illness six months ago and, although most of us were aware of its terminal nature, his death still came as a tragic blow to us all. I will convey the *Hansard* report of members' condolences to his widow, Wendy, and his two children.

MILLION MINUTES OF PEACE

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

That to acknowledge the International Year of Peace the House observe one minute's silence after prayers on each sitting day for the remainder of the month.

My remarks in support of this motion will be brief, but I think that I owe it to members who may regard this as a rather unusual departure and who may not have been briefed on the concept of the million minutes of peace to say a

little in support of the proposition. It is a request that has been put to members by people who are involved with the appeal for a million minutes of peace. I think I can do no better than to read into the record a message from the Governor-General, Sir Ninian Stephens, for the Million Minutes of Peace. It states:

There can be no cause on earth more worthy than the preservation of peace. This appeal, for one million minutes of peace, is an integral part of the International Year of Peace. Originating here in Australia, it has now been taken up in some 53 countries around the world.

This call for peace differs from others in that it asks each one of us to give something, and something that we are quite capable of giving: a few minutes of our time to re-think our attitudes towards fellow men. The international Million Minutes of Peace appeal asks us to look at the concept of peace in its broadest sense, beginning with the state of being at peace with oneself, with one's family, and with neighbours and workmates, so that a general state of harmony may be created. Thus will be laid foundations on which to build towards the ultimate aim of achieving and maintaining world peace.

Were people the world over to forget their differences and concentrate on the very many things all humanity share in common, the world would surely become a better and safer place for all.

I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the motion, of course. However, it would have been courteous if the Deputy Premier had given us some notice. I think the first notice that any member on this side had, other than myself in the corridor, was what they read on the green sheet today. I make that point without making a big deal of it. The fact is that we support the motion but, if there is an intention to alter Standing Orders in this place, it would be common decency, I would have thought, to let us know beforehand. Having said that, I hope the Deputy Premier notes it. The Opposition supports the motion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for the support which is indicated for this motion. I just wonder whether he forgets the conversation that he had with a member of my staff in which it was indicated that we would be proceeding along these lines.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S CONDUCT

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I wish to express my regret to this House and Parliament as a whole for the publicity that my presence in the Upper House Liberal Leader's office has created. I realise by giving a personal explanation now that it is likely to extend the publicity, but I feel that I owe it to members and to the Parliament to make a brief statement. I did go to that member's office for the purpose I have stated, and, just to get the record straight, I inform the House that on the same evening and for the same reason I went to the refrigerator of the Hon. Ted Chapman—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS:—but his supplies also were of no help.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Chair has stressed on previous occasions that personal explanations are among the most important matters to come before the House and should be heard in silence.

Mr S.G. EVANS: By that, I mean that there was no wine but only some small bottles of beer in that refrigerator. I told the member for Alexandra of that situation on the first occasion I saw him, and that was after the publicity.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You didn't offer to stock it up, though?

Mr S.G. EVANS: No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: On that evening, the light in Martin Cameron's front office did not work when I switched it on, nor did it for the member of Mr Cameron's staff, and the caretaker found the same fault a little earlier that evening. However, the half light available was sufficient for me to see into the refrigerator. I therefore explain that some of the comment about the light not being on was quite legitimate. Three people can vouch for that and, if anyone wants to check, they may do so. Likewise, my opportunity to make contact with the caretaker was not available, except that since the incident it has been explained to me that, if I had gone outside and rung the doorbell, I could have got him. That did not enter my head, because all the telephones from which one can dial out of this building and the bells which ring all over the House and which the caretakers answer did not work. That was reported to the caretaker, who tested it in my presence that night when he telephoned his wife and asked her to phone back. One could telephone out to other people. She tried it, but it did not work, and Telecom was informed of that fault. That situation may be unusual or hard to believe, but it is fact.

Over the years I have had a lot of trust placed in me as Whip, and I believe that on both sides of politics (and in particular on the other side) there has to be trust. I have known of details where people have had tragedy in their families, the details of which the press has not got hold at the time. The reasons why people were not in the House would have made great stories. If I was an untrustworthy person, those details during that time would have been leaked out. It never happened with me, and some members may not even now know of some of those quite tragic circumstances. Some were very personal. I have had that trust, and I have respected it. I appreciate that people have had that trust in me.

If the Leader finds after what has happened that the Liberals in general now prefer not to have me in the office where they are associated, I will be quite happy to leave that office and let it be made available to Parliament, because I can get by with the one that I have. I know there is a shortage of offices within the Parliament. My electorate office is only 25 minutes away, and I do not want anybody to think that I cannot be trusted. I want to apologise for what has happened because I may have been over-enthusiastic, although I thought that I was held in trust. Under the circumstances, however, it has caused a bit of hurt to a lot of people.

I have apologised to Mr Cameron's staff member and I have expressed my apologies for any concern that I may have caused the caretaker. I also express my apology for any concern that I have caused to any member of Parliament, because in these circumstances trust in each other is important. Irrespective of what other members may feel about me I hope that that situation can continue and I thank members for their courtesy in listening to what I have had to say.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 August. Page 815.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In these difficult, uncertain economic times, it is by no means easy to frame an annual budget. This applies to Governments at all levels, but it applies equally to individuals, families, small businessmen and women, farmers, shop owners, and big business. These are the people who earn or create the money that Governments appropriate in their budgets. In times of difficulty—the sort we face at the moment—they look to Governments to exercise some very special responsibilities, including ensuring that their policies do not discourage other sectors of the economy; limiting their taxing and regulatory functions to the minimum necessary to serve the overall public interest; making sure they do not favour one sector of the community at the expense of others; ensuring that they exercise, in a positive and constructive way, the powers and opportunities that they have to encourage economic development and diversification; and being frank, open and honest with people about economic problems and what needs to be done about them.

I suggest that, measured against these criteria, this budget has failed the test. The Premier calls it a budget of transition, but he offers no signposts to where South Australia is going. The Premier blames Canberra for some of his problems. Mr Hawke and Mr Keating blame the world for theirs. Labor is flick-passing the buck so much and so often that the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer, and our Premier and Treasurer are prime candidates for a compensation case for RSI. They have betrayed the people of South Australia and they have betrayed the trust put in them at the last Federal and State elections.

Members must not forget last year's South Australian budget—the election year budget—the budget which said that everything in the economic garden was sound. Members must not forget the Premier's even rosier election promises made less than a year ago. Members must measure the promises, the media hype, and the great expectations raised against the failures and the admissions of this budget. Members must measure the Premier's pleas for understanding of his difficulties against the restraint that Governments have been asking individuals, families and businesses to exercise for the past three years. While the Premier asks the community to understand the difficulties that he has had in framing his budget, he has turned a blind eye to the difficulties that Labor policies are imposing on everyone else in the community.

The Premier says that this is a budget of transition and indeed it is. In the sense of moving from one point to another, the budget marks a movement by the Government away from many of the promises Labor made at the election, and away from the confidence in the State's economic

future, which the Premier encouraged South Australians to have at the last election. This budget rests on a strategy which already is in serious doubt. There is renewed pressure on interest rates, which means that the Government's heavy borrowings will cost taxpayers even more.

Continuing indications of economic recession place in doubt the Government's capacity to maintain sufficient revenues to fund its high spending policies without either further rises in taxes or a deficit blow-out. As the budget results for last financial year—revealed for the first time in these budget papers—give the Parliament its first opportunity to review the financial performance of this Government in its first term, it is appropriate to begin at that point. The salient features for taxpayers are that between June 1982 and June 1986 State taxation increased by 68.6 per cent—almost double the rate of inflation; total Government spending increased by 77.5 per cent.

Mr Oswald: How much?

Mr OLSEN: By 77.5 per cent.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The figures are contained in the Premier's papers tabled in this Parliament. I can well understand that the Treasurer may not like to hear the figures recounted for the benefit of the Parliament, the record and the media, but they indicate that they have risen by that rate. Despite the tax increases, and across the board rises in State charges—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Premier cannot have it both ways. In answer to a question today he said that the State's indebtedness had been reduced, but the Auditor-General's Report put the lie to that. This State's indebtedness has increased by 14.6 per cent over the past 12 months, and that is indicated in the Auditor-General's Report. He is the independent accounting umpire, and he puts paid to the statement made by the Premier in Question Time in Parliament today. I suggest that the Premier gets his facts right before quoting off the cuff because, in economic terms, he has not got it right.

These facts are against the background of the Premier's promises in 1982 not to increase taxes and to exercise responsible financial management. The taxpayers may well ask whether they are now better off following this high taxing, big spending strategy. Last year the Premier asked the voters to accept that his first term had produced economic recovery for South Australia.

Mr Tyler: So it has.

Mr OLSEN: Wait a minute! The member for Fisher will get the true track record in a minute. In a press statement on 5 August last year, just 13 months ago, the Premier said:

South Australia is leading the national recovery.

In his 1985 budget speech to this House just one year ago, he said:

The South Australian economy is performing strongly. The Government is confident that the improvement in the South Australian economy will continue in the coming year.

In his election policy speech the Premier said:

South Australia is up and running. Our recovery is a reality. Now, let's see how far we can run.

There was only one run in which the Premier was interested at that time, and that was the race to the polls—to get in before economic recession became apparent to the wider community. There is no doubt that it is apparent to the wider community at this time.

It is not necessary for me to point out how the Premier misled the people of South Australia—not once, not twice, but time and time again—about the state of the South Australian economy. His own Treasury, in its paper on the economy tabled with this budget, exposes the Premier and

expunges any claim that he had to credible economic forecasting. We remember the Premier predicting in London last year that the dollar, then at almost 70 cents, would rise. We remember the Premier predicting more than once last year that interest rates would fall. We will not forget that just one year ago the Premier expressed his Government's confidence that the economy would improve through 1985-86. Admittedly, when all these false promises were made, we were heading for an election campaign.

In fact, although during the last financial year the national economy began to slow, South Australia went downhill faster. I quote the Treasury's own figures, comparing the June quarters of 1985 and 1986. Unemployment was up 1.3 per cent in South Australia, but down 0.8 per cent nationally. I notice that the member for Fisher has now chosen to read his newspaper: presumably, he does not want to hear the true record of his Government's administration.

Employment was up 2.8 per cent in South Australia, but down 4.1 per cent nationally. Advertised job vacancies were down 23 per cent in South Australia, but only 2.1 per cent nationally. Retail sales were up 7.9 per cent in South Australia, but 10.7 per cent nationally. Motor vehicle registrations were down 24.7 per cent in South Australia, but only 19.4 per cent nationally. New dwelling approvals were down 27 per cent in South Australia during 1985-86, with our share of the national figure falling from 9.4 to 7.8 per cent. During 1985, South Australia's population growth was the lowest of any State. Indeed, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory all had growth rates at least double ours.

Put simply, these figures show that South Australia is being out-performed by the rest of Australia. We are not leading the national recovery as the Premier suggested only a year ago: we are leading the national recession. Let it not be said, however, that the Liberal Party is a voice in the wilderness. Let me quote the latest quarterly survey of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the State Bank. It predicts an overall decline in activity over the next 12 months. It shows very little expectation in the South Australian business community that the next 12 months will see any improvement in business conditions generally. It refers to a loss of confidence and it points out that this is occurring at a time when the Australian dollar is at a level which should be encouraging firms to invest in new plant and new machinery to meet the opportunities for import replacement and to capture markets overseas.

The Premier referred to this in his financial statement: to the need for business to be given every opportunity to respond to these new circumstances. However, the Premier refuses to entertain the need for changes in Government policy, at the Federal and State levels, to maximise those opportunities. I will have more to say later about this lost opportunity, lost investment and South Australia's investment drought brought on by business confidence drying up.

The credibility of the Premier's last budget, not to mention the economic predictions upon which it was founded, is in tatters. The Premier generated the maximum publicity from what has proved to be the minimum of commitment. Let the House recall the major selling points the Premier used for the 1985-86 budget. First, I refer to State charges and quote his budget speech, as follows:

The Government now commits itself to a freeze during 1985-86 in State Transport Authority fares, motor vehicle registration fees, driving licence fees, fuel franchise rates, irrigation rates and Housing Trust rents.

He embellished this in the *News* on 5 November last year, when he said:

I have promised a total freeze on State Transport Authority fares until next July and inflation-only rises after that—and it's a promise I intend to keep.

There was an election in the wind at that time, and now we find that that promise has been broken, as have the promises on motor vehicle registration fees, driving licence fees and Housing Trust rents. Moreover, train and tram fares have risen by between 14.3 per cent and 33 per cent, thus recouping revenue forgone last year as well as more than compensating for inflation.

Motor vehicle registration fees are up 16 per cent, drivers licence fees by 20 per cent, in both cases higher than the inflation rate and wiping out any benefit to taxpayers from the decision not to increase them in an election year. Housing Trust rents have already gone up once this year—with a further increase in the pipeline. Members will recall that help for the unemployed was another cornerstone of last year's budget selling exercise. The community was promised 6 300 additional employment and training opportunities by the end of June 1986 as a major attack on this tragedy of our jobless youth. But at 22.6 per cent, South Australia's teenage unemployment rate is now the highest in the nation. Once again last year's budget strategy has failed. While our young people are finding it harder and harder to get a job, the public sector just goes on growing and growing.

The Premier told members when he presented last year's budget that it would allow for a slight increase in public sector employment. This commitment was not limited to departmental employment: it was put in the context of overall public sector employment, and the Premier tried to explain this in the House recently in order to get off the hook. The growth figure he put on it was 0.7 per cent but the actual result was much greater.

During 1985-86, departmental full-time equivalent positions increased by 772. In relation to the public sector as a whole, full-time equivalent positions increased by 2 561 during 1985-86. This was about four times the increase foreshadowed by the Premier. It represents an all-up additional wage and related cost component of \$76.8 million—\$55 million more than the Premier estimated would be spent to fund public sector growth.

To demonstrate how this bureaucratic blow-out limits the Government's ability to fund other important areas of community need, this \$55 million could build 1 000 Housing Trust homes, 15 new schools, two hospitals or 150 child-care centres. That represents the cost of the Government's allowing the Public Service to expand as a result of requesting, prodding and pushing from the Public Service Association—the *quid pro quo* it is called, for support during the election campaign. There are many other examples of wide disparity between budget forecasts and promises made last year by the Premier and actual outcomes. The South Australian Development Fund; the Manufacturing Advisory Council; important work to upgrade the Port of Adelaide; the Jubilee Maintenance Program (if ever there was a con job it was the Jubilee Maintenance Program announced last year); the lack of action on promised sporting facilities like the hockey stadium; the broken promises on the taxi service for the disabled: these are all examples where much was promised by the Premier last year when he introduced the budget, only to have very little delivered.

The Premier knew full well last year that he could not deliver on these promises, but it was an election year, so we had this hype and these promises, even though he knew that they would not be delivered to the South Australian community by this Administration. As it is, despite under-spending on projects like these which were given great prominence in last year's budget selling exercise (and despite the savings of \$27 million generated by later than expected

national wage movements), total spending from the Consolidated Account was still held at levels estimated in the budget. The savings were not used to rein in the deficit by more. Apparently, the Premier intends to go on ignoring warnings issued by the Auditor-General in his report last year. I will refer to them again when considering the Government's borrowing program for this financial year.

I now turn to a consideration of the budget for 1986-87. Again, we have had a pre-budget selling exercise. It was not the hype of the past three years—the announcement every day of budget week about this spending proposal and that spending proposal. The election is over: times are different.

The Prime Minister has suddenly discovered restraint. He says the party is over, but most Australians are still awaiting their invitation. The Premier has started talking not about how far we could run, but by how much we should lower our sights. He promised to grasp the nettle, but the only people who will be stung are taxpayers.

This is a budget of risk, not restraint. Overall Government spending is up 9.3 per cent; the tax take goes up 10.3 per cent; and borrowings increase by a massive 33 per cent. The deficit will rise by more than \$7 million, and I suggest that this may be a conservative estimate. Before further analysing the budget, let me make clear that there are some aspects which the Liberal Party endorses.

We certainly welcome the further payroll tax relief incorporated in the budget. Even though the amount of relief given this year will permit companies only to mark time against wage movements, it currently maintains our exemption level above New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, although below Queensland, Tasmania and the Northern Territory.

We support the allocation of resources to help in the development of Roxby Downs, to help the push for the submarine project, and to extend random breath testing and the community policing concept. We support the announced determination to seek savings in items such as equipment, power and light, fuel, accommodation, travel, and so on.

However, behind the rhetoric of restraint lies another story. I refer in particular to some taxation items, first, land tax. As a result of the dramatic increase in land values last financial year, the Government has decided not to take all the windfall this would produce. While this is not stated, I assume that the Premier will provide his so-called \$11 million land tax concession by reviewing the marginal rates. However, despite this forgone revenue, land tax collections are still forecast to be \$45 million this financial year, or 16.9 per cent higher than in 1985-86.

Since 1982-83, land tax collections have grown 90 per cent—a price small business has to pay whether it leases, rents or owns a factory, a corner deli or a snack bar. I call on the Premier to give a commitment that the Government will review annually the incidence of bracket creep brought about by rising property values, and provide appropriate adjustments to limit the impact of this tax.

Motor vehicle registration and drivers licence fees—the Clayton's taxes—will produce extra revenue of \$19 million this financial year despite the Premier's election promise not to increase taxes. That is a rise of 26.8 per cent—coming at a time when motorists and the car making industry are already under pressure from rising fuel imposts and the fringe benefits tax. The financial institutions duty, South Australia's first new tax in a decade, will have raised more than \$104 million since its introduction. There is no relief, despite the Premier's stated desire to take on board the concerns of those in the wine industry, from liquor licence fees in this budget. So much for the rhetoric! The Government's action does not match it. Since the election of this

Government, revenue from that source has increased by 64.6 per cent—twice the rate of inflation.

Receipts from the petrol and tobacco taxes have increased even more dramatically. Over the past three years, the growth rate in petrol tax has been 80 per cent and 157 per cent in tobacco tax. Hidden away in the budget papers was the revelation that hospital inpatient fees and surgery bed fees will be increased by 19.6 per cent—more than twice the rate of inflation. These increases are expected to result in a rise in family health insurance cover of 70c a week. This will be in addition to the increased health insurance costs of between \$1.50 and \$2 a week flowing from Federal budget decisions.

In South Australia, families with private health insurance currently pay \$6.90 a week for basic cover with Medibank Private and \$7.20 a week through Mutual Community. They now face further health costs with the increase in the Medicare levy of about \$1 a week for the average family, as well as the increased cost of prescription drugs, the widening of the maximum gap between the Medicare payout and doctors' fees, and the abolition of subsidies to most private hospitals.

Labor Government decisions, Federal and State, are reducing our health care system to a costly shambles. The increase in private health insurance will only lead to more pensioners and lower income earners being forced to leave the health funds. More pressure will be placed on public hospital waiting lists as a result.

I turn now from the revenue raising side of the budget to spending. Recurrent spending is up 8.7 per cent on last financial year—a real terms increase. For this reason alone, this cannot be said to be a budget of restraint. In their budget replies, my colleagues will examine particular aspects of the Government's spending priorities.

I want to deal in particular with education. First, I remind the House of what the Premier said during the election campaign, and I refer, first, to a statement he made on 21 November last year in releasing the Government's education policy. He gave a whole series of commitments—cast iron commitments. I mention the following in particular. The Premier said:

I can announce today—

and the words 'announce today' were underlined in his press statement—

that a State Labor Government will continue to retain teacher numbers, in spite of decreasing student enrolments.

He also said:

Labor will give parents a guarantee that there will be no cuts to schools during our second term.

He added:

We give the teaching profession a guarantee that teacher numbers will continue to be retained.

In both these statements, the words 'a guarantee' were underlined. These commitments were repeated in the Premier's election policy speech on 25 November. He said:

I give South Australian parents a guarantee that there will be no funding cuts to schools.

He further said:

I give the teaching profession a guarantee that teacher numbers will be maintained.

In view of the decisions contained in this budget, no more graphic a case of misleading the public could be imagined. And even then, after the budget was delivered, the Premier still tried to tell untruths—he still tried to cover up that deception. The implications of the budget spending decisions for teacher numbers are made clear nowhere in the budget papers. However, in response to media questions on budget night, the Premier said that about 180 teaching

positions would go. This would have been bad enough, given the election commitment, but the position is in fact even worse, revealed by a memorandum circulated by the Director-General of Education the day after the budget, in which he states (and I quote his actual words so there can be no mistake—no fudging):

The Government's budget strategy for education is to reduce the number of teacher positions by 230 from February 1987.

In fact, the latest budget papers reveal that this Government has given education the lowest priority of any Government in the last decade. It is interesting to note that those specific commitments that were made during the election campaign have been broken. On budget night, the Premier referred to 180 positions, but he did not tell the whole truth even then. Only the Director-General's memo showed that the Premier was misleading the public of South Australia in relation to the commitment to education.

Education spending as a percentage of the total recurrent budget has dropped from a high of 31.5 per cent under the former Liberal Government to a low of 26.9 per cent proposed in this budget. The reduced priority since 1980-81 translates into a cut to education of \$146 million a year in real terms under this Administration. The Premier now tries to rationalise this record in terms of reduced student numbers. It was the Liberal Administration that took the education spending to its highest level: in percentage terms, it spent more on education as part of the budget than any Administration, and certainly this Administration is headed towards an all-time low in relation to education funding.

The Liberal Party agrees that some account must be taken of student numbers in determining education budgets—I acknowledge that—particularly in circumstances of reduced resources and competing priorities. However, when the former Liberal Government used these criteria to make its education decisions—decisions which still accorded education a higher priority than at present—what did the Premier and the present Minister of State Development (then shadow Minister of Education) do? They ignored financial responsibility. They quite deliberately raised the ante—raised the expectations of the teachers union in South Australia.

I hope that those members of the teachers union who are prepared to take a more consistent attitude to this matter than are the Premier and the Minister will never forget the deceit of this Government in relation to its commitment to education. What makes matters worse is that education in South Australia will now suffer because of the warped priorities of this Government. It has wasted millions of dollars in re-organising the Education Department, hundreds of thousands of dollars in bailing out the Youth Music Festival, thousands of dollars in a self-congratulatory lift-out in the *Sunday Mail* to attempt to sell this budget, and now it intends to spend \$40 000 for a public relations officer.

But, at the same time, the Premier asks children, schools, parents and teachers to cop cuts in teacher numbers and the reduction of important services in the education field. I am sure that teachers, students and parents would be much more interested in seeing money spent on vital teaching staff and services than on propaganda, grandiose schemes, and an over-fed education bureaucracy which cannot even properly organise a music festival. I also suggest that the Premier should not attempt to excuse these broken promises by saying that the Commonwealth let him down.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Orders 23 to 25 which clearly indicate that the House will be under the control of the Speaker and, in the absence of the Speaker, of the Deputy Speaker, and that, if either of those two persons is present in the House in that particular order,

they will take the Chair. I suggest that that is not the situation applying presently.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms GAYLER): I uphold the point of order and ask the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point the member for Light has made is quite correct. I am the next speaker on the list, and that was why the Acting Speaker was in the Chair. I accept the point that the honourable member is making.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Does the Deputy Speaker accept the situation that, if the Speaker is not in the Chair, he will not be the next speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I accept that. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: It is important that the Premier not attempt to excuse the blatant broken promises in the education field, as I have identified today, by saying that the Commonwealth Government has let him down. The Premier knew, long before the last election, that there would be a reduction in the Commonwealth funding from which the education budget is supported. Vital areas like education, health, community welfare and police are going to be further strained for financial resources because of the borrowing policy of this Government. The debt servicing cost of this budget is three times what the Government will spend this financial year on the Police Department budget.

Before dealing with the borrowing policy, let the House also recognise that, despite the capital works program it is intended to support, there are still some more major election promises not being implemented. The entertainment centre, which the Premier deliberately announced on the day of the Liberal Party's election policy speech (quite deliberately—we do understand that), is now in doubt. The budget allocation this year will not take it beyond site acquisition and design work. On the Jeremy Cordeaux show the day after the budget, the Premier said this project was a candidate for deferral. He has tried to buy the youth vote, only to sell credibility yet again.

I understand that the completion of the O-Bahn is to be delayed a further 18 months—another deferred election promise to a key group of voters, the north-east marginals. Some people might suggest it is being cynical to believe that the timetable for the entertainment centre and the completion of the O-Bahn are being deliberately delayed so the Premier can cut the ribbons just before the next election. But, given this Government's record before the last election, nothing is now beyond them, not even a further delay to the Finger Point project. Apparently the Premier has given up the seat of Mount Gambier once and for all—and so he should. The member for Mount Gambier gave the Labor Party an absolute thrashing in the last State election campaign.

The Government has also downgraded stage 2 of the Lyell McEwin Hospital redevelopment—another project strongly publicised during the election campaign. Given current economic circumstances and Commonwealth Government decisions, the Premier will argue that he has had no choice but to make these budget decisions. The point is that he was wrong to make these promises in the first place—promises he knew he would not be able to honour.

It is clear from a close analysis of the budget papers that there are already more than enough commitments in the capital works pipeline to prevent the sort of program the Premier promised during the election. Works already under way will require at least a further \$400 million to complete. That is how heavily capital works spending is already committed, without projects such as the entertainment centre.

This program will require massive borrowings which will swallow up more and more recurrent funding just to pay the interest.

Almost three quarters of this year's capital program will be funded by borrowings. Overall borrowings will increase this financial year by 33 per cent. In a quite unprecedented way, we are mortgaging the future of our kids.

An honourable member: That is true.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, it is true. We had an example of that today. The SAFA undertaking deferred annuities, if successful and put into place, will involve \$100 million. In 1993-94 we have to pay back \$325 million. Obviously the Government is not working on being the Government of the day in 1993-94, because I have no doubt that at that time there will be some great difficulty for Treasury to meet that commitment as well as the \$153 million on the scheme prior to the Federal Treasurer's decision to rule out these schemes at the end of 1984.

In relation to SAFA, in the absence of the authority's annual report now just tabled it is difficult to precisely analyse the short and long-term impacts of the financial strategy the Government is pursuing. However, the matters the Opposition raised today in Question Time about SAFA's use of deferred annuities are cause for very grave concern about the commitments SAFA's borrowing policies are building up for future generations of South Australians.

I now want to elaborate on those deferred annuities. In 1983 and 1984, what were called 'zero interest coupon notes' were widely utilised as a device to defer taxation liability. The investor borrowed money and on-lent to a second borrower, whose liability to make repayments of capital with interest did not commence until some years in the future—as much as 10 years ahead. The investor claimed the interest paid by him or her as a taxation deduction but showed no corresponding 'interest due' as income. As the interest from the on-lending did not fall due until some years ahead, income for taxation purposes was deferred for a considerable period. Several governments or their instrumentalities utilised a more sophisticated version of this scheme to raise funds on a deferred interest and repayment basis.

These schemes were known as DINGOS—deferred interest Government securities. Their purposes were: to raise capital funds but to defer repayment of both interest and capital; to gain lower interest rates by offering taxation advantages to the lenders; and, to obtain capital funds in a manner which could be argued to be outside Loan Council constraints. Late in 1984, the Federal Treasurer took steps to rule out these schemes. Now it appears that several governments—the State Labor Governments (one of which is this Government), are in collusion to achieve precisely the same results through the sale of deferred annuities.

The State Labor Governments believe that their sale will be upheld as a *bona fide* use of section 27H of the Income Tax Assessment Act, claiming they are selling *bona fide* annuities rather than raising funds by borrowings. Nevertheless, the purposes of their sale are identical with those of the previous DINGOS, ruled out by Federal Treasurer Keating. I understand that this scheme is being designed and marketed on behalf of the State Government by a leading foreign bank which receives a commission by way of remuneration but incurs no liability. The Governments involved are those of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia.

My information is that SAFA is seeking to raise \$100 million by this means. This would be repayable in 1993-94 at a cost, including interest, estimated at about \$325 million. It is understood that the merchant bank is suggesting to

prospective institutional participants in the scheme that they form nominee companies to formally undertake the participation with a view to maximising the taxation advantages or, putting it another way, minimising taxation liabilities. This involves the provision by the institution of some equity funds to the nominee company and the balance by way of loan funds.

I have also been informed that the governments involved are required to give participating institutions an indemnity against any other interpretation being adopted by the Taxation Commissioner or the courts of section 27H of the Income Tax Assessment Act. Further broad indemnities are also provided to underpin all the major assumptions upon which the scheme is based.

In researching this matter it has also been suggested to me that the South Australian Government and the other two State Governments have quite deliberately sought to avoid any publicity for the schemes. They are being marketed privately through a single merchant bank so that the transactions will appear to be private ones which cannot be described as public borrowings. The implications of this apparently clandestine approach to financial activity are enormous.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is indeed shonky. It will be interesting to see just how much homework was done with the Federal Treasurer prior to the negotiations that are currently taking place being entered into. But they will build up a quite huge debt for future generations of South Australians. They appear to be a form of tax avoidance. They also appear to be a quite deliberate and calculated attempt to circumvent Loan Council restraints on borrowings. The Premier owes the House and the taxpayers of South Australia a full and immediate explanation. We certainly did not get that in the House today. We certainly got an avoidance of even contemplating the question.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, I think that is quite right: I do not think the Premier even knew the basis of the question. He did not even understand the question and therefore could not give an answer to it. But there are important implications for a strategy of this nature being undertaken by SAFA, and the Treasurer has the responsibility to explain that to Parliament.

The Premier also needs to justify this policy of SAFA against the warnings of the Auditor-General. It is a policy which pointedly ignores warnings made to Parliament last year by the Auditor-General. In his last annual report to Parliament, Mr Sheridan referred to borrowings from statutory authorities through SAFA—the source for almost 76 per cent of the year's borrowings. Indeed, in this year's Auditor-General's Report, tabled today, we see that again the Auditor-General has drawn the attention of Parliament to the practices undertaken by SAFA that the Auditor-General considers to be quite inappropriate and improper. People might well shake their head at that, but the fact is that that is included in the Auditor-General's Report that has been tabled in this Parliament. The Auditor-General nominated a number of factors which he said needed to be watched carefully. I am referring specifically to the Auditor-General's Report, which I am sure all members of this House will take on face value, and I hope that officers of the Treasury will also take it on face value and not dismiss it lightly.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Not dismiss it with a shake of the head.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, not dismiss it with a shake of the head. The Auditor-General has nominated a number of

factors which he said needed to be watched carefully in using these funds for public purposes including:

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.

Further:

That their use does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of the debt servicing costs on the Consolidated Account and taxation.

Those comments are in the Auditor-General's Report, and I have quoted directly from it. Yet the Premier in this budget is doing exactly what the Auditor-General warned last year that he should not do. The debt servicing cost is \$425.6 million—\$42.6 million, or 11.1 per cent, more than last year. This financial year, the interest cost of the budget is the equivalent of \$6.40 a week for every man, woman and child in South Australia. When the Government came to office the equivalent figure was \$3.70. To completely ignore such a strong and specific warning by an Auditor-General to this Parliament is unprecedented. The Auditor-General obviously is concerned about the implications of this rising debt for future generations of South Australians in a way that the Premier and the Government are not.

Under this Government, the State's total debt has already risen from \$3.5 billion to almost \$5.5 billion. That represents a 38 per cent rise, and is more than twice the rate under the former Liberal Government. All the budget will do is compound the problem. I refer as well to the Premier's use of SAFA earnings to boost the recurrent spending. SAFA's contribution to recurrent spending this financial year will be double what it was in 1985-86. The Premier is using SAFA to increase Government spending to levels which it is unlikely he will be able to maintain without further rises in taxation. I say that for a number of reasons.

It is quite clear that the Premier cannot rely solely on economic conditions to fund further Government spending. Receipts in areas like payroll tax, stamp duties, liquor licence fees and motor vehicle registrations are all affected in one way or another, either by economic decline or, particularly in the case of liquor licence fees and motor vehicle registrations, by specific policy decisions of the Federal Government in relation to the wine tax, the fringe benefits tax and higher petrol taxes.

The assumptions on which this year's revenue estimates are based are, I suggest, already shaky. Next year's prospects cause even further reason for concern. We know that we will be at least \$17 million worse off from the Commonwealth as the special assistance grant tapers out. Mineral and petroleum royalties will decline even further, as will the levels of other receipts dependent on economic activity. Indeed, from previous Treasury estimates given to this House, it is likely that total royalty collections this year and next year may well be lower than the amount actually collected in 1985-86. In other words, the estimated deficit on Consolidated Account at the end of this financial year of just over \$47 million may hide an underlying deficit that could amount to at least \$100 million next financial year without a permanent increase in the revenue base, a permanent decrease in spending, or a combination of both factors. Put simply, the Premier has increased Government spending and borrowing to a level that the taxpayers can no longer afford to sustain. They have been bled dry. Something has to give.

However, the Premier refuses to look at any significant reduction in Government spending. All he does is to let the bureaucracy blow out. Insufficient attention has been given in this budget to areas where savings could be achieved. I recognise that it is not easy to trim Government spending—it is easy just to accept that and to decide to do nothing

more about it. Ministers have not been called on to justify their departmental spending, to explain every dollar of taxpayers' money that they want to spend. Let me quote from the Auditor-General's Report, tabled today, to support that fact. The Auditor-General has identified a number of areas where savings could have been achieved. For example, he points out that in the Health Commission the Central Office staff numbers increased by another 25 last financial year. The Auditor-General questions whether there was an opportunity to have absorbed some of this increase within existing staff levels, given areas of inefficiency in the Central Office, previously identified.

The Auditor-General also points out that no policy change has been made in the area of cleaning schools, despite his comments last year that savings of \$2.6 million could be made annually by introducing efficiencies in that area. Workers compensation is another area where costs have simply blown out. Net claims increased by another \$5.4 million last financial year, taking the total to \$26.2 million, representing a 26 per cent increase. All the Government has done is to increase the bureaucracy.

The experience with events like the Youth Music Festival and the Three Day Event shows that Ministers simply are not exercising rigorous and relentless scrutiny of spending within their given areas of responsibility. The Premier thinks that it is sufficient to just pay out \$11 507.17 of taxpayers' money for a double page spread in the *Sunday Mail* and that taxpayers will accept that their money is being spent wisely. That is typical of a Premier and a Government interested more in the media presentation of their decisions than in the long-term impact of those decisions.

It is clear that, in the lead-up to this budget, the Premier and the Government decided yet again to put off today's problems until tomorrow. The Premier decided to borrow against tomorrow to boost capital works today. He has gone to the bank for another overdraft. He hopes that this will prevent unemployment climbing too steeply when Labor has failed for three years to put into place the policies that would have avoided this situation in the first place. That is why this budget strategy will fail.

Its only hope of success is a sudden, swift economic recovery. As much as we would all like to see it, it is just not going to happen. Even by the Premier's own definition, the State economy is in more trouble than other regional economies. Let me quote the following from his five year economic plan about the South Australian economy. He stated:

Demand for new motor vehicles is a good indicator of the state of the economy.

They are down 24.6 per cent. He further stated:

The strength of the construction sector is a key indicator of the overall activity and health of the State economy.

The Premier must admit, based just on those indicators, that the State economy is fading fast. Yet his Government does nothing about it except tax more, spend more, and borrow more. In key areas like workers compensation and industrial safety, it wants to add further to business costs and reduce incentive for investment.

In these two areas of vital concern for business, the Premier has left in charge a Minister who would say to the assembled mob on the steps of Parliament House, 'We don't believe in capital punishment, comrades, but we're going down the next step.' This is symptomatic of his socialist approach. He has just not been interested to achieve an objective debate—in getting the facts.

Indeed, the budget papers reveal that while he had a spending allocation last financial year of \$179 000 for reviewing the Workers Compensation Act, actual spending

was less than \$25 000. Yet the Government refused to assist in the inquiry which has got to the bottom of the Government's unreal costings, and we know why. I am sure that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry would be pleased to see those sets of figures where the Government refused to subsidise an independent costing, which has shown up this Government and its legislation for exactly what it is, a fraud.

Let me mention some other aspects of the Government's performance where much has been promised but little, if anything, achieved. The Premier said in his five year economic plan announced just before the election that a key to the plan would be the immediate (that was his word) establishment of South Australia International as a key to the drive for exports. He repeated the commitment in his policy speech, but where is South Australia International today? Where is the gateway to the outback campaign promised for the tourist industry—again in the five year plan? Where are the lower interest rates—the strengthening dollar, the reduced bankruptcies—all further promises of the Premier in the election year?

On other issues of vital community concern, the Premier promised in his policy speech that his Government would fight the drug menace, yet it now wants to decriminalise marijuana smoking in public. He promised to act immediately (a word he uses often, without understanding its meaning) to toughen parole laws. It will be at least a year since that promise of immediate action, before any changes are in place.

He promised a joint parliamentary Party committee to act as a focus for continuing vigilance and reform in law and order. We have seen no action yet. He also promised to extend transport concessions to pensioners in regional cities. That is yet to happen, but what the Government has done in this area is introduce additional fares for pensioners in the metropolitan area.

As I said at the outset of my speech, this is a budget of transition—of transition from credibility—from confidence in the State's future on the part of the Government. It is not a budget that reflects the changing times in which we live. The Prime Minister talks about war. There is no doubt that the Federal Treasurer has slipped up in his claim about the banana republic. These are difficult times. They demand not the typical socialist responses inherent in this budget, namely, more spending, more taxing, more borrowing, more encouragement of public enterprise, more growth in the bureaucracy, more regulation of the private sector, and more faith in public sector leadership, but new policies—a fresh approach to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

This Government has had three years of economic opportunity. It came to office at the end of an economic world recession—at the end of our worst drought in modern history, and at the beginning of a wage pause. Yet, it has squandered those opportunities. All the Premier can ask us to do now is lower our expectations.

What South Australia needs is a Government with more verve, more vision, and more veracity. For 20 years, South Australia has been failing in the greatest challenge it has faced—the need to diversify our economy through encouraging our industrial base to become more nationally and internationally competitive. Over the last three years there has been a further decline of 12 700 manufacturing jobs, with more on the way. Put plainly, we are in the grip of an investment drought. We are performing particularly poorly with regard to foreign investment. In the three financial years, 1982-83, 1983-84 and 1984-85, South Australia's share of total investment in Australia has been only 2.2 per cent, and I understand that, for the first half of this financial

year, the situation has deteriorated even further. This is occurring at the very time when we should be attractive to investment—when the export markets of Asia in particular offer great opportunities.

It is time to be frank, honest and open in our appraisal of our economic problems. We need to have a constructive approach to their solution. We need to rethink our priorities. As a nation, our spending is now geared far too much towards consumption rather than investment. The public sector—Federal, State and local—consumed 43 per cent of GDP last financial year. The public sector's claim on our earnings has increased by almost 6 per cent in just the last 10 years. Unless this is wound back, it will deny our economy the investment and export orientation it needs to improve our future outlook.

All those interested in helping to make our regional and national economies more efficient, more productive and more competitive, should have the following objectives: limiting Federal and State Government outlays; balancing Federal and State budgets by a set date and a reduction of total public sector indebtedness; phasing in, over time, changes to industry protection and our industrial relations systems to enable a more open and flexible economy; wage levels to be determined by productivity criteria; elimination of payroll tax, the capital gains tax and the fringe benefits tax in a way which still recognises the need for Commonwealth funding so that the State can meet its constitutional obligations; a fairer, more efficient tax system which gives maximum encouragement to individual and corporate initiative and enterprise; curbs on union power, including secret ballots, end to compulsory unionism and making unions subject to injunctions and damages under common law; more encouragement and opportunity for employee participation at the level of the industrial enterprise; a more efficient public sector, including a review of permanent tenure for public servants at the higher classification levels; and compulsory work programs in return for unemployment benefits.

The Premier's continued silence on key issues like wages policy, industrial relations, union power and tax reform will not make our problems go away. The slide, the drift, will only continue. The objective I have nominated can underpin a deregulated more competitive State economy with less government interference, fewer burdens on industry, and more individual choice.

These are essential if we are to confront what is the key issue in our economic future—our ability to increase our exports, especially into the massive potential markets of the Asia-Pacific region. An export diversification of our economy over the next 15 years to the year 2000 can be achieved through a cooperative approach by the private and public sectors in confronting the underlying difficulties that our economy faces at present. That is the sort of transition that we should be talking about. The Liberal Party has always been prepared to join in the effort that is necessary to achieve that objective.

In this our Jubilee year we should be contemplating transition to a better, more productive future. The Premier talks about transition—but he offers no signposts. I have said we need reforms in areas like industrial relations, in taxation, in the size and role of government and in education to better equip our young for tomorrow's jobs. In 1986, as we contemplate our first 150 years, we should be lifting our sights towards the next century, not lowering them. We should be doing what the Premier said, and I repeat to him the last words of his election policy speech: 'Now let's see how far we can run.'

With this budget, all the Premier can offer is a journey up a blind alley. I believe that, with the right incentives and the right opportunities, this State still has a sound future, still has a lot of energy and a long way to run. In this our Jubilee year we should not be content with a budget which lacks vision and direction and which can offer only a journey into the unknown.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate, I wish to talk about the State budget as it relates to my own electorate. I am sure that many of the things that the Leader of the Opposition has put before the House will be answered in due course. One of the good news propositions that came out of the budget concerned increased spending in relation to the Children's Services Office. This relates also to the Federal budget which indicated that, so far as children's services are concerned, there would be an increase in the allocation. Following the stringent steps that had to be taken by the Treasurer in order to try to balance the books in the partial crisis which we now face, it was one of the few departments that received an increase in the Federal budget.

In addition, following the announcement of the Federal budget figures, the Federal Government announced that, so far as child-care was concerned, there would be an increase in the number of places available to mothers who sought occasional care. As recently as 27 August, Senator Don Grimes announced that, under the new policy, 3 000 places would be created and they would form part of the target of 20 000 new child-care places that would be available in Australia by June 1988. As a result of this decision up to 120 new occasional care centres will be established, and these will be funded by the Commonwealth, especially for families and women who are not in the work force. This will double the current supply of the services funded by the Commonwealth to this stage.

Capital funds will be made available to build and equip the centres. Recurrent grants will then be provided for both operational subsidies and free subsidies for low income families. As I have mentioned, I was delighted also to hear the announcement made by the Treasurer in his papers that there would be an increase in the establishment of child-care centres in South Australia. Members will be aware that I have taken a deep interest in the question of child-care facilities in my own electorate. Unfortunately, the Henley and Grange area and surrounding areas have a chronic lack of child-care services, with no private or Government subsidised child-care centres or after-school or vacation care programs operating. There is not one child-care facility in the area of Henley and Grange, part of Seaton, Findon, Fulham Gardens, Henley South, Lockleys—that very large area of the western suburbs. Naturally, I am therefore very interested in the announcements that have been made in both the State and Federal Government budgets concerning the possible increase in child-care facilities.

In my electorate there has been a community movement towards the establishment of child-care, and during 1986 representatives from local primary schools, kindergartens, family day care, CAFHS, Grange TAFE, Grange CYSS, Grange Community Centre, the western regions of the Children's Services Office, the Department of Community Services, the Henley and Grange council, and I have been meeting to discuss ways of addressing child-care needs in our area. This group of people has sought to redress the imbalance and have established three subcommittees to look specifically at the area of child-care centres, after-school care and vacation care. The needs of the latter two services have been reinforced by a recent survey of all primary schools which indicates that 38 children require full-time care, 26

require part-time care, 50 children from time to time need emergency care and 47 require occasional care. I emphasise that this relates only to the Henley and Grange areas.

In response to the need for vacation care, in June the Henley and Grange child-care group submitted a registration of interest form to the Children's Services Office to operate a vacation care program in the Christmas holidays at the Henley Beach Primary School. Since then funding has been received from the Education Department to operate a recreational vacation program at the Grange Primary School in the recently concluded September school holidays. I had the pleasure of being invited to the last day of that program, and I met many of the mothers and workers involved with that group. They expressed their satisfaction with the way in which the vacation care program had operated. Also, they expressed their desire for and reinforcement of the need for funding from the Children's Services Office for child-care within my electorate.

Ideally, the Henley and Grange child-care group would like to see two vacation care programs operating in all vacation periods, with one being located at the Henley Beach Primary School and the other at the Grange Primary School. The Children's Services Office has been very helpful in trying to assist the operation of these programs. It has provided expertise and support wherever possible, but to this date it has not been able to assist with funding. The after-school care program is very important for my electorate. There are many so-called latch key children and, unfortunately, from time to time these children, who have been unsupervised from the time that school has finished until either their mother or father have returned from work, have got themselves into trouble. There is a great need to provide a program which will look after the children after school.

We have now moved into an era of self help. Not only was there a successful vacation care program but also an after-school program has been established at the Grange school on a user pays basis. It is hoped that, now that the community is beginning to assist itself, in due course it will gain the necessary assistance and help from the Children's Services Office in order to provide the sorts of facilities that we are seeking. From time to time mothers have sought my assistance for long day care, particularly on a respite basis where the family is in need of assistance. The local kindergartens have been very helpful in providing for emergency care, but I believe that the time is now due for this side of the western area to receive some of the increase in allocations that was announced in the budgets so that we can go ahead and establish a long day care centre in this area.

One argument that is used by both administrators and Federal politicians as to why long day care cannot be provided involves the needs based proposition, which is an illusive subject, no-one having been able to establish what it actually encompasses. I should be grateful if someone could supply me with the relevant details so that in due course we could direct our arguments to establishing in my area a needs based program.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Surely it concerns ability to pay.

Mr FERGUSON: I agree, and ability to pay is a problem that faces our child-care group in Henley and Grange because of the involvement of people on a variety of wages, people with two incomes, people with separate sources of income apart from their own income, and people on social security benefits.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And people with big mortgages.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, including second mortgages. People in the social security area are on various benefits, so there are poor people and very poor people, and it is dif-

ficult to establish on a needs basis how much should be paid to whom.

The other matter to which I wish to refer in the few minutes left to me concerns the sort of protection that will be provided by way of legislation on aged care. This subject was referred to in the budget, and there are three aspects of this matter. One aspect that will be well catered for relates to the regulation of retirement villages. As such villages are often provided by companies that operate for profit, the Corporate Affairs Commission has no problem in framing the sorts of regulations needed to cover these operations. One of the other areas of responsibility involves nursing homes, which are basically set up to provide nursing and medical care for aged and infirm persons. The provision of fees in this regard does not come within the definition of a common enterprise, so closer attention is needed in this area.

Some regulations, both Federal and local government, operate in this area. Nursing homes are licensed under the provisions of the Health Act and, although the licensing provisions basically refer to the nursing ability of such homes, the subject of the competence of the management is often not considered. However, there is some regulation in this area. The problem to which I refer concerns the 'boarding house', which is not regulated. In this regard, certain persons set themselves up in business to provide accommodation for aged people.

From time to time, certain nursing needs when these people become ill are provided for under verbal contracts. What concerns me most is that quite often boarding house proprietors ask for a deposit, which has increased in recent years. I know of one case where a proprietor asked for a deposit of \$6 000 from a person who was to reside in his establishment. However, if the resident of the boarding house cannot live compatibly with the other people, for any reason, and if in due course the management asks that person to move, there is no contractual arrangement under which whole or part of the deposit can be returned.

The regulation of this area would create an administrative problem, and I understand the argument that it would be costly for the State to provide for administration in that area, but I believe that the Parliament should consider self-regulation of the boarding house situation for aged care. People should be able to sue the proprietor of the boarding house if the contract is not fulfilled. This proposition may cause alarm in some areas, and I am aware that all sorts of organisations, including church organisations, would be caught up in this type of regulation, but I feel sure that it would not be beyond the wit of Parliament to provide for proper contracts for people entering these homes. Those contracts should relate to all parties. If, for example, a person was ejected from a boarding house after paying a large deposit, there should be some arrangement under which whole or part of that deposit could be returned to the person concerned.

At present, child-care is the greatest need in my district and I hope that the Children's Services Office can see its way clear to establishing a child-care centre there. The unregulated nature of aged care is also a cause of great concern in my district. I hope that the Parliament will consider the establishment of a child-care centre in my district and introduce legislation in the aged care area.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In the time available to me I would like to raise one or two issues in connection with this budget. The most salient feature of the budget is that it is a big borrowing budget which, judging by past experience, will lead to con-

siderable problems down the track. If we compare the State's indebtedness (which was revealed today in the Auditor-General's Report) with the last indication of the State's indebtedness according to the financial statement accompanying last year's budget, we see clearly that there has been a considerable increase. All that means is that we are storing up problems for the future.

The Hon. H. Allison: For our children.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Indeed, we are. That is the precise position in which this nation finds itself at present. The situation has caught up with the nation and in due course it will catch up with the State—with all the States that follow that sort of fiscal policy. Australia is virtually bankrupt: we are now borrowing money to make social service payments and we are paying interest on recurrent expenditures. No business, whether large, small or mid-dling, can survive by following that course. It is fairly apparent that the State Treasury, the Treasurer and the Government are following that track. It is interesting to note that a number of Treasury officers listened to the response of the Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament after the budget—

Mr Rann: They didn't wait for you.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think it was the member for Henley Beach who put them off: he is probably enough to put off most observers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: People would really have to have extraordinary endurance and patience to wade through that. I have enormous respect for these Treasury officers. I got to know them quite well when we were in Government: they are very competent indeed. I hope that they are not allowing themselves to be used politically by this Government. I was astounded to see on the front page of the *Advertiser* during the last election campaign a copy of a document which was purported to come from the Under Treasurer and which was highly critical of some of the proposals put up by the Opposition during the campaign.

I know (and I say this with due respect, because I have absolute confidence in the ability of these officers) that the former Under Treasurer would never have let himself be put in that position. During the 1982 election campaign, when the then Bannon Opposition was seeking to destroy any confidence that existed in South Australia and put up a whole range of spending proposals, the former Under Treasurer was at great pains to distance himself from any political input in the election campaign. I say that because I have observed over the years (and both the member for Light and I have been here for a good many years) the behaviour of public servants. They are apolitical, as they should be. They steer well clear of any political input in terms of their advice being used and their being quoted in the political sphere.

I would also like to emphasise what is a fundamental doctrine—ministerial responsibility. The Parliament is made up of members, and in the front line on the Government side is the Ministry. The Ministry must front up. I was appalled to hear in this place some time ago the Hon. Frank Blevins say that he was not responsible for the misinformation or the incompetence of some of his officers. That is a complete rejection of ministerial responsibility. It gave me great heart to read the judgment of Acting Chief Justice Zelling and his two fellow judges sitting as a court of appeal of the full Supreme Court: I commend to all members their judgment relating to the doctrine of ministerial responsibility and parliamentary privilege.

It reaffirmed the proper role of Ministers in Her Majesty's Government and the doctrine of parliamentary privilege which has existed for many centuries. I read those judgments last evening and it warmed my heart to think that some of the leading judges in this State—Justice Zelling, Justice Prior and Justice Jacobs—were unanimous in upholding this doctrine of parliamentary privilege and ministerial responsibility in the case of Chapman *versus* Chatterton on appeal. It was a very important document, indeed. Those judgments were very important in the context of the South Australian Parliament and, indeed, in the whole of the Westminster parliamentary system. Those judgments are going to be more far-reaching than many in this place realise. I will say more about that on another occasion. I raise that point to indicate to the House what is the proper role of Ministers and Government and senior public servants. I take it as a compliment that such a number of Treasury officers presented themselves in the gallery today to hear the Leader's response to the budget. I will say no more than that.

This budget is indeed a big borrowing budget and is the track down which Australia has gone and which has led to this present crisis that has now caught up with us. In due course the day of reckoning will come to South Australia. I would only suggest that the State that, in my view, has gone down this track to an even more damaging degree is the State of Victoria under Treasurer Jolly. Under the last two Labor Administrations in Victoria enormous problems have been built up for that State. In due course I suppose we in South Australia could take heart from the fact that some other State may have got itself into an even bigger mess because of its fiscal policies than indeed we have under a succession of Labor Governments in South Australia. Jolly has really bloated the public sector in Victoria to an enormous extent.

There were enormous expenditures of loan funds and any money they could get their hands on. The day of reckoning is at hand in Victoria to an extent similar to that looming in South Australia. It is the track record of all Labor Governments to take no thought for tomorrow. It is a case of what can be done today to prop up the situation, to appease temporarily public perception, to satisfy the appetite of the public for spending of money, to con the public into thinking that someone else is going to pay, to thinking that there is some benefit in it for them if the Government is spending money on them and that someone else is picking up the tab. That is what this budget seeks to do.

The Premier and his then Deputy were certainly the prophets of doom in 1982 and now the Premier is about the cheeriest optimist one could hope to meet anywhere. Of course, he will not face reality. He keeps talking up the South Australian economy, suggesting that all is well, that we have no problems. All the economic indicators show that South Australia is doing very poorly indeed. An examination of the budget shows that. I was interested to hear a speech by one of the leading business entrepreneurs in South Australia, Mr John Spalvins, a week or two ago when he talked about what we need to do to put South Australia back on the map and to keep us on the map. Really, when one boils it all down, he was talking about getting back to the sort of thinking that was current during that long term in office of Tom Playford.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The application of plain, simple common sense.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: How true! He was saying that we must have a competitive edge in South Australia. So much for these advocates for the centralised wage fixing system! South Australia will never have a place

in the sun under some centralised wage fixing system where our wage rates, conditions and all the rest are tied to the eastern States, because they have advantages that we cannot meet. They have a population that we cannot meet. If we want the population of South Australia to decline even further relative to the other States—which is what is happening under this Administration—we will follow that doctrinaire wages policy which was again enunciated in a rambling answer by the Minister of Labour today in his attack on the so-called New Right.

The fact is that, if we cannot regionalise our economy and get some competitive edge in South Australia, we will simply go slowly but surely further into decline in relation to our position with the larger States. We used to hear from Premier Dunstan, who is apparently seeking a job back in South Australia, about our appalling record in South Australia in relation to health and education. The fact was that we had a system of community hospitals in this State second to none. All or most of that competitive edge was destroyed during the pace setting 1970s and, unless we get a grip on this regional economy and do some of the sorts of things Spalvins was talking about, I do not see where we are going to finish up in the State. If we look at all of the indicators,

and if the Premier is prepared to look at them, we see that we are doing very poorly indeed.

Referring to the figures for the three months ended June 1986, in South Australia we had an increase in employment growth of 2.8 per cent, while in Australia the figure was 4.1 per cent. The unemployment rate in that period went up by 1.3 per cent here and down in Australia by 0.8 per cent, while job vacancies were down 23 per cent here and down 2.1 per cent nationally. I believe the Leader quoted these figures. Retail sales for the June 1986 quarter showed a 7.9 per cent growth in South Australia whilst nationally it was 10.7 per cent. Motor vehicle registrations for the same quarter were down 24.7 per cent in South Australia and 19.4 per cent nationally.

If we look at the 13 key indicators of activity in South Australia and around the nation we find that, in all of those, South Australia is performing worst or second worst—by far the worst record overall of any State. I have the figures in the form of a table which I seek to have inserted in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the table purely statistical?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

Leave granted.

KEY ECONOMIC INDICATORS*

	N.S.W.	VIC.	QLD	S.A.	W.A.	TAS.	AUST.
Population Growth (For year to June 30 1985)	1.15%	1.05%	1.57%	0.66%	1.72%	1.08%	1.26%
Net Migration Gain	4	2	5	1	6	3	
From overseas and interstate (for year ended 30 June 1985)	0.39%	0.31%	0.68%	-0.04%	0.69%	0.26%	0.44%
Employment Growth	4	3	5	1	6	2	
July 1985-July 1986	4.3%	3.6%	4.5%	2.6%	5.8%	3.4%	4.3%
Overtime Worked	4	3	5	1	6	2	
Average weekly overtime hours worked per employee working overtime—increase from May 1985 - May 1986	2.1%	1.8%	7.7%	-21.6%	-2.5%	6.9%	0.1%
Unemployment Rate	4	3	6	1	2	5	
July 1986	8.3%	6.5%	9.6%	8.4%	7.6%	7.8%	7.9%
Building Approvals	3	6	1	2	5	4	
Private Sector Dwellings six months to 30 June 1986, com- pared with same period 1985	-18.9%	-16.5%	-33.1%	-36.1%	-8.2%	-11.1%	-21.5%
New Private Capital Expenditure— 1986-87	3	4	2	1	6	5	
Forecast increase over 1985-86	+28.3%	+27.2%	+2.9%	+3.0%	+102.4%	+16.8%	+28.0%
New Motor Vehicle Registrations	5	4	1	2	6	3	
Cars, wagons, utes, trucks, buses six months to 30 June 1986 compared with same period 1985	-21.3%	-17.2%	-25.3%	-26.0%	-27.7%	-25.8%	-22.0%
New Motor Cycle Registrations	5	6	4	2	1	3	
Six months to 30 June 1986 com- pared with same period 1985	-31.1%	-27.7%	-29.0%	-34.8%	-31.8%	-30.6%	-30.2%
Retail Sales	3	6	5	1	2	4	
Six months to June 1986 com- pared with same period 1985	+10.6%	+10.6%	+13.0%	+8.2%	+12.3%	+4.6%	+10.8%
Bankruptcies	3	3	6	2	5	1	
Increase in 1985-86 over 1984- 85	18.5%	2.7%	22.7%	39.3%	9.2%	21.5%	18.3%
Inflation	4	6	2	1	5	3	
Movement in Consumer Price Index since Labor came to power	24.2%	27.1%	25.3%	26.8%	23.8%	25.8%	25.5%
State Taxation	5	1	4	2	6	3	
Increase from 1981-82 through to 1985-86 budget estimate	53.1%	57.0%	40.3%	68.5%	64.9%	52.8%	54.5%
	4	3	6	1	2	5	

*State with worst performance for each indicator is ranked 1 and other States ranked in order.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Industry Statistics and Government Departments.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: These 13 key economic indicators show how poorly we are performing. The table, from the South Australian Bureau of Statistics, includes

figures on population growth and net migration gain. We remember the sob story from the Premier about our precious resources leaving the State. It has become worse since

he has been in Government. The other headings cover employment growth, overtime worked, the unemployment rate, building approvals, new private capital expenditure, new motor vehicle registrations, new motor cycle registrations, retail sales, bankruptcies, inflation and State taxation. On all those indicators we are worst or second worst—worst in most of them. We obviously need a change of direction, a change of philosophy, and a return to the idea of the work ethic where we do things a bit better in this State than others do elsewhere, where we contain our costs and keep our housing costs down, as well as our cost of travel—all these costs, which were so much lower than the rest of the nation back in the years to which I referred a moment ago.

I believe that it is absolutely fundamental to any economic recovery that we reform our industrial relations system. I see the two as going hand in hand. There is a growing perception in the Labor Party, and certainly with Treasurer Keating, that the financial system should be deregulated. That is a real conversion, something of a miraculous flash of insight for the Labor Party. For the Labor Party, particularly spearheaded by Treasurer Keating, this sort of thinking is quite new. Suddenly there is talk about Australia becoming competitive.

There is talk about reducing tariff barriers. Of course, that is being resisted pretty strongly by the influential left wing of the Labor Party. But, nonetheless, some of the economic rationalists in the Labor Party are talking that way. This is almost like a religious conversion. It is something quite new for them. But to deregulate the labour market or, to put it in other words, to come to grips with the arbitration system will be a much tougher battle. The arbitration system of this nation is now so inflexible and so one-sided that no real economic recovery can be achieved in this country unless it goes hand in hand with a renovation, or to put it even stronger, a rewriting of our industrial code and a restructuring of our industrial relations system in Australia.

That will not be easy. Of course, the Labor movement will fight that tooth and nail, because they are very powerful people in this country. They are more powerful than the elected government. I have said before that the Federal Government cannot move without the say-so of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. It has to hammer out a bargain with the ACTU before it can do anything. As a group the ACTU enjoys an immunity that no other citizens in this country enjoy. In South Australia in particular they enjoy an immunity from court action which none of us, no other group or individual in this nation, enjoys. They are above the law. That situation will have to change. If this nation and this State are to get on top of the problems and the malaise that besets us, a deregulation of the labour market must go hand in hand with the Keating/Howard philosophy of deregulation of the financial markets, otherwise our problems will simply be accelerated. This does not involve grinding workers into the ground. It does not involve sweated labour or sending kids down into the coal mines. What this involves is cooperatively working out together some way in which we can improve the productivity of enterprises and make them competitive.

The Confederation of Australian Industry provided a very interesting report as to what is required to get manufacturing going in this nation. The sorts of things that I am talking about are the questions that must be addressed. For example, in relation to outmoded work practices, if people took the trouble to read what is going on in Western Australia they would understand why we are not competitive internationally. It is not a question of beating workers into the

ground but of working out a sensible arrangement which suits both employer and employee.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to address this budget document, which has already been discredited. In the 2½ weeks since it was presented to this House it has suffered the same fate as has the Federal budget, delivered in Canberra on 19 August, namely, a serious questioning of the nature of the figures that were presented.

There is already existing evidence of the fuzziness of a number of the prophecies made in the budget. The normal practice of the Premier of the day is to outline the general philosophy based on the known fact. I suggest that in this case, as also occurred in relation to documents presented before the most recent State election, the prepared script already has lost any relationship to the scene as it really is. Treasurer Keating in Canberra has already had to publicly acknowledge, as has the Prime Minister, the failure of a number of the prophecies in the Federal budget. It can be demonstrated already that the prophecy of the Premier in relation to this document is in serious question.

For example, this afternoon the Premier acknowledged, by way of interjection during the Leader of the Opposition's excellent contribution to this debate, that a number of the statements made by the Premier prior to the last State election already belong to the broken promises category. However, I do not want to go into the matter of broken promises at this time. I just say that I do not believe that the Premier will be capable of the sort of deft footwork that he will need to get himself out of this bind.

I now refer to the reasons why I say the budget is a discredited document. To set the scene, I refer to some of the statements made by the Premier on pages 1 and 2 of the document. The Premier made the following point:

... moving from an environment characterised by high levels of Commonwealth support and strong revenue growth to one of slower revenue growth and significant cut-backs in Commonwealth funding.

It is acknowledged that the Commonwealth has taken that action. The Premier says that 1986-87 will be a transition year. In that transition year he will blow out the current deficit of some \$40 million by an additional \$7.3 million. It will be interesting to see what the situation is at the end of the financial year. In the economic context of the budget, the Premier further says:

The international economic environment in which Australia must sell its exports has become very much more difficult.

He relates that to the reason why South Australia and Australia are encountering difficult economic consequences. Why are we in such great difficulty with overseas markets, quite apart from the floating dollar, which I have supported but which has not been helped by a number of activities of the present Federal Government? Why are we at a disadvantage with our trading partners overseas? I could belabour the point of the cost of labour, although that has been documented on a number of occasions. I refer members who want to look at the position to statements that I have made in the House, as well as statements that have been documented covering a whole range of assessments of labour charges within Australia. I do not need to go into that issue, but I certainly pick up the problems that we have with shipping, of getting our products away from the coast, once we have managed to get the product on to the ship itself, as it is always rather difficult to be certain that on delivery to the port one will be able to get material on to the ship.

Once the material is on the ship, will you be able to get the ship away from the wharf? The Minister of Marine may

well be able to give us a very interesting discourse on the problems even of the South Australian port system, which has had a better record than some of the other States but which is certainly not able, with its capacity, to overcome the grave difficulties that exist from the major export ports on the eastern coast. For example, I refer to a situation which allows moorers to work 25 hours a week for something in excess of \$70 000 income, thereby preventing the proper loading of ships on a continuous basis because of the manner in which they walk off after a certain number of hours on the job. I refer also to the position of holding shipping exports to ransom. We can ask about the situation relative to iron ore from the Pilbara and coal from the eastern States.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: It should all go through Port Adelaide.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I would be prepared to accept at this moment that if it went through Port Adelaide there would be a greater chance of its getting away. However, how long would it be before the heavies from interstate would be breathing down our neck and causing the same disruptions in South Australia? Fortunately, because we are small fish—and I do not say that with pride or in a critical sense—compared with the size of the ports on the eastern seaboard and fast developing on the north-west coast of Australia, we do not attract the same sorts of difficulties that these other States have had. However, it is all a reflection on the Australian trading scene, and, as such, it is a reflection on the ability of the South Australian scene to perform in an adequate way to offset the difficulties that we are dragging down on ourselves.

We can talk about the strikes and, although the Minister of Labour even as recently as this afternoon laid claim to the problem not being as grave in South Australia as it is in other States, certainly a look at the building immediately to the west of this place shows that the ASER development and convention centre are no testimony to a better South Australian situation. We have merely to look at the other side of North Terrace and the building that is being prepared for the STA to recognise that it, by virtue of statements made by the builders and the STA board, is already 10 months behind schedule, and blowing out at the top in relation to the cost of the building program.

We can ask ourselves about the sweetheart deal which Mr Mierisch is very quick in the paper this morning to suggest was not a sweetheart deal after all but which is an additional \$25 to everyone who will work on the State Bank development. We are setting the scene by that sort of action which will be a cross around our neck in this State and indeed a cross around employment in Australia for a long time to come.

We ask ourselves what has been the situation in Australia in a labour sense over a period of time. We can go back to the fact that it was Chrysler, now the Mitsubishi organisation, closely followed by General Motors-Holden, which decided by a flick of the fingers overnight that a full adult wage would be paid at age 18 rather than at age 21, thereby completely destroying the motivation which existed for younger people to accept apprenticeships and to strive to achieve a satisfactory result. In 1970, when I first came into the House, the Hon. Geoff Virgo, who became Minister of Transport, decided that in the Railways of South Australia, for example, the maximum difference between a wage for a person who had trained and a person who was unskilled would be \$3.50 per week. Where was the initiative? Where was the motivation that is needed to put one's shoulder to the wheel, take night classes, do apprenticeship work or go the extra mile to get the extra skill to enable a person to

obtain a payment for service that was commensurate with the effort that was put into it?

Mr Lewis: No incentive at all.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: There was no incentive in it at all, so we have this problem associated with the labour scene in Australia generally. I have referred to some of the positions that have arisen in South Australia, all of which are putting us at a disadvantage to those overseas trading nations and which makes a complete farce of the following statement by the Treasurer in this House:

This year has seen a dramatic turnaround in Australia's economic circumstances. In particular, the international economic environment in which Australia must sell its exports has become very much more difficult.

I suggest that it has become very much more difficult because it is the Australian scene which has made it more difficult. We are making a rod for our own back and are suffering the consequences as a result. We are fully aware of the standover tactics which are entering into the work force. The BLF has so much of a standover tactic profile in the eastern States that the State Governments there were prepared to bite the bullet in a very practical sense to go out and take on those people.

We now have a situation in which the courts have found that the management of that organisation left a lot to be desired. Regrettably, the leader of that organisation in South Australia has taken himself across to accept responsibility from where Norm Gallagher left off. As a consequence, he is currently in gaol in New South Wales. Yet this Labor Government would reappoint him to a significant board relating to long service leave in South Australia. They are the sorts of problems that this Government has drawn down upon itself, as have other Governments of the same ilk right across Australia, and this is why we are not trading effectively overseas. Further on, the Treasurer said:

However, it seems clear that for the immediate future at least the Australian economy is facing a period of adjustment and lower economic growth which can lead only to a lower rate of growth in employment and the possibility of some increase in the current level of unemployment.

We have already seen that. My colleague the Deputy Leader, who has just resumed his seat, had inserted into *Hansard* an identification of the problems that we have got in this State compared with other States. Our degree of isolation and the manner in which we have eroded the advantages that we had are coming home to roost more and more month by month.

I make these points not because they have not been made elsewhere but because they are not being made or recognised or accepted in this Parliament by the present Government. It is finding ways of pushing all these facts under the carpet, walking away from them and making pious statements such as I have just related, being unable to accept the degree of responsibility that a Government in difficult times must accept. We have a situation which is identical with that in the Federal scene of a Government which cries 'difficulty' and 'financial problems' and then goes out and continues to spend without coming down hard on those areas of expenditure that need to be curtailed.

If the union movement says that you may not do this, you are not permitted to do it. One has only to read the PSA monthly documents that are now circulated to members of Parliament. The most recent statement in relation to Samcor indicates that, 'Yes, we might redeploy people out there if, first of all, we give them a \$5 000 or \$8 000 pat on the back as they go. Yes, we might come into a superannuation scheme so long as you allow us to take the employer and employee sum total after five years in the scheme.' Where does superannuation go when you are

destroying the principles behind the original superannuation ethic in this manner?

Where does superannuation go when you are destroying the principles behind the original superannuation ethic in this manner?

I could go on and quote numerous details of that sort of activity. I will briefly quote a report, which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 11 September 1986, of an address that was given at Adelaide University the previous evening. The address was well supported by a large contingent of people from across the fabric of South Australia, including Cabinet members of this Parliament and other members. The address was given by the author Morris West, who was giving the inaugural Playford Lecture. The article states:

Celebrated Australian author Morris West last night described Australia as 'a country in peril'.

One might suggest that they are hard words. Mr West went on to explain why he believed this, and he was roundly applauded. In fact, he was given a standing ovation after he concluded his address. Mr West concluded his address about the Australian problem, as follows:

Australia had been spendthrift with its resources and now the bills are in. We have become partisan instead of patriots. We are divided, confrontationalist and have introduced vote-catching policies which are untested and panaceas which may turn out to be poison for this country.

I will dwell on that point because during Question Time this afternoon we had an opportunity to draw attention to the activities of SAFA, more particularly in respect of the new annuities, which were closely questioned.

We know of the Auditor-General's concern from his report for 1985, and it is there again in the Auditor-General's Report tabled today. Quite apart from the remarks which appear at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4, I draw attention to page 24 of the Auditor-General's Report which was tabled today and which refers to public accounts and, more particularly, public sector indebtedness, as follows:

Last year, Treasury released an information paper entitled 'Trends in the Indebtedness of the South Australian Public Sector 1950 to 1985'. That paper was the result of a comprehensive examination of the financial assets, 'gross' and 'net' public sector debt, undertaken by analysis of all the accounts of State semi-government authorities and the public accounts.

The paper indicated that—

- the information made available on the public finances of the State was considerable and complex;
- to be useful, that information must be put into context and adequately explained and analysed;
- for the purpose of the paper, the State's financial institutions, that is to say, the State Bank, State Government Insurance Commission, S.A. Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and other public sector superannuation funds, were regarded as falling outside the public sector;
- intra public sector transfers were offset to reflect net transactions.

It goes on a little further down to point out yet again that there is a day of reckoning that is not far away and that the activities of SAFA must be suspect in relation to the year after, the year after that and the year after that. I am trying to suggest that, while it may be glorious today to say that we have been able to inject an additional sum of money into the predicted budget for 1986-87, the Auditor-General and others have clearly pointed out that there is a day when that sum will have to be repaid. That day is getting closer, which is the very self-same point that was made by author Morris West in his inaugural Playford Lecture. That is a warning which should be heeded but which has not yet been heeded by the present Government.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I will take up where the member for Light left off, because that is precisely the commencement of my own address on the budget and follows on absolutely in line with what he was saying. This is an extremely large borrowing budget, and I remember that prior to the last election one of the slogans that I used was that Premier Bannon had borrowed \$1 billion. That figure really represented the increase in the State's indebtedness over the three years prior to the last election. That pattern of borrowing has been maintained. One has only to look at the Auditor-General's Reports over the past 25 years to see how acutely borrowing has been increased over the past four years during the life of this present Labor Government. For example, from 1960 through to 1980 the increase in indebtedness of South Australia in the public accounts has been approximately \$100 million additional per annum. In the past four years that has changed quite radically. From 1983 to 1986 the State indebtedness has increased by over \$300 million, or threefold, per annum. In the current 1986-87 year the predicted increase is about \$450 million, which represents approximately a \$1.5 billion increase in indebtedness under the present Labor Government.

One has only to look at the budget papers handed down by the Treasurer a couple of weeks ago to see what impact this will have annually on South Australia in debt servicing alone. The 1983-84 debt service charges were \$191.96 million. In 1984-85 that figure had increased to \$261.94 million, and in 1985-86 the cost of servicing our debts had risen to just a fraction short of \$300 million. That means that \$300 million has to be raised and spent on interest on our debts before a single cent of Government income is expended on the essential aspects of running this State and providing the essential services of health, education, social welfare, and the like.

This Government really is creating millstones which will be around the necks of our children for decades to come. As I have said, the pace of borrowing and servicing debts is accelerating at an extremely rapid rate. Really, it means that the taxpayers of South Australia—and future generations—can look forward only to having to raise greater sums of money to service these exorbitant spendings of the present Labor Government, coupled with Federal Labor Government expenditure. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 8.5 p.m.]

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Before the dinner adjournment I referred to the quite massive millstone debt being created by State and Federal Labor Governments in Australia for

future generations. I also referred to the substantial increase in debt servicing costs from \$191 million interest in 1983-84 to \$300 million in 1985-86. I will now move on to several other topics, in the knowledge that my colleagues will cover the broader general scope of the budget in considerable detail. I choose to tackle one or two individual matters contained in the Auditor-General's Report.

The first is one affecting my local electorate, that is, the operation of the South Australian Timber Corporation in conjunction with the Woods and Forests Department. The House will recall that in his report to 30 June 1985 the Auditor-General drew attention to a number of problems within the corporation, not the least of which was the fact that the corporation had absolutely no equity base, yet it was borrowing substantially and acquiring properties and other industries, the operation generally showing absolutely no return to the Government: in fact, it was incurring an annual loss. The situation has not improved over the past 12 months. In fact, it has deteriorated considerably from the point of view of profitability. Referring to the financial position in his report (page 388), dealing with the corporation, the Auditor-General states:

Last year, I expressed concern that, unless the corporation could significantly increase its revenue from investments, losses would continue to accumulate. Based on the year's operating results and the increased borrowings, this concern still exists—

- the accumulated deficit at 30 June increased to \$2.3 million due mainly to the necessity to write off the loss of shares in O.R. Beddison Pty Ltd \$1.5 million (offset partly by a provision of \$400 000),
- the corporation has no equity base.—

the same statement as the previous year—

Due to the necessity to borrow large sums for investment capital, interest commitments are a major factor in the financial viability of the corporation and its associated companies. Borrowings increased by a further \$12.3 million to \$23.2 million of which \$14.3 million is advanced to associated companies:

- whilst a number of smaller ventures operated at a profit, International Panel and Lumber (Holdings) Pty Ltd was unable to meet interest on advances of \$11 million and provide a return on the corporation's shareholding in that company of \$3.6 million.

Little wonder then that the Auditor-General continues, as follows:

Although the corporation has expressed confidence in the long-term viability of its ventures, management needs to carefully monitor the performance of its activities in recognition of the following factors—

- predictions of future profits from International Panel and Lumber (Holdings) Pty Ltd rely heavily on—
 - further penetration of plywood sales into the Australian and overseas markets and access to the American market;
 - the acceptance and marketing of a new product, laminated veneer lumber (L.V.L).
- the successful development, production and marketing of a new reconstituted wood product (scrimber).
- further capital needed to develop scrimber.
- in the short term, the effect of economic conditions on the demand for wood products in Australia.

It is recognised that the requirement of the corporation to fund its investments from interest bearing borrowings has contributed to its lack of profitability.

He concludes:

If an equity base is provided to the corporation, then implicit in that financing arrangement should be a requirement that the corporation provide, within a reasonable time, an annual return to the Government representing an appropriate dividend payment and a statutory taxation payment.

I recall some opposition being registered in 1979 when the then Dunstan Government first brought forward the South Australian Timber Corporation legislation, but that measure passed both Houses with slight amendment and I recall that the Hon. Don Laidlaw in the Legislative Council said (page 2951 of *Hansard* of 27 February 1979):

Under sections 12, 13 and 16 of the Forestry Act 1950-1974, the Minister is empowered to operate mills for the treatment of timber, to sell any timber or any mill products and to enter into any transaction in order to execute these objects. This presumably would give him sufficient authority to undertake this woodchip project.

He was referring to the Panalur project that we were trying to organise with exchange of woodchips to India. He continued:

I can only assume that the Minister wishes to make use of a separate authority in order to be able to borrow up to \$1 million a year without the need to obtain Loan Council approval. Furthermore, a statutory authority engaged in a commercial enterprise probably is eligible to receive Federal export incentive payments, which would not be offered to a State Government department.

It is interesting that the present management of the Woods and Forests Department and, incidentally, the South Australian Timber Corporation, is currently recommending a review of the woods and forests legislation with a view, I understand, to amalgamation of the South Australian Timber Corporation and Woods and Forests Department. It concerned me and it still concerns me that the Timber Corporation comprises only three members—the Director of the Woods and Forests Department and two other members appointed by the Minister of the day. In addition, the South Australian Timber Corporation Act provides that two members of the corporation constitute a quorum and that a decision in which any two members of the corporation present at a meeting concur shall be a decision of the corporation. That means that matters of great weight can be arrived at and concluded by only two members of the Woods and Forests Department or the South Australian Timber Corporation.

In view of the increasing penetration of the Woods and Forests Department into State and international markets and its increasing involvement in purchasing and running other timber concerns, there is a very strong need to review both those Acts to change the system of management. But that apart, one question that remains in my mind is whether the Director of the Woods and Forests Department envisages an amalgamation, so that the Woods and Forests Department becomes a statutory authority like the South Australian Timber Corporation, or whether he simply wishes to embrace the Timber Corporation within a still Government run organisation, as is the Woods and Forests Department. I believe that the Woods and Forests Department management would prefer the creation of a statutory authority, but in the thinking behind establishing a committee of review to examine the benefits and disadvantages of amalgamation there is no indication of the rationale of the directors or anyone else, including the Minister. So I suggest to the Minister that he and his Director come before the Estimates Committees (which will be held in a couple of weeks) prepared to explain the rationale behind the amalgamation review.

I, for one, will certainly be extremely interested, and I understand that union and other members in the South-East are especially concerned that the proposed amalgamation—whether it be under a statutory authority or a Government department—should certainly have as one of its prime causes of concern the job security of employees. I wish to refer to other issues, although my time is running out. The reduction of our speaking time from half an hour to 20 minutes certainly causes one to either speak more quickly or to do more homework.

The next issue is tertiary education, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that four or five years ago I was pointing out to the then Government of the day that the South Australian College of Advanced Educa-

tion amalgamated had a superannuation liability of around \$50 million, which caused me concern, because I believe that statutorily the State is liable for payment of superannuation benefits but that, under a gentlemen's agreement arrived at between State and Federal Governments, the Federal Government has been looking after retirement payments for retirees from both of our universities and our amalgamated colleges of advanced education, the new SACAE.

However, if that gentlemen's agreement broke down (and one would hope that it does not), the Auditor-General has pointed out that currently the situation is far worse than that of five years ago. The superannuation liability for our tertiary institutions—and that does not include Roseworthy, which is currently struggling to manage its own affairs—currently is \$127 million. The significance of that very large sum is that it is not funded. It is simply a liability sitting on the books and, as and when there is retirement from any of those tertiary institutions, then the Federal and State Governments between them have to pick up the tab.

That means, simply, that the State taxpayer pays those superannuation liabilities. That is an issue which I am sure must be concerning the State Actuary and the Auditor-General on an ever-increasing scale as the years go by and as salaries escalate: not only do salaries escalate, but there is an annual incremental creep which is part and parcel of the education system.

The next point at issue is that the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority has increased its debt by another \$1.4 million this year—it increased \$1.1 million last year—so that the total debt stands at \$7.2 million. The Government continues to debt finance the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority, letting it go deeper and deeper into debt with ever-increasing annual interest repayments. This is very much the same pattern to which I drew the attention of the House for the State and Federal Governments overall policy of funding State improvements.

We go deeper and deeper into debt with little thought of what is going to happen in five or 10 years time when the bills fall due. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, when this Government loses power—which I suggest will not be in the too distant future—a future Government will have the problem of working its way out of a very sticky financial situation.

The Education Department is also the subject of criticism from the Auditor-General, who points out that the reorganisation which was proposed as a panacea for all of the ills in education, particularly in a top-heavy administration, has now been completed, but he also points out that, the reorganisation having been completed, the benefits are very difficult to assess, mainly because the base figures of teacher and ancillary staffing which were given to the then reorganisation committee back in 1982-83, were in fact improperly based.

As a result, there is no common figure against which to assess whether the current staffing is an improvement or not on the 1982-83 figure. One thing is significant, however: when present-day dollar expenditure on salaries is taken into consideration and equated with the 1982-83 dollar expenditure, the answer comes out to \$1 million extra being spent in salaries in administration.

So, the Auditor-General concludes that if anything the staffing situation has been worsened rather than improved. We have been losing about 5 000 students per annum from the primary-secondary system in South Australia's State schools. Since 1977-78, the member has fallen from about 245 000 to 196 000 students, an average of about 5 000 a year. In spite of that, teacher numbers have increased over

that period and the graphs would literally be diametrically opposed for student decline and teacher increase over that decade.

Another interesting factor that causes me great satisfaction is that over the past 10 years the Labor Party's current expenditure on education is the lowest during that decade. The highest during that decade was in those maligned days when the Tonkin Liberal Government was in power and we spent 32 per cent of the State's budget on education.

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

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I support the fourth Bannon budget and in doing so I want to bring back some balance to the debate. So far all we have heard is the Opposition whinging, complaining and carrying on, and that is all that this Opposition is good at doing. I want to give credit where credit is due, something the Opposition should do. I congratulate the Premier and Treasurer for bringing down a budget that again holds down State taxes—the third consecutive budget in which State taxation levels have remained stationary.

In fact, this budget provides significant taxation relief by way of a payroll and land tax relief package, valued at about \$13 million. People in my electorate will also applaud the increase in the Capital works program. This will maintain community services and help employment growth in the private sector. I will talk more about the capital works program shortly. The budget also reveals an \$11 million surplus in the 1985-86 budget—a much welcomed achievement that will further reduce the State's accumulated deficit which blew out under the previous Tonkin Government. The Premier in his budget speech described the budget as one of transition and a budget that recognises that times will be harder in the next few years than they have been in the past. He also described the budget as a document that will allow us to adapt to those leaner times without undue economic or social dislocation. The budget papers show a substantial decline in revenue from the Commonwealth Government and other sources. If, as expected, this decline continues we will obviously have less money to spend.

This Government has been very successful in managing the economy in the past three years and, if it was not for this prudent and skilful approach, we would have been unable to maintain a reasonable level of activity. Without such management no stimulus could have been provided to the private sector and we could not have maintained a reasonable level of community services. Luckily for South Australia, we have had a Government that has been spectacularly successful. For example, the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA), which the Bannon Government established in 1983, has enabled us to cushion the effects of cuts from Commonwealth funding and in other sources. I would have thought that the Opposition would give credit in this area, instead of knocking and whinging as it has done throughout the day, beginning during Question Time.

This year SAFA has contributed \$164 million to the State Budget. If SAFA's contribution was not available, we would have had some drastic expenditure cuts this year or a significant increase in taxes if we were to maintain a reasonable level of teachers, nurses, police and doctors. Fortunately for South Australia, the Bannon Government's economic management means that we do not have to take such a drastic course.

However, the Premier has pointed out that the community as a whole must realize that in future years we will not have the resources to continually increase services and that any call for an increase in one area will need to be met by a corresponding decline in another.

It was on this note that it was disappointing to see the irresponsible comments of the Leader of the Opposition immediately after the budget on budget night. To illustrate this, I quote from the *Advertiser* of Saturday 30 August an article by political writer Matthew Abraham, who I believe illustrated this point very effectively in stating:

In the face of this, it was surprising and disappointing to see the plastic post-Budget performance of Opposition Leader John Olsen. While Mr Bannon was still delivering his Budget speech, John Olsen went before the TV cameras on total automatic pilot.

This Budget was all about 'tax, tax, tax' said Mr Olsen in a broken-record spiel which must have been rehearsed beforehand. While it is important for Mr Olsen to catch the evening news, it is important for him also to project the right image of those news services.

Mr Olsen got it all wrong on Budget night. This Budget is not about 'tax, tax, tax', it is about 'borrow, borrow, borrow'. And at its very core, about 'jobs, jobs, jobs'.

The only thing the Opposition is good at is criticising the Government. For example, we have the Leader of the Opposition saying that the Government should reduce expenditure, reduce Government activity and reduce taxation while, on the other hand, demanding that the Government bail out incompetent private sector activities.

There is no better example of this than the Three Day Event debacle. The Leader's Party colleagues, shadow Ministers and back benchers, also continually want, want, want; they cannot and should not have it both ways. One of the reasons why the Opposition has been very unsuccessful in recent State elections is that the South Australian people know that the Opposition and Liberal Party in this State are made up of hypocrites.

I turn now to the benefits in the State Budget for housing. Home-buyers, those seeking public housing and emergency accommodation, building workers and the building industry will all benefit from the State budget. The great strength of this budget is its emphasis on housing, with funds being maintained and in some areas increased. The South Australian Housing Trust will be able to continue its development program, with more than 2 900 houses to be added to its stock in 1986-87. This will cost about \$210 million and will provide the building industry with considerable stability by ensuring a steady level of building activity throughout the year.

Another pleasing aspect of the budget is that the State Bank will receive \$135 million to provide 2 700 low interest housing loans at a rate of 54 loans a week. Overall, this housing package has increased by 13 per cent in real terms from \$161 million last year to \$282 million this year. When one adds to this the Federal Government's contribution one sees that South Australia still has the best housing budget in the country, in relative terms, with a total value of \$460 million.

Mortgage relief has also been increased from \$600 000 to \$900 000. This will enable the State Government to continue to act as a last resort helper for families unable to meet mortgage commitments. Providing opportunities to obtain affordable housing, whether rental or purchase, has become a hallmark of this Government. I am pleased to say that this budget continues that trend. This commitment to housing not only meets community needs but stimulates the home building industry to the benefits of the broader economy in this State. There is no better example of this increase in home building activity than in my electorate.

For education the 1986-87 South Australian budget provides improvement in resources for schools. We have the best schools in Australia and it is pleasing to see that quality will be maintained in 1987, and improved in some very key areas. Over the past 10 years our investment in education per student has increased by 40 per cent, and in

1986-87 \$3 250 will be spent on average, for each student. This is an increase of \$940 for each student in our schools.

Teachers have attracted much attention in recent years, so it is pleasing to note that 100 contract teachers will be made permanent in 1986-87, joining the 500 former contract teachers made permanent since 1982. An amount of \$4.5 million has been provided for new children's services projects.

An additional sum of \$350 000 has been allocated for minor works and equipment, and \$373 000 for pre-schools. In the next year five new kindergartens, two new child parent centres and eight subsidised child-care centres will be opened. Also, 10 new subsidised child-care centres will be started during 1986-87 at a total cost of \$2.014 million. Parents, teachers and students can be confident that the Education Department budget furthers the Government's goals of excellence, equality and efficiency in education. I am delighted to support the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In speaking in this debate I want to talk principally about the issue of time zones that the Government has now forced on us. Before doing so, I want to make a couple of comments about the budget. The fact that the Government came through last year by reducing the accumulated deficit by about \$11 million should be supported and at least recognised by this House. However, the fact that through the budget the Government now proposes to reverse that trend and to go back and put us into increasingly greater debt is a matter of concern. I can recall the first budget presented by the Treasurer following the Labor Government's assuming office. There was a large accumulated deficit, and the Treasurer gave an undertaking that within three years he would be able to reduce that deficit to nil. I applauded him at that time, for I believed that his motivation should be recognised and I believe that every South Australian thought it correct and proper to recognise that objective.

However, that was not to come to pass during that first year, although, as the Premier explained, programs were in motion that could not be reversed overnight. Therefore, the deficit grew to quite some extent. However, from that point on there was a gradual pegging back of the accumulated deficit, to the stage where now, as of 30 June this year, the deficit is \$40 million. This budget means that the accumulated deficit will be increased by \$7.5 million, and I just want to add my voice of protest and to point out that I do not believe that that is the correct direction in which to go. I believe that a change of direction from achieving an \$11 million surplus to a \$7.3 million deficit, collectively an \$18 million change in there, needs to be watched very carefully. To that end, I think some words of caution need to be expressed.

Since the budget was brought down, the Government has announced that it intends to change South Australia's time zone to Eastern Standard Time. The reaction of people in the communities that I represent has ranged from 'The Bs must be mad,' to total disbelief that any sane or responsible person would attempt to make such a change, first, without proper consultation with the community, with at least a referendum or, secondly, without heeding the wishes of business, the tourist industry, local government agricultural bureaux, the Women's Agricultural Bureau, the Country Women's Association, and so on. Almost every organisation in South Australia has opposed very strongly the very move that the Government intends to make.

For the life of me, I cannot understand what the Government is up to. Is it being mischievous? Does it intend to deceive the public to the extent that it wishes to create

a cloud or a smoke screen, if you like, to distract people's attentions from the real issues of the day? That is the point that worries me. Just what has motivated the Government to undertake this course of action? I have endeavoured to find out where in South Australia there has been any demand or push for Eastern Standard Time. To my knowledge, there has never been a letter to the editor or a public request by any organisation for Eastern Standard Time, although there have been plenty of expressions of opinion against it.

The only information I have received—and this has come from the Minister's office—is that a committee called the Green Triangle Committee, or council, or whatever it might be, has made representations. I am still at a loss to really understand what this organisation is, because from what I have found out so far, apparently, it comprises more Victorian business people than it does South Australians.

When that committee is alleged to be demanding that the South Australian Government change the time zones one questions where the Government's priorities lie. Will it have demands placed upon it by a committee that is predominantly made up of interstaters and people who live outside the State? Is the Government pandering to the wishes of those people? Is it serious about South Australian business? I wonder whether it is.

Perhaps this is my cynical political mind but I wonder whether the Government is honouring a political favour following the last election and whether it gave an undertaking to a handful of big businesses that it would attempt to alter the time zone. That raises questions that have not been answered by the Government. It is not able to answer those questions and hold up its head.

The proposed change is ludicrous. I have already pointed out in the Chamber that if we had Eastern Standard Time and daylight saving, the relevant natural time meridian would be 160 kilometres from New Zealand. That is how far we would be out of kilter, but the Government seems to take it in its stride. What motivates a Government to want to be so different from the rest of the world that it will take it on its shoulders to interfere with nature to that extent? I do not understand, and I do not think that anyone else does.

In doing research on this matter I came across an article written in 1982, when the Mount Gambier City Council said (and perhaps this is the basis of the Government's argument) that it wanted national time zones abolished and a common time for all the States. With due respect to those on the council, that would be ludicrous. People would be starting work in the eastern part of the state at 9 o'clock in full daylight while in the west they would be starting in the dark. That is the Government's problem.

Shearers who start at 7.30, but, because they are not allowed to work overtime, they cannot start work an hour late, as the unions demand that they knock off at 5.30.

Mr Becker: Why should they not work overtime?

Mr BLACKER: If we tried that, a shed would be black banned as quick as lightning. Trying to get the shearers to work an extra half hour to cut out a run or work on Saturday morning is not on. The whole thing goes down the line because it has union backing.

We already have shearers in the middle of winter starting work virtually in the dark. If they had to start half an hour earlier, as the Government is proposing, nearly every shearer or shed, for the bulk of the shearing season, in the wetter parts of the State, would be starting in the dark. That is ludicrous. What about the public servants? I am thinking about the E&WS, the Highways employees and the outside staff—those who start work at 7.30.

Is it the Government's wish that we get them out of bed so that they start in the dark? I think that the Government has to stop and have a good look at this one, because it is just not on.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says they would be delighted. I am not sure about their children. I know for a fact, even in the circumstances of today's light, that there are children on Eyre Peninsula in grade 1 being put on a bus—I am not saying they get on a bus, but being put on a bus—for 10 weeks of the year and, although it is light, the sun has not come over the horizon. Take another half an hour off that, and I do not think that is fair on any child. I do not think any person here would agree that it is fair on any child to be put on a school bus for an hour's ride—and in many cases a lot more—and then be expected to behave rationally. I do not think it is fair. Just human common sense and common decency would tell any sane person that.

The Minister of State Development and Technology, formerly the Minister of Education, would know that there are plenty of students throughout this State who board school buses at 7.05, 7.10 or about that time. I do not believe that I am being unfair or unreasonable in pleading to the Government—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Thank you, Mr Minister. I am most grateful for your raising that. That has been debated in the majority of school councils. It has been raised by district councils, CWAs and just about every other community group. There is a problem, and the problem seems to be unions—teachers initially. The teachers do not want to work at those times. They want their daylight saving period. It does not matter what the community thinks. In many cases they have overridden school councils. I did not think that you could do that, because I thought parents had majority control on school councils. We had an example where the teachers agreed, the community agreed—everyone agreed except the bus drivers.

Mr Tyler: What school is he talking about?

Mr BLACKER: Ceduna. I think. The member for Eyre would be able to back me up, but he is not here. It has been tried at Warrambo and Wudinna. There it is also a problem with school starting theoretically at 10 o'clock instead of 9 o'clock, the mother starting work at 9 o'clock, and the child going to school at 10 o'clock. Is that rational? Sure, it may not be a national problem or a State-wide problem, but it is a problem to those individuals. It is a problem to the working mums and those people who have to go to work. This Government is saying to those mums who have to go to work, 'You go to work but leave your child loose for an hour before school starts.'

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The member for Hanson says they have to go to work to save the farm. Unfortunately, that statement is truer than perhaps he first imagines, but it is in fact a reality.

I have received piles of correspondence, and I am not sure how many inches thick it is. It just goes on and on. Today I received two letters which sum up in a common-sense and rational way the concerns of the community in relation to time changes. The first letter I wish to quote is from Mr David Humphris, President of the South Australian Rural Youth Movement, GPO Box 1671, Adelaide. He states:

Re: PROPOSED CHANGES TO TIME ZONES

The Rural Youth Movement of South Australia is an organisation with member representation in all areas of our State.

including Adelaide. We wish to express our concern over the recent proposal to change South Australia's time zone.

The issue was considered and discussed at our last State Executive meeting held on 7 September 1986. Representatives at the meeting expressed strong opposition to the State changing to Eastern Standard Time.

A motion was passed at the meeting that this letter be written to you expressing our concern with this issue. Indicated below are some of the reasons for our concern.

Business operates effectively on an international scale passing through many time zones. Therefore, the argument that South Australian business would prosper is invalid.

What is so different about South Australian business that it cannot operate within time zones? Every other business in the world does. Do South Australian businessmen have a lower mentality which makes them unable to handle that? I do not wish that to be recorded as being a derogatory remark about business, but that is what the Government seems to be saying about business. The letter continues:

The changes proposed would especially disadvantage country people living west of Adelaide, because of the long distances that school children who now catch a school bus at 6.55 a.m., will be catching it at 6.25 a.m. in the dark. This will further increase the problems of lack of sleep at night, loss of concentration during afternoon school lessons for all children, along with the current problem of travelling home in the hottest part of the day.

The Government will not consider giving those children shadowed glass on the sides of the school buses, let alone air-conditioning. Every member here would probably drive around in an air-conditioned car and spend only half an hour a day in that car—except country members.

Ms Lenahan: And the other metropolitan members.

Mr BLACKER: I take that point. However, we expect schoolchildren to be on a school bus from 7 a.m. to 8.45 a.m. and for the same period of time at the end of the day. With daylight saving and Eastern Standard Time, that will be during the heat of the day, and that is the problem. The letter continues:

Another disadvantage to country people, particularly farmers, is at shearing time where shearers start work at 7.30 a.m. Even now it is often dark in winter time, and at either end of the daylight saving period. Many pastoral shearing sheds have no facilities for lighting, therefore reducing efficient productivity through lost time. Shearers work by standards set by the Australian Workers Union and work by the clock, not by the sun. Neither do they work overtime to make up for time lost in delayed starting time.

Members know that. A wet day can stop shearing and shearers cannot make up that time. The letter continues:

Due to grain moisture content controls, the start of harvesting each day is controlled by the sun and weather, not the clock. If moisture levels are too high (common in the early morning), the grain is unacceptable to the South Australia Cooperative Bulk Handling Ltd. With 8 000 farming families involved in the harvesting of South Australia's most important cereal crop, wheat, a further offsetting of delivery times of grain to silos would result in the need for temporary paddock storage of 48 000 tonnes of grain every night, throughout the State. With the proposed time changes, the silos will in effect be open for a shorter period during the ideal time of the day for harvesting. This once again reduces optimum productivity of a very important industry.

The West Coast of South Australia relies on GTS BKN 4 television in Port Pirie, and in parts ABC television for news services. If the proposed change to daylight saving was to take place, viewers west of the 137° longitude line will receive the 6.30 p.m. news at 5.30 p.m. which is much earlier than farmers and business people can be home.

I ask members to consider the following point. The letter continues:

Also GTS BKN 4 would be able to play a commercial for alcohol legally at 8.30 p.m. in Port Pirie, and at the same time illegally at 7.30 p.m. west of 137° longitude. A similar problem arises with telecasting Adults Only rated programs from stations east of the new time zone, when it is prime children's television viewing time in the western zone.

The Rural Youth Movement of South Australia recommends that:

1. South Australia remain on Central Standard Time.

2. Daylight saving cease on the weekend prior to school commencing in February each year.

I believe that to be a rational approach to the problem and I believe that the Government should consider it. I believe that the Government would consider it if it was thinking, first, of the children and, secondly, of the general business community throughout the State. Regrettably my time is running out. I received a somewhat different letter from the Women's Agricultural Bureau of South Australia, which shows similar support.

I have received literally dozens of letters from CWA groups and every local government body in my electorate. No doubt, if members in this Chamber were honest, they would all admit to knowing of the community concern surrounding this issue. I know that many members of the Government, the Liberal Opposition and the Democrats have been, or are being, invited to attend the meeting at Port Lincoln to discuss the concerns of residents. Those concerns are many and varied from both a business and tourism point of view. How can we promote Eyre Peninsula as a tourist destination when its residents are being told that each day during summer there will be an hour less of daylight?

Ms Lenahan interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am saying from the close of business.

Ms Lenahan interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am sorry, but this matter was raised with me by the regional tourist officer.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): There is a considerable amount that I would like to add to what the member for Flinders has said on the subject of the time change, but there will be an opportunity to do that when the legislation comes before the House. I find it incredible that the change is being taken for granted as a result of a Cabinet decision and that the State will go down this track despite all the concerns being expressed. I am not in the same situation as the member for Flinders because I cannot say that I represent a rural community. In fact, I represent a very mixed metropolitan and partly rural electorate. Certainly, the concerns I am receiving by way of correspondence and through personal contact indicate that there is a considerable amount of concern in the community. I will use my time this evening to discuss aspects of the budget, and I look forward to a later opportunity to discuss the matter raised by the member for Flinders in this House tonight.

Much has been said about the budget. In summary, we on this side recognise the concerns being expressed by a wide cross-section of people in this State as a result of the budget. I think it is fair to say that in the final analysis it is recognised as a 'borrow and hope' budget. It has been referred to in those terms by media commentators, by my colleagues and by those in the community who are directly affected by the budget. The Government is budgeting for a \$7.3 million deficit on current accounts after an 8.3 per cent increase in recurrent receipts and an 8.7 per cent increase in recurrent payments.

It could be said that in financing the State budget the key item is the massive increase in the contribution from the South Australian Financing Authority, as debt servicing costs to SAFA and other statutory authorities have soared by some \$44 million. Today during Question Time concerns were expressed by the Opposition yet, again, very little in the way of an answer was provided to dismiss those concerns. However, the Government does admit that its continued ability to borrow at such levels and to service the debt commitments arising from those borrowings will depend

to a marked extent on how quickly the national economy improves. That is a rather dangerous situation to be in. As has been said before, it is a borrow and hope budget based on a lot of happenings that we cannot see clearly. It has certainly come about at a time when this State's economy is rapidly heading downward.

I am not necessarily concerned about the community we represent today but, rather, about our children and their children who, as a result of this Government's actions, will be the ones who will have to carry the financial burden of escaping from the problems which we are experiencing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Members of the Government backbench can continue with all the huffing and puffing they wish. They are quite happy to put up a smokescreen and to suggest to their constituents that everything is rosy—there is nothing to worry about; big brother Government is looking after them and there are no problems at all. All one has to do is look at the problems that will occur in years to come, to realise that we will not be here to worry about them: our children will have to pick up the costs. Let us look—

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will go into the Government's policy, which the Premier very clearly has set down in this House, and I will refer to some of that a little later. Let us look at some of the aspects of the present economy and such things as employment growth, unemployed persons, job vacancies, retail sales and motor vehicle registrations. I realise that these matters have been referred to, and it is quite obvious that members opposite are not interested, although I do not know what one has to do to make this sink in.

In South Australia, for the three months to the end of July 1986, the increase in employment growth compared to that of the previous year was 2.8 per cent, whereas for Australia it was 4.1 per cent. South Australia misses out. In relation to unemployed persons, again on an average for three months to the end of July 1986, there was a decrease in Australia of 0.8 per cent and in South Australia there was an increase of 1.3 per cent. South Australia misses out again. Job vacancies advertised decreased in Australia by 2.1 per cent, but in South Australia they decreased by 23 per cent. People cannot argue about that. The statistics are available from the papers delivered to each and every member in this House in connection with the budget.

For the June quarter 1986, in Australia retail sales increased by 10.7 per cent on the previous year, and in South Australia they increased by only 7.9 per cent. In Australia there is a reduction of 19.4 per cent in motor vehicle registrations, compared to a reduction in South Australia of 24.7 per cent. I suggest that those areas of employment growth, unemployed persons, job vacancies, retail sales and motor vehicle registrations reflect a very sad story as far as South Australia is concerned. I hope that most people are beginning to realise that.

In South Australia the number of new dwellings approved for 1985-86 decreased by 27 per cent, whereas the national total of new dwelling approvals for 1985-86 was 7.8 per cent, down from 9.4 per cent in 1984-85. Again, that reflects a very sad situation for South Australia. During the term of the Tonkin Government criticisms were made about the estimated resident population figures.

There was much huff and puff expressed at that time by the Labor Party whose members were indicating that people were moving out of South Australia, and certainly there was not any increase in population. Let us see what is happening at present in South Australia. I refer to the

following figures showing percentage growth in Australia during 1985:

ACT 4.48 per cent
NT 3.75 per cent
WA 1.98 per cent

The House will well recall that South Australia and Western Australia were running neck and neck, and we have seen a massive increase in Western Australia in recent times. The growth figures continue:

Qld 1.61 per cent
NSW 1.16 per cent
Tas 1.05 per cent
Vic 1.01 per cent
SA 0.68 per cent

Need I say it: South Australia is on the bottom of the list again. That can be described only as a sad situation for this State. Obviously, there is no way that we are keeping up with the average growth in Australia.

The statistics paint a grim picture for South Australia. The Treasurer's department has, by its own hand, admitted that South Australia is being outperformed by the rest of Australia. No-one other than the Bannon Government can be blamed for this performance. I come back to the situation that it is not this Government that is facing the problems: it is our children who will have to come to terms with these massive borrowings and other massive problems that will prevail when they come to have some responsibility in regard to the State.

The other matter that concerns me is the attitude of the average person. Earlier I said that Government backbenchers were happy to huff and puff and paint a rosy picture for the people of South Australia. I have become aware while performing my duties that there are many people who do not think further than their nose concerning the State's economy. Many people in South Australia are perfectly happy to sit back and rest on their laurels and think that everything will be all right. This attitude has grown up over time and sooner or later the majority of people will have to come to terms with the significant problems that we have. Of course, while all that is going on—and I have referred to that sad state of affairs—one area in South Australia that has continued to grow rapidly is the public sector, with the increase in our bureaucracy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Government members can chuckle to themselves. If they are not being made aware by their constituents of increased regulation resulting from an increased public sector, that is not our fault. It simply means that Government members are totally out of touch with their own constituents. There is grave concern about the cost to this State of the public sector and the increase in the bureaucracy, and they continue to sail through; not worried about it, not caring about it at all. Certainly, Government members are not worried about the effect that all this is having on the State's economy. There is only one reason for this situation, and already I have shown that South Australia has the lowest growth rate of any Australian State. Therefore, South Australia and the population that it carries in no way can afford the current bureaucracy. There is no way that it can afford a public sector the present size, yet that area continually increases.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Members opposite are constantly asking what a Liberal Government would do. I point out that the Leader of the Opposition recently (just before the two week recess) spelt out clearly in this House what a Liberal Government would do. In this Parliament the Leader of the Opposition called for action on a number of fronts in response to the growing State and national economic

difficulties that we face. The Leader said that South Australia needs the following:

- a wage freeze until at least mid 1987.
- a review of the holiday leave loading—

and that is one thing that I support very strongly indeed—

- firm opposition to the ACTU superannuation push.
- scrapping of the fringe benefits tax, capital gains tax, superannuation lump sum tax and assets test.

Members opposite are quiet now. I presume that they agree with all this but have not had the guts to do anything about it. We need:

- no real increase in Federal and State Government spending for three years.
- the introduction of a compulsory work for the dole scheme.
- rejection of current proposals by the Bannon Government to force changes to workers compensation and industrial safety legislation on employers.

The Leader further said:

I trust that it may now be possible to forge a consensus based on a common understanding and acceptance of the new conditions and the new challenges that we face. I throw out that challenge to the Premier and his Governments—will they grasp the new reality, the need for some far-reaching changes in attitude and in action? I hope that all members will accept in these days of dollar shock and trade trauma that, even at the State Government level, action is possible to free up the economy so that it is more responsive to the opportunities of tomorrow.

A deregulated and more competitive State economy with less Government interference and fewer burdens on industry is essential if we are to confront what is the key issue in South Australia's economic future—our ability to increase our exports, especially into the massive potential markets of the Asian-Pacific region.

I could continue to quote the Leader's remarks, but I do not have the time. No member in this House, particularly the backbenchers on the Government side, can say that we are not setting down very firm guidelines in this regard.

The other thing that concerns me about the direction in which this State is heading is the total lack of incentive in the State in regard to those who should be fully exempt—those who are looking to employ. People have told me that they are past the stage of even considering employing more people because of the costs and regulations associated with employing in this State. That is a very sad situation when we are looking to an increase in unemployment. I suggest that we are doing very little indeed to improve that situation because of the lack of incentive.

There is also little incentive for families. We only have to look at the federal taxing system to recognise that. There is no incentive in this State whatsoever for a husband and wife who are attempting to bring up a family. I know that, because my wife and I are trying to bring up four children. The lack of incentive resulting from the taxing system in this country for a normal family is quite unbelievable. Unfortunately, my time has run out, but I want to make one plea to the Government. I know that this is not the time to ask for more money.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Members should bear with me. This Government can pay out millions of dollars because of a defunct situation in relation to the Three Day Event and other activities, but I am talking about the need for \$30 000 to support the Parents of Hearing Impaired in this State. I suggest that that area is a hell of a lot more important than a lot of the other crap on which this Government is spending money in South Australia at present. These people who are representing the deaf children of this State find themselves in a critical situation, and I have referred to this matter in the grievance debate previously. They now have 10 days in which the Minister of Education can make up his ruddy mind for once about whether or not the Government is prepared to give assistance to enable a lec-

turer to work in the college to help these kids whose hearing is impaired.

As I said earlier, I have referred to this matter at least once before. All that the Parents of Hearing Impaired in South Australia wants is an answer. I sincerely hope that it is an answer in the positive, because I believe that if ever an organisation needs help it is one that looks after children who are disadvantaged by being deaf. As I say, it is a matter of \$30 000, and if priorities cannot be arranged to provide that assistance for a worthwhile cause there is something very wrong with this Government.

I plead again for the Minister of Education and for the Premier to consider their situation and to decide immediately to make available to the Parents of Hearing Impaired in South Australia the \$30 000 which it desperately wants to enable it to provide assistance for the deaf children in this State.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): That was a most disappointing contribution from the honourable member who, essentially, failed to deal with the budget at all. In fact, most of his speech dwelt on Canberra. Let us look at what is within our control at State level. I want to place on record my congratulations to the Premier for the competent way in which he and Cabinet are managing the State's finances. So far members opposite have not really dealt with the State budget at all; they have complained about Canberra. Members should come back to reality and look at what is within our State's control.

Let us look at the setting for the budget strategy. There has been a 23 per cent reduction by the Commonwealth in capital grants to the States. Our borrowing program under the Loan Council arrangements has been cut by 23 per cent. Our Commonwealth grant for South Australia under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement remains unchanged in monetary terms, and that means a real cut when inflation is taken into account. Overall, 46 per cent of our State budget revenues comes from the Commonwealth, and overall Commonwealth cuts to South Australia have resulted in a 3.5 per cent reduction in Commonwealth revenues. Combined with our problems, as a consequence of cuts from Canberra, our stamp duty collections have been down \$22 million. We have had this year a \$30 million reduction in royalties from the Cooper Basin as a consequence of the over-supply of petrol and the fall in world oil prices.

Notwithstanding these problems confronting South Australia, the Premier has been able to produce a budget which contains an \$11 million surplus, enabling us to reduce our accumulated deficit from \$51 million to \$40 million, and members should not forget that we inherited a \$63 million deficit from members opposite when they were in Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: They know it is true. I know that they do not like to be reminded of that deficit. During the past 12 months tax cuts of \$42 million have been delivered to South Australians, and that is a truly remarkable result. Moreover, there have been no capital works transfers for the past two years. The member for Kavel said that it is time for a new direction. Let us look at the direction his Party gave us when it was in Government between 1979 and 1982. It inherited a \$1.5 million budgetary surplus from the outgoing Corcoran Government—and that was as at 30 June 1980 and as recorded in the budgetary papers. In August 1981, the Liberal Government transferred \$44 million from capital works moneys (and I know members opposite are very silent now because that is how they were going to manage

the finances of South Australia) to fund their recurrent expenditure.

The Liberal Government continued these transfers from capital works and provided in the August 1982 budget \$42 million from capital works. It said that it was a balanced budget but immediately it was \$42 million in the red. That \$42 million became \$51.9 million as at 30 June 1983. Combined with that, building up in the system was an accumulated deficit of another \$6.1 million.

So what would be the consequence of the new direction that members opposite want to take South Australia back to? They ran up \$44 million in August 1981 as a result of capital works transfers, another \$51.9 million and a \$6.1 million accumulated deficit. There was then a blow out in the deficit of another \$57 million. The Liberal Government misled the people of South Australia in August 1982 as it did not have a balanced budget.

In two or three years, that Government let the State's finances go to the tune of \$159 million. A sum of \$100 million was wasted through the transference of capital works. That is why there was a recession under the Tonkin Liberal Government and members opposite know it. There was a recession in those years because that Government used capital works money to prop up its failure to manage the State's finances competently.

What did we do in the capital works area upon coming to Government? We inherited this \$100 million wasted in capital works money, plus the blowout of another \$57 million and an accumulated deficit of another \$6 million, totalling \$159 million. In our 1983-84 budget, we reduced the \$51.9 million that had been used to \$28 million in capital works moneys; an amount of \$28 million was used and, in August 1984, the 1984-85 budget proposed a further \$25 million in capital works moneys which was not used. So, all this Government has done is use some \$28 million of capital works moneys as we were forced to do in August 1983 to ensure that the State got through that traumatic period. In August 1985 we put an end to the capital works transfers and, in August 1986, in the Premier's speech to the Parliament, that was confirmed.

What a truly remarkable result on behalf of the Premier and Cabinet in a short time to be able to reduce an accumulated deficit of \$63 million down to \$40 million and come in with a surplus this year of \$11 million this year whilst budgeting for a small deficit of \$7.3 million next year.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to that. The honourable member will get his opportunity. I know that it is painful for members opposite to have to face the fact that Labor Government are competent financial managers. Members can laugh, but how can members laugh against their record in Government when they frittered away \$159 million? Is that what they are laughing about? A total of \$159 million was frittered away through financial incompetence.

Let us look at the contribution of statutory authorities to State Budget revenue. Let us look at some of the authorities and some of the governmental bodies that members opposite were going to privatise. The Electricity Trust contributed some \$28.2 million—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Mr Acting Speaker, I ask your indulgence in having the member for Bragg discontinue. I point out the benefit of contributions of statutory authorities to State Government revenue including, from the Electricity Trust from 1985-86 by virtue of a levy, \$28.2 million. I know that members opposite last year wanted to privatise the Electricity Trust. The State Bank—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I do not care how the honourable member describes it. It is a substantial contribution from a semi-government authority to our budgetary position. If the honourable member wants to do away with that money, let him get up and say it.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I hope to hear you. The State Bank contributed 12.5 million as a consequence of a payment in lieu of income tax. That meant that for 1985-86 ETSA and the State Bank contributed \$40.7 million to Government revenue.

Next year, combined with the Woods and Forests Department contribution of \$2.9 million, because they are to make a payment in lieu of income tax (and we know that honourable members opposite wanted to privatise the Woods and Forests Department), it means that for 1986-87 \$43.9 million will be contributed to the budget by these authorities. That is a very significant contribution to State budget finances, much of which honourable members opposite would have liked to privatise completely and dispense with.

I turn now to return on capital. Let us look at the contribution that we get from the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which in 1985-86 contributed \$84 million by way of return on capital to State Government budgetary revenue. The State Bank made a return of capital of \$6.5 million, meaning that the total return on capital to our budgetary revenues by these two authorities in 1985-86 was \$90.5 million; that will increase in 1986-87 to a total of \$177.9 million, being a contribution from the South Australian Government Financing Authority of \$164 million and \$13.9 million from the State Bank. The borrowings—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I think that the Leader of the Opposition got up and criticised these borrowings. First, the borrowings were originally estimated at \$195.6 million from the South Australian Government Financing Authority. As it turned out, we needed only \$181 million. That \$14 million figure was the result of an improvement in our recurrent operations. We did not have to borrow as much, and that again advances my point about the financial competence of this Government. We did not need the full \$195 million.

Because of the success of the South Australian Government Financing Authority, we are able to maintain the economy of this State despite the cutbacks at Federal level and despite all the problems that are confronting economies in the world today and the economies that our State Government faces. Because of the success of statutory authorities, and because of the success of the South Australian Government Financing Authority, we are able to increase our borrowings from that statutory authority to ensure that this State's economy continues.

In 1985-86 the South Australian Government Financing Authority had a surplus of \$189 million of which \$84 million went to the State Government by way of a return on capital, which I have already mentioned, and of the other \$105 million the sum of \$30 million has been put away for investments and \$75 million has gone into a reserve account. So, this year, as a consequence of the strength of that statutory authority, the estimates of receipts show that we are able to budget for a contribution of \$164 million, because the South Australian Government Financing Authority will have a projected surplus of \$210 million. Not only that, but also there is immediately a \$46 million reserve. These revenues are guaranteed because they come from governmental and semi-governmental authorities, so we know that we have a certain guaranteed revenue.

Mr D.S. Baker: The three card trick.

Mr GROOM: It is not a three card trick. No matter how the honourable member describes it, whatever the niceties, the fact of the matter is that the South Australian Government Financing Authority is an extremely successful body and a very competent manager of offshore investments as well as investments within Australia. It will have a projected surplus of \$210 million. This means that, with its general reserve of \$75 million, and the \$30 million that it has been able to put away because of competent management, SAFA will have an extra \$46 million to play around with, too, if it comes in on target of \$210 million.

I note that the Under Treasurer has said that that \$210 million is a very conservative estimate. Not only that but also they have an annual balance sheet of \$7 153 million. This is an extremely competent authority, which is competently managed and which—as I mentioned and as I will reiterate for the member for Bragg—will show a return on capital next year of \$164 million. Let us hear honourable members scoff at that. That is a very significant contribution to State Government revenue and, when one combines it with revenue from other statutory and semi-governmental authorities, one can see the benefits that this State gets from a partnership between private enterprise and public enterprise. Members opposite would have liked to privatise the lot.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member wants to debate privatisation, he can do so, and I will respond later. To maintain the South Australian economy, for 1986-87 we need a total of \$566 million in capital money. From the Loan Council we will be getting \$156 million. That was to be \$203 million, of course without cuts, and from statutory authorities we will increase our borrowings to \$314 million, which is an increase of \$136 million on the \$180 million used last year. Combined with that, we must increase borrowings to maintain the economy, because I note that we are \$4 million down on receipts from the Commonwealth for specific purposes. As a consequence, we need to increase State borrowings for capital works. To maintain our housing targets we have had to increase borrowings from the statutory authority.

Our target for 1986-87 is 2 800 additional units for the Housing Trust, plus the figure of 100 that is being carried over from 1985-86, and we must maintain the 54 concessional loans each week. To maintain that, we need a total outlay of \$180 million—in other words, an increase of some 25 per cent from the previous year's figure of \$149.5 million. In 1985-86, our Housing Trust targets were 2 900 units, plus a 300 carryover, and the need to keep up the weekly concessional loans. So, that is why the South Australian Government has had to increase its borrowings from the South Australian Government Financing Authority, but that can be done only if there is a competently managed authority and only if significant contributions are made by statutory authorities.

This new direction that members opposite have purportedly spoken on is nothing more than a return to their sorts of formulas that have been used in the past. How can they criticise the Premier, when in the years from 1979 to 1982 the Liberal Government ran up a budgetary deficit of \$63 million and at the same time transferred over some \$100 million in capital works money, which meant that it was taken from the South Australian economy? The present Government has been able to avoid that situation, and in fact the only capital works transfer occurred in 1983-84, when I think \$28 million was used and then a further \$25 million was set aside for 1984-85 which was not used. So,

in a short space of time there has been a remarkable turnabout in the State's position.

In November 1983, members opposite carried on about the financial institutions duty. They opposed it and they did all sorts of things, but that is now contributing \$33 million to State Government revenue. Had members opposite had their way and if we did not have that financial institutions duty, where would the Government get the money from? What would they do? They would have to go back to their old formula. Further, members opposite will abolish everything. Like John Howard, they will give everything away, with things going for \$99.99, which is his sort of line. Members opposite would curtail all these institutions and give everything back. How then does one run the State?

Obviously, members opposite have no policies. All they can do is get up and criticise. However, when one analyses their record one sees what they did to the South Australian economy. They put the economy in reverse. They created a recession because they were incompetent. Members opposite were facing an election towards the end of 1982, and before going to that election they presented to the people the 1982 budget as being a balanced one, knowing that to be untrue, and they frittered away \$100 million in capital works. They told lies to the people in August 1982 about their budgetary position.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order. The member for Hartley used the term 'lies' as an inference against the Opposition. I believe that that is completely unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr GROOM: To make it easy, I simply say that they told untruths to the South Australian electorate about their budgetary position when coming into the 1982 election.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member whether he is withdrawing the unparliamentary words that he used and replacing them with others.

Mr GROOM: I will withdraw, in deference to the honourable member, and I substitute the words that they told untruths to the South Australian electorate. South Australians cannot put these people back into government. They are quite incompetent when it comes to financial management. Would not members opposite have liked to deliver the budget that the Premier delivered a week or so ago?

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I have always subscribed to the view that the State and Federal Governments should not be allowed to budget for, or end a financial year with, a deficit. The Consolidated Account, which finances the day-to-day running of the State, is operating under a debt of some \$40 million. The appendix to the report of the Auditor-General gives the details of the State Consolidated Account. I want to rebut some of the remarks made by the member for Hartley. His Government promised a balanced budget and, when it came in, it had in hand a surplus of \$11 million. I am not critical of that. However, the so-called balanced budget was pretty wide of the mark. Page 1 of the Auditor-General's Report, which was tabled today, for the year ending 30 June 1986, says that the Government had 'a saving of \$33.7 million against the round sum allowance for increased wage and salary rates and other contingencies'. In other words, the Government overbudgeted for wages and salaries and other contingencies. The report goes on to say that there was 'an improvement in receipt from public undertakings, \$8.1 million; and in receipts from royalties, rents, etc., \$5.6 million'. So, there was some \$47 million in benefits on that side of the ledger and, on the other side, State taxation receipts were down \$16.4 million and departmental recoveries and receipts were down \$23.3 million.

The reason for that is the non-receipt of the budgeted amount of \$34.3 million under the Minister of Housing miscellaneous provisions. The books in that department were not all that well monitored and supervised by the Minister of Housing and Construction. We shall have more to say about his performance later. Those figures are wide of the mark, false, and do not present the true picture. It makes it difficult for the people of South Australia to understand what is going on. The public debt—what the State owes—is \$6 billion gross for the first time.

Mr S.G. Evans: Do the public understand what \$6 billion means?

Mr BECKER: It is \$6 000 million. That figure, on top of what the Federal Government owes, represents \$3 million for every person. That is a staggering deficit figure. The net indebtedness of the State, when one takes off the credit funds held by statutory authorities and so on, is about \$3.8 billion.

The horrible tragedy of such financial statements is that not only are our children saddled with a terrible debt, but unborn generations to follow will inherit from us, as a result of the folly of socialist Governments, a debt that they will never repay. They will struggle to pay the taxes to cover the interest, let alone the repayment of the debt. Unless strong management and disciplined Governments reduce spending, little economic progress will be made in the State or in the country. South Australia will plunge rapidly into a deadly recession. We, the taxpayers of South Australia, have our backs to the wall. The Premier has said that the Hawke Federal Government was unkind to South Australia. What does one expect if one has a reformed alcoholic as a Prime Minister.

We get unstable, unsound management and leadership. There is nowhere else in the modern world where there is a Federal Leader of a Government with the record of the Prime Minister of this country. I do not care what anyone says—he is a security risk; he is unstable. That is why Australia's standing overseas at the present moment is so poor. It reflects on the standing of Australia. He and his Foreign Affairs Minister have done much to upset overseas relationships, and there is no doubt that this is being reflected in the economic squeeze that this country is suffering. Make no bones about it. I have been here long enough to see and to monitor the economic situation as we go from—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The honourable member is probably one of the rudest members we have ever had in this House. He has not been here very long and will not be here very long. When he was the assistant to the Minister who is on the front bench, he never had the courtesy to ring me back when I left phone calls for him. So the member for Fisher should not stand in this House and try to criticise me ever again. He has no credibility. He is the greatest oncer that we will see in this House for many years.

Is it any wonder, with that type of mentality and attitude, that Australian taxpayers and the people of Australia are sick and tired of the 'stop-go' unstable policies of the State and Federal Governments? I am referring to the attitudes not only of the Hawke Government but the Parliamentary process itself. People are looking for strong, stable leadership. They do not want these insecure wimps and pragmatic politicians running around this country causing fear, worry and unnecessary stress. Just look at the uranium announcement that followed the Federal budget, because it is the impact of the Federal budget that has had the impact on this State budget. The Federal Government's uranium announcement has caused more problems for the Federal Government at the present time than anything else. I do

not believe that any Labor Government could be so stupid in relation to their proposals for the Kakadu National Park. Anybody who would support it at the level they were trying to advocate would wonder really what is going on with the current Government.

So, was this whole thing a smokescreen, a cover-up for probably one of the worst Federal budgets we have ever seen, because it set out to try and correct some of the anomalies that the Government had created? The impact that those budgets are now having on the States is costing us confidence again. Our standing overseas has again suffered because of the lack of confidence in the management of the Australian Government. That is a terrible shame, because the people of Australia do not deserve the treatment that they are receiving. They do not deserve the politicians running around saying, 'You will have to go without. You will have to tighten your belt.' I do not see why I have to tighten my belt because of the folly of the Federal Government, because of the stupid, inane decisions that they make for pragmatic purposes. Do I have to tighten my belt and go without because the Premier of this State and his Ministers cannot set their priorities in order?

I am not being selfish, but it is the general attitude of the public. The public will not wear this type of situation. The Government might get away with it once, but it will not get away with it time and time again. The public will not suffer because of incompetent management of the finances of the State. That is a terrible problem. I have said time and time again that it is not the tall poppies who suffer. We tried to tell Don Dunstan that years ago. He was going to tax the tall poppies by hitting the top 3 per cent. But who did he hurt? He hurt the underprivileged, the disabled, those who through no fault of their own were not able to handle their own situation. Indeed, they had no finances to handle. They are the ones who got hurt. It is the same situation that we have now, with the Federal Government trying to put on a so-called squeeze, but the people you do not want to hurt are being hurt, and the ones you want to help cannot be helped. They are not being helped because the Governments are squeezing the services in those areas. They will play up all sorts of facts and figures as we see in the budget and as they will unfold during the budget estimates—how much we are doing in the area of welfare housing, social welfare, social justice, health and so forth.

However, when it comes down to the real nitty-gritty, very little has been done for the underprivileged in this country, and that is a terrible shame. Governments are handling billions and billions of dollars, and they cannot handle it properly. I did not put the Labor Party in Government in this State or federally, and I do not see why I should have to pay for the Labor Party's folly. Members should note that 50 per cent of people in this country feel the same way as I, and I believe that that percentage is conservative. These people will not forget the suffering they have gone through unnecessarily because of incompetent management by Labor Governments.

Let us look at our budget and what the Government is trying to achieve in relation to the redistribution of wealth and the problems that have flowed from those types of policies. A policy area I have to look after, correctional services, reflects the difficulty that the community is facing in handling and managing these awkward economic times. Our prisons have never had as many inmates as they have at present: there is overcrowding, and the worst has for many years been at the Adelaide Gaol. There is no excuse for this, and there never has been an excuse for the conditions at that prison.

At least we have a new remand centre, but it took 10 years of research and development to come up with a building that reflects modern thinking. The bright spot in building the remand centre was that it came in some \$2 million under budget, proving that what Dean Brown started when he was Minister of Public Works and what occurred during the days of the Tonkin Government in managing, restructuring, reorganising and striving towards setting the pattern finally paid off.

It takes years to get many projects up and running; it takes years of conferences, seminars and discussions in the Public Service to bring about change. However, the concept was right. The lead was given during the era of the David Tonkin Government and has been followed through.

Let us look at what we are now facing with these terrible economic times that have been forced on us by the Federal and State Governments. The Auditor-General's Report in relation to correctional services (page 57) points out that staff personnel have increased by some 191, or 23.7 per cent, to 997, and that the average daily number of prisoners is 775. I concede that was necessary to employ additional staff to man the new Adelaide Remand Centre. However, there was no excuse for the Minister of Health not approving sufficient staff to man the health facilities at that centre; that was unforgivable. A \$17 million building staffed by 130-odd personnel was ready to go, and the Minister of Health, that well known individual with a huge ego, was holding up the whole works and saying that it would take two weeks to sort the matter out. At least once we made a call to the Premier to do something about it the matter was solved in a few days.

The Premier must feel awfully embarrassed that one of his Ministers can hold up the operations of another Minister and the Government, and embarrass the Correctional Services Department in South Australia. That department did not deserve such treatment by the Minister of Health, and I hope he was severely castigated by the Labor Caucus for what he did. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that the average annual cost per prisoner has increased by 7.8 per cent (about equal with inflation) to \$35 800 per annum. That, of course, computes out at \$688 per week.

When that figure is related to the public they find it very difficult to understand. It is very expensive to operate and supervise the present system to meet the demands made on it by the public, because the public demand that once a person is placed in the care of correctional services in one of our prisons it must be under absolute maximum security, and that security costs very dearly. In Yatala Labour Prison, for example, the cost of keeping a prisoner has increased to \$75 000 per annum, which is \$1 442 a week or \$206 a day.

It is very expensive indeed and, of course, it looks worse than it really is. At Yatala Labour Prison on average there are 164 prisoners and the overall net cost this year was \$12.309 million. At Adelaide Gaol at one stage the average daily number of prisoners was 295 and the net cost per prisoner was \$23 000; at Northfield, with an average daily number of prisoners of 59, the annual cost is \$35 000 per prisoner. In actual fact, Northfield appears to be the only complex that reduced the cost of maintaining prisoners.

Northfield is a well managed, well run prison, as are most of our prisons at the moment. There has been a remarkable change in the management of correctional services over the past five or six years. Allan Rodda has never been given credit for this, nor was the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister. They instituted moves to rectify the situation that had been allowed to deteriorate for many years during the Dunstan era.

While looking at problems associated with correctional services, I am also worried about juvenile offenders and how that situation has escalated. Unfortunately, if we cannot arrest the behaviour problems of juvenile offenders and put them on the road to rehabilitation, they will end up in the correctional services system. We do not want that to happen. Last financial year on average it cost \$92 347 to look after a person in the Youth Training Centre, which is \$253 per day or \$1 775 per week. At the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre the average cost has increased to \$120 000 per annum or \$2 307 per week, or about \$329 a day. The cost in providing security, services and supervision for young offenders in this State has got out of hand.

It is worth noting, as has been reported in the Auditor-General's Report, that the Department of Community Welfare is undertaking a feasibility study into the construction of a number of small secure centres to replace existing residential secure centres located at the South Australian Training Centre at Magill, and the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre at Enfield. They are old institutions that do not really work. Sure, let us bring it back to smaller, manageable units; they will be just as expensive, but let us try and rescue these people. Let us try and come up with rehabilitation programs (which I am still trying to find in our prison system) to save these people and reduce the horrendous debt to the taxpayers of South Australia. Through the Department of Community Welfare there is also provision of residential non-secure care centres which cost per person on average \$58 224 a year or about \$1 119 a week. On average, there are about 49 young people in these residential non-secure hostels and cottages.

It all comes back to the economic situation and the problems that are created for the young people and those who cannot handle the stress of the current community living standards. Also, it comes back to the demands that are made of Governments by the people and the failure by the Governments to meet those demands, so we have a situation where those who cannot handle it turn to crime. That crime is now costing the taxpayers very dearly indeed and it is a debt at which I believe we should look. It is a cost that we should start to investigate very seriously to see how we can reduce the impact on the taxpayers of this State.

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

Mr KLUNDER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Following my Address in Reply speech, in relation to the then forthcoming world speed skating championships at the Parks Community Centre, I can now advise that they have been run and have been very successful. Because the venue for this event is located in my electorate of Price, I was most fortunate to be invited to attend some of the sessions of these most important competitions. I attended with the Federal Special Minister of State and member for Port Adelaide (Hon. Mick Young) at the opening ceremonies of the championships and, also,

I attended the first session of the championship races. The series was opened by Mr Young on behalf of the Federal Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism (Hon. John Brown) and I congratulate both the South Australian and the Australian Speed Roller-skating Associations on their organisation and conduct of these important championships. First and foremost, the South Australian Government should be congratulated for its initiative in planning and building the excellent 368 metre speed skating circuit at the Parks Community Centre.

Mr Becker: Good old Jack Slater.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, the previous Minister, Jack Slater; the member for Hanson is quite right. The circuit is an impressive one and was widely praised by overseas competitors and officials. It is a world-class circuit and the conduct of the entire meeting was world class. I also place on record the contribution by Lloyd Bond, who has been President of the South Australian Speed Roller-skating Association for some years, and who set about staging these world championships. Obviously, first he had to talk the Government into providing this ideal world-class circuit, and then he had to obtain the world championships for this event. It has taken him 10 years to achieve this and he is to be congratulated for it. Also, he and his wife Maurine have been the two people who have had more than anyone else to do with the organisation of these world championships, and their effort was a magnificent one.

Also, I congratulate the Parks Community Centre board of management, its staff and the local residents, who all contributed to the success of these world championships. I mention also the local police, who did a magnificent job in organising traffic and in controlling people and the crowds who attended the event. It was a real team effort and it was top class not only for South Australia but also for Australia.

I attended a special reception which was held at the Festival Centre banquet room, for all officials and delegates attending the world conference which was completed prior to the commencement of the championships. I was quite impressed with the VIP nature of many of these officials and delegates, who included several members of Parliament from Korea and other Asian countries, including the Leader of the Chinese Taipei Legislative Assembly, Professor David Cheng. In addition to these MPs were many other professors and doctors, as well as many important businessmen from other countries.

This series was the most successful in the history of the championships since they were inaugurated in 1936, and 21 countries participated—a record number. I was fortunate to witness the first men's championship event, the 300 metre time trial standing start speed skating competition which, since the inaugural championships, has been won by Italian skaters on every occasion. That was the case until 1986 when for the first time a skater other than an Italian won this prestigious event. I was absolutely thrilled, as was almost everyone else at the circuit, when Western Australian Joe Askew, representing Australia, put in a scintillating effort over the lap to win the title.

The top ranking world officials, who were mainly from Italy, were quite aggressively predicting further Italian domination of this event and were fully expecting their countrymen to win gold, silver and bronze medals. On paper, I guess they were justified because of their country's dominance since 1936, and the dominance to a slightly lesser extent of American skaters. However, they did not anticipate a Joe Askew and had to eat humble pie in settling for silver and bronze medals. Indeed, I had the pleasurable task of adorning the new world champion—Joe Askew of Australia—with the world champion's multi-coloured racing

shirt. It was the icing on the cake for me and the very proud Australian crowd.

It was unfortunate that the media was poorly represented and that the event was hardly reported. In Europe, especially in Italy, France, and Belgium, in the United States of America and several South American countries, roller-skating, especially speed roller-skating, is a big sport and also big business. Several businessmen who attended these races owe their entire living to the production and distribution of roller-skates and associated equipment. The poor media coverage was disappointing. We get pages and pages in our newspapers about our local league football, but with all due respect to league football, in which we are all interested, it is a local competition.

Mr Duigan: Sour grapes because Port is not in it!

Mr De LAINE: They are still in it. The Magarey Medal and other events on a local level are covered by pages and pages and hours of media exposure. Here we had a world championship receiving almost no media exposure. This is a constant theme applying to other so-called minor sports, and it is disappointing. We feted our own people, and rightly so, but nevertheless a world championship in whatever sport—be it speed roller-skating, cycling, table tennis, gymnastics or whatever—should get the media attention it deserves.

It was unfortunate that controversy surrounded the last couple of sessions of the championships. That controversy did not involve competitors so much, although roller-skating is a fairly rough sport, similar to cycling. Some of the tactics are a bit rough, as in cycling, but the problem, based on my observations and based on talks with officials, especially the top Australian officials, was that the controversy was political, introduced by some delegates and officials.

I was amazed that several delegates who attended the conference that preceded the championships jumped on a plane and flew back to their homeland without even bothering to see the skating.

That surprised me, because I expected that people would have come from the other side of the world to see the skating, but that was not the case. The politics of the sport was the number one attraction and, once that was over and the knives were stuck in, people jumped on planes and went back to the other side of the world. That was a pity, but nonetheless the contest was very successful and well conducted, and a credit to Australia and South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to draw to the attention of the Premier in particular a concern that has been brought to my notice by a constituent. In January 1985, one of my constituents purchased a Jaguar motor car from a motor vehicle dealer in Adelaide. Over the ensuing months the vehicle proved to be mechanically unsatisfactory and was deposited in the service division of the dealership for a lot more time than it was actually on the road. In short, the vehicle could be described as a lemon. After many attempts to communicate his disappointment to the management of the dealership, without success, my constituent was obliged to place the matter in the hands of solicitors.

After further prolonged dispute, the dealership agreed to rescind the contract of sale and to refund in full the purchase price of the car. At the time of purchase, upon registration my constituent paid \$1 884 in stamp duty to the South Australian Government. On 26 August his solicitors wrote to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties seeking a refund of the stamp duty paid, as the rescindment and cancellation of registration in effect meant that the purchase had not

taken place or it was a contract without action. However, this request to the Commissioner was refused.

My constituent's letter goes into considerable detail about the faults of the car. He states that during the first 85 days after delivery of the motor vehicle it was in the workshop for a total of 31 days. The letter gave details to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties about the problems experienced, including the twice removal and replacement of the auto-transmission and torque converter assembly for oil leaks and contaminated oil damage, replacement of the engine oil cooling system due to leaks, replacement of the engine timing gear housing oil seal due to leaks, and so on (and I will not cite all the details). The letter to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties from my constituent's solicitors also stated:

Notwithstanding further attention after that initial period the motor vehicle continued to leak considerable oil and continued to have considerable front-wheel vibration. The dealer's maintenance staff acknowledged that they were unable to remedy the remaining faults in the car. Our client sought discussions with the senior management of the selling dealer without success for most of this time.

After the firm became involved and some attempts were made to contact the senior management of the selling dealer, without success, the solicitors contacted representatives of the importer of the motor vehicle, J.R.A. Limited in Sydney. A number of discussions ensued between the solicitors, representatives of the importer in both Sydney and Adelaide, and the company secretary of the dealership. During much of this time the motor vehicle was in the workshop or could not be used by my constituent. After these discussions continued for some time and no resolution appeared to be forthcoming, my constituent instructed his solicitors on or about 17 May 1985 to contact the manufacturer in England. That contact was made by telex.

In late May my constituent received a number of offers to rescind the contract. There were further negotiations on 29 May, as appears from the exchange of letters—which I have in my possession—between my constituent and the dealer and a rescission was in fact achieved. As part of the arrangement my constituent returned the car to the selling dealer on the agreed date to effect the rescission. The registration disc was removed from the motor vehicle, and my constituent's representative then attended at the office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to seek a refund of the registration fee.

My constituent has instructed his solicitor to seek from the Commissioner of Stamp Duties a refund of the stamp duty paid in this matter, on the basis that the original contract was rescinded, as appears, again, from letters I have in my possession, as the car was unmerchantable and little benefit was derived during the intervening period in which the car was in the possession of my constituent.

The Commissioner refused that request, and my constituent subsequently wrote to the Premier's Department suggesting an *ex gratia* payment, but that was also refused as being inappropriate, and the letter from the solicitor states:

The Commissioner informed us that the circumstances outlined in our letter do not fall within the provisions of section 42d of the Stamp Duties Act of 1923 and, consequently, it is his advice that there are no grounds upon which a refund of duty can be granted under the Stamp Duties Act 1923.

My constituent's solicitor suggested that, notwithstanding this response, the Treasurer should be requested to consider making an *ex gratia* payment. That request was made, and in April of this year a reply was received from the Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Acting Premier and Treasurer, which states:

While it is clear that your client has been most unfortunate in his choice of vehicle, I am not convinced that the circumstances are necessarily those which it was intended to cover when the refund provisions were included in the Act. Therefore, I do not believe that an *ex gratia* payment would be appropriate.

As members would be aware, section 42d of the Stamp Duties Act is controversial in application of provisions for refund of stamp duties, and it is the opinion of the solicitors advising my constituent that this case does fall within the meaning of the section. As a result of that, my constituent wrote to the Ombudsman spelling out the situation to which I have referred tonight. As a result of that, the Ombudsman replied to my constituent, stating:

I refer to the stamp duty view, which is that the duty is payable upon application to register a motor vehicle or upon an application to transfer the registration of a motor vehicle, i.e. it is not assessed upon the contract and the question of whether or not such contract is void or voidable does not arise. No evidence has been given that the application to register the motor vehicle was rescinded, and the implication is that registration was in force until some time in late May 1985.

The more general question of a refund of stamp duty under section 42d (1a) of the Stamp Duties Act occurs consistently, section 42d (1a) very specifically refers to a seven-day period, and that period is adhered to by the stamp duties office in authorising refunds, and by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in discussions and in correspondence with persons dealing with that office, which they do in the first instance.

My constituent, being totally dissatisfied with the reply from the Ombudsman and at the invitation of the Ombudsman, who said, 'If you wish to comment upon the above, I suggest you may do so in writing . . .', has written back spelling out the situation very clearly. I suggest that this letter has only recently been forwarded to the Ombudsman and is in his hands at present. I hope that that officer will have a very close look at the situation, rather than just reflecting the attitude of the Commissioner of State Taxation.

I believe that my constituent has a very firm case. He has been treated shoddily by the Premier, who was not prepared to make a special allowance and provide at least part of the funding that should go to my constituent in this matter. I would be very happy to provide the Premier with any of the information to which I have referred this evening as long as he is able to do something about it.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to draw to the attention of the House tonight some problems that have arisen with some of my constituents in relation to the payment of workers compensation. The father of one of my constituents, who is now in the United Kingdom, recently came to me with an account that he had received on behalf of his son from a firm of physiotherapists. The firm of physiotherapists wrote this very nice letter to explain why they were billing him in respect of an account that would normally be paid for by the insurance company in relation to workers compensation. They said to my constituent, Mr Michael J. Moore of 327 Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton, South Australia, the following:

Dear Sir,

Regarding the treatment you received from us in March this year, Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Ltd are refusing to pay this cost of \$97.60 as they say that Taminga Furniture Pty Ltd did not lodge a claim form for your injury. Taminga Furniture Pty Ltd is no longer in business and the receivers, Allert Heard & Company, refuse to negotiate with the insurance company re your claim.

We must point out that treatment is always the personal responsibility of the patient, but we have not pressed for payment solely because of the expectation of being reimbursed through workers compensation. As this is now being disputed and as the account is very much overdue, we enclose a copy for your prompt payment.

That demand, which is signed by the firm concerned, is a very reasonable one for services rendered. The constituent came to me to see what I could do in relation to the claim. As a result of that, I telephoned the claims clerk at Manufacturers Mutual Insurance to notify him of the difficulties that my constituent was facing in respect of a claim for

workers compensation. In the first instance the clerk did not want to know anything about it, said that it was nothing to do with him and that, so far as he was concerned, the firm Taminga Furniture Pty Limited had gone bankrupt and the insurance company no longer had any connection with it. Of course I disputed this, having some knowledge of workers compensation, and told him that liability would remain for many years with Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Company for the people who were working with the firm.

I then tried to establish why the workers compensation accounts were not being met, and I was told by the claims clerk that he had been instructed that he was not to proceed with any claims whatsoever and that, even though I was putting to him the proposition that this account ought to be paid because of workers compensation, he would not take any notice of it because he had not received notification from Taminga Furniture Pty Limited. I then telephoned the receivers, Allert Heard & Company and spoke to a gentleman handling affairs there.

I was informed that, as receivers for the company, they had no intention of taking up any compensation matters, that taking up such matters would waste their time and that, if it wasted their time, it would cost money, which would be debited against those people who had a claim on the company. Therefore, we reached a Catch 22 situation so far as my constituent was concerned: on the one hand the receivers for the company were the only people who could do anything about the matter but on the other they were refusing to notify the insurance company, Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Ltd, which is refusing to pay because it has received no notification.

This would not be such a difficult proposition if we were taking of only one person. However, I understand that there are 110 outstanding claims on Manufacturers Mutual Insurance in relation to workers compensation from Taminga Furniture Proprietary Ltd, and that Manufacturers Mutual Insurance is not prepared to move in relation to any of these claims. I asked the clerk involved if he had any knowledge of whether or not the worker had filled out a form 16 as he was duty bound to do. He could not tell me whether the worker had filled out that form and, what is more, he was not interested.

I find this very alarming because insurance companies have been complaining bitterly, and members in this House have expressed the thoughts of insurance companies in relation to the cost of workers compensation. Yet we have an insurance company which is deliberately not processing any claims and which is not prepared to look at them.

The next step open to my client is to take this matter to a solicitor. As soon as he does that, costs will start piling

up: not only will there be a claim in relation to outstanding accounts for treatment but also solicitors' costs will be debited against the insurance company. I have explained to members that we are dealing here with at least 110 claims and that if Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Ltd intends to continue in this vein no doubt it will be faced with 110 separate claims, all involving solicitors' costs and all of which they will have to contest. Once they start contesting such claims large amounts of money will be spent on solicitors' costs. If the insurance company wins the cases it will still cost the company money and, if it loses, it will have to meet the claimants' costs.

The South Australian Workers Compensation Act is quite clear. Once a firm is placed in receivership, workers compensation becomes the responsibility of the insurance company holding the insurance at the time. The onus of workers compensation moves from the owner of the firm to the insurance company when a company enters into receivership.

I am particularly disturbed about the sort of treatment that my client has received from the insurance company and the receivers. I am concerned about the treatment that I received from Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Ltd after having explained the situation to them. They promised to return to me with an answer, which has not been forthcoming in relation to this case, and it is quite likely that because of the time that has already been taken no answer will be forthcoming to me regarding the claim that I have made on them in relation to payment for my constituent.

I do not think that any insurance company should treat any person in this way, displaying the sort of ignorance that it has displayed. In my view Allert Heard and Company, although it has no legal responsibility in this area, has a moral responsibility to do something about the paperwork which may or may not be in its possession. This firm has also informed me that it would get back to me with an answer, I have made a claim for additional costs that it might cost Michael Moore. I have asked the firm to make a note of them, because he will also be a claimant at the time of settlement and distribution of whatever money is available from this firm. Allert Heard and Company have also refused to get back to my office in relation to the queries that I raised on behalf of my constituent. I hope that Manufacturers Mutual Insurance takes heed of what I am saying. If the opportunity arises, I will raise this matter again.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 17 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 September

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FESTIVAL THEATRE

4. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: What are the engineers' findings of design and construction faults in the Festival Theatre plaza and underground car park, what is the estimated cost to repair such faults and when will the repair work be completed?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Adelaide Festival Centre plaza has been investigated by engineers from the S.A. Department of Housing and Construction, and advice has also been obtained from Consultants, CSIRO and Amdel regarding the faults and proposed rectification measures. It has been found that water leakage through the plaza has caused serious deterioration of the supporting structure. The principle defects are:

- Water leakage through the plaza.
- Structural deterioration resulting from water leakage.
- Drainage to internal finishes resulting from water leakage i.e. damage to carpets, ceilings, electrical circuits etc.
- Breakup and movement of the northern plaza pavement
- Deterioration of precast concrete balustrades, fascias and handrails.

The most serious of these faults is the structural deterioration. As a result of corrosion of the steel reinforcement, concrete has spalled from the structure and fallen to the lower plaza, and will do so at an increasing rate unless remedial measures are taken. Should the member not be familiar with the term, spalling refers to pieces of concrete which break away from the face of a structure. The pieces of concrete can be up to several kilograms in mass. If left unchecked, that deterioration will eventually affect larger areas of the structure, leading to the possible collapse of a major structural element. Clearly, there are short and long term safety problems associated with the plaza unless preventative action is taken.

Accordingly, reconstruction of the waterproofing, drainage and paving of the plaza is proposed, together with the repair of structural elements, and the replacement of damaged precast concrete fascias and balustrades as necessary. It is proposed that this repair work will be undertaken in conjunction with improvements to the plaza which include:

- Relocated and enlarged access stairway
- Refurbished box office foyer area
- New service store
- A demountable stage on the southern plaza
- Improvements to seating, directory signage and planting.

The total estimated cost of the scheme is \$8 820 000 at July 1986 prices. Allowing for escalation, and anticipating completion in December 1989, the adjusted estimated cost of the project is \$10 700 000.

On 25 August 1986 Cabinet referred the proposal to repair and improve the Adelaide Festival Centre plaza to the Public Works Standing Committee for enquiry and report.

HOUSING TRUST ACCOMMODATION

12. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What South Australian Housing Trust accommodation is available to young single tenants in the Adelaide Hills

Face Zone and Mount Barker areas and what is the time delay in filling applications?

2. Does the Trust have any plans to build or obtain rental accommodation for single tenants in the areas and, if so, when and how many units?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Trust rental accommodation in the Adelaide Hills is available at Mount Barker with lesser numbers of rental dwellings located at Brukunga, Echunga, Littlehampton, Lobethal, Nairne and Woodside. This stock contains a wide range of housing types suitable and various household compositions, including two bedroom units for young single applicants. The Trust is also actively pursuing a program of converting pairs of older style double unit accommodation into three smaller self-contained dwellings suitable for single person households. Currently the Trust is housing those applicants who applied for housing 30 months ago.

2. In view of the escalation in demand for housing by smaller sized households, including young single applicants, the Trust has undertaken programs to increase its stock of two bedroomed accommodation in the Adelaide Hills. This involved inclusion into the most recent design and construction call and consequently nine units are presently under construction at Mount Barker under this scheme and are scheduled for completion in October. The Trust is also currently undertaking planning of three other developments at Mount Barker consisting of two bedroom unit type accommodation collectively comprising 31 dwellings.

BUILDING SOCIETY SUBSIDY

17. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many borrowers of housing loans from building societies are now in receipt of the 0.75 per cent subsidy arranged by the Government and how does this figure compare with the number of borrowers receiving the subsidy as at 31 December 1985?

2. How much was deposited by the Government with the building societies to provide the subsidy and at what interest rate was it deposited?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The subsidy to building society borrowers ceased on 30 June 1986. Some 28 000 building society borrowers benefited from the subsidy, the average benefit being \$25 per month. At the cessation of the Building Society Subsidy Scheme, the State Government announced the introduction of the HOME Guarantee Program to assist borrowers in difficulty.

2. \$28 008 150 was deposited by the Government with the building societies at zero interest.

CRISIS ACCOMMODATION

18. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What crisis accommodation is being provided by the Government and to whom?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The following provides details of crisis accommodation provided by the State Government and Commonwealth Government within South Australia. The major areas discussed provide assistance for special needs groups including youth, aged, unemployed, single parents, disabled, and single persons.

*Emergency Housing Office (EHO)

The Emergency Housing Office is administered by the South Australian Housing Trust and provides financial

assistance in the form of bonds, rent in advance, and removal expenses to assist in establishing disadvantaged people as tenants in the private rental market. In addition, the Emergency Housing Office provides counselling, advice on housing rights, and short-term accommodation in the form of pool housing for people in severe crisis.

Prior to April 1985, the Emergency Housing Office services were available only to people in the Adelaide Metropolitan area. However, funding for the Emergency Housing Office was increased in the 1984-85 State Budget to \$2.4 million enabling the expansion of Emergency Housing Office services to country areas. This was further increased to \$3.6 million in 1985-86.

During 1985-86, 24 271 households approached the Emergency Housing Office for assistance. Of this figure, 7 550 households were provided with financial assistance for bonds and 4 867 with other forms of assistance including rent in advance and removal costs. Total financial assistance distributed during 1985-86 is as follows: Bonds \$1.8 m; and Other \$0.45 m.

*Priority Housing

The South Australian Housing Trust provides priority housing to assist those applicants identified as being in need of urgent housing assistance. The Housing Trust defines five main areas of need which are taken into account in assessing Priority Housing applications:

- medical;
- present accommodation extremely unsatisfactory;
- financial;
- physical eviction, and
- social or other reasons.

Under the formal Priority Referral Scheme, social workers in government and voluntary agencies refer households in urgent need of housing to the Trust. The Trust also operates internal procedures whereby households who appear to be in need of urgent assistance are identified and afforded priority housing.

Over the past financial year 18.3 per cent of all housing allotted by the Trust were priority allocations. This represents a figure of 1 431 allocations out of a total of 7 816.

*Community Tenancy Scheme

The South Australian Housing Trust also provides residential accommodation for community purposes in conjunction with funding programs administered by other areas of the State Government. As at 30 June, 1986, 435 dwellings had been allocated to organisations for special purposes including crisis accommodation. These include:

- women's shelters;
- housing for youth;
- hostels for the mentally handicapped;
- hostels for the physically disabled;
- halfway houses for the rehabilitation of alcoholics;
- community uses;
- refugee resettlement programmes, and
- homeless persons' hostels.

*Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP)

The Crisis Accommodation Program provides capital funding for dwellings for supported accommodation services provided by community-based voluntary organisations. The program provides funds to build, buy, lease, renovate or convert dwellings for short-term crisis accommodation (such as youth and women's refuges). Funding for the program is provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and these funds are administered by the South Australian Housing Trust in conjunction with an advisory committee made up of representatives from various Government departments and community groups.

Funds of \$1.161 million were available under CAP in 1985-86.

*Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP)

The Supported Accommodation Assistance Program, which is administered by the Commonwealth Department of Community Services (and therefore not part of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement), complements CAP by providing funding for salary and operating costs for women's, youth, and general homeless support services. Funds allocated by the Department for Community Services are administered in South Australia by the Department for Community Welfare in conjunction with an advisory committee, also made up of representatives from various Government departments and community groups.

In 1985/86 a total of \$5.582 million was allocated by the Federal and State Governments for SAAP. Of this amount \$3.746 million was provided by the Federal Government with \$1.836 million being contributed by the State.

EMERGENCY HOUSING

23. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What resources are available to check information given by applicants seeking emergency housing and are these resources sufficient to handle the demand and, if not, what action will the Minister take to rectify the situation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The following information is provided in regard to the availability of resources to check information provided by applicants seeking emergency housing:

Emergency Housing Office

It is the responsibility of housing officers providing assistance to check and verify where necessary information provided by clients. This is done primarily through liaison with social agencies and direct contact with landlords, etc. Currently 21 officers are employed in general service delivery by the Emergency Housing Office and they undertake these duties within their total responsibilities. In addition, two clerical officers are engaged in monitoring the lodgement and recovery of bonds.

Housing Trust

In regard to priority assistance through the Trust, it is the responsibility of tenancy and interviewing officers to verify information provided by applicants through direct contact with social agencies, hospitals, etc. Currently 97 officers, the majority in regional offices, are engaged in these duties as part of their broader responsibilities. In addition, a central unit consisting of seven officers co-ordinates the assessment of priority referrals and also maintains close liaison with referring agencies. The adequacy of these resources is kept under review and in annual budgets provision is made for additional positions as necessary and consistent with availability of funds.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

24. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Are any members of the South Australian Housing Trust Board tenants of the Trust and, if so, who, and, if not, will consideration be given to appointing a tenant to the board?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No member of the South Australian Housing Trust Board is currently a trust tenant. However, Mrs S.K. Hall is a former trust tenant.

In addition, all trust members take the opportunity to maintain contact with tenants to ensure an understanding of their needs.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

25. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many properties were sold to South Australian Housing Trust tenants during 1985-86 to date and how does the number compare with the previous year?
2. How many properties were sold to non-tenants during 1985-86?
3. What was the average price per property sold and what were the highest and lowest prices?
4. How do sales of such properties compare on average with trust valuations?
5. What now is trust policy relating to disposing of properties to tenants?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Sales of existing houses to tenants in the period 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986 totalled 175 (132 single units and 43 double units). This compared to 167 sales (139 single units and 28 double units) for the same period in 1984-85.

In addition to the above there have been 51 sales to existing tenants financed under the HOME Rental Purchase Scheme, from 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986. For the same period in 1984-85 there were 36 Rental Purchase Scheme sales to existing tenants.

2. Sales of properties sold to non-tenants in the period 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986 totalled 269 with the breakdown being as follows:

- 22 sales of newly constructed trust dwellings on completion, of which 4 were financed under the HOME Rental Purchase Scheme.
- 246 private properties purchased by non-tenants under the HOME Rental Purchase Scheme.
- 1 sale of an existing trust property which was no longer required because of problems associated with an adjoining block of three-storey flats.

This compared to 178 sales for the same period in 1984-85 with the breakdown being as follows:

- 46 sales of newly constructed trust dwellings on completion.
- 132 private properties, purchased by non-tenants under the HOME Rental Purchase Scheme.

3. Sale prices were as follows:

	1985-86 (full year 1986)	1984-85 (full year)
	Average Sale Prices	
	\$	\$
Existing SU	45 393	41 972
Existing DU	41 549	35 621
New Houses	64 700	53 784

The lowest sale price over this period was \$10 500 for an existing timber frame single unit house at Nangwarry (which was sold under agreement to a longstanding tenant) while the highest figure was \$136 000 for a property at Freeling. This particular property was sold to the Police Department and comprised a police station as well as a residence.

4. Sales to tenants are made at valuation, determined by private valuers engaged by the trust. Sale prices of new

dwellings are based on either market value or cost, whichever is the higher of the two.

5. The trust's policy is to sell houses to tenants provided:
 - (a) the dwelling is on a separate title or capable of being separately titled, and
 - (b) the tenant arranges his/her own finance if a loan is required.

The following restrictions apply:

- (a) the sale of new constructed dwellings on completion in the inner metropolitan area is restricted to those tenants who have been in occupation for a minimum period of six months, due to the scarcity of land to enable replacement building, and
- (b) the sale of dwellings purchased by the trust off the open market, generally in locations where the trust is unable to add to its stock of housing, is only permitted under special circumstances.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

26. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many concessional rental tenants of the South Australian Housing Trust have had their rents increased in the past 12 months?

2. What funds have been made available by the Commonwealth Government this financial year to assist the trust to provide concessional rent?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Those tenants benefiting from reduced rents have their circumstances reviewed at regular intervals, every three months for employment benefit recipients and 6 monthly for pensioners.

The reviewing of reduced rents is ongoing and the time of individual review is dependent on the date on which the concession was originally approved.

During the twelve months, 26 047 tenants in receipt of rent reductions were subject to review (excluding cottage flats, concession card holders and people recently housed who have not as yet been reviewed).

Of these, during the year:

- 18 779 had their rent increased (72.1%)
- 5 043 remained unchanged (19.36%)
- 2 225 had their rent further reduced (8.54%)

2. During the year, untied grants provided under the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement were applied in part to fund the rental rebates to pensioner tenants and the amount so applied was determined by the Commonwealth, based on the pensioner rental supplement assistance of \$15.00 per week (\$10.00 per week in 1985) granted to tenants of private landlords.

In the year ended June 1986 \$21.6 million was so applied.

HOUSING TRUST PURCHASES

27. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Further to Question on Notice No. 281 of the 1984-85 session, how many properties were purchased in Glandore, North Plympton, Plympton and West Richmond, where were they located and at what prices were they purchased?

2. What alterations and additions have been or are to be made to each property and at what cost?

3. How long were the properties vacant before occupation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows: 1.

Address	Purchase Price	Upgrading/ Renovation Cost	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	Comments
West Richmond						
6 Dover Street	48 800	10 220			13.6.86	
Plympton						
424 Marion Road	55 000	13 000			20.12.85	
9 William Avenue	110 000	25 600			26.3.86	This property has been purchased for Community Tenancy Group with two additional units built on the surplus vacant land.
189/191 Anzac Highway	115 000	15 100			6.12.85	Two units
145 Glengyle Terrace	85 000	20 500		11.3.85		Converted to two units for Youth Housing Program.
60 Daly Street	45 000	10 500		22.8.84		
28 Mackay Avenue	59 000	6 400	15.6.84			Modified for handicapped person.
Plympton North						
19 Mackay Avenue	60 000	8 900			16.6.86	
2 Packard Street	59 750	6 500			13.6.86	
67 Dingera Avenue	62 000	5 750			16.4.86	
22 Mackay Avenue	60 000	9 400			16.1.86	
9a and 9b Allchurch Avenue	75 000	14 850		24.8.84		Two additional units to be built on surplus land.
5 Murdoch Avenue	56 000	4 300		25.7.84		
Glandore						
15 and 17 Winifred Avenue	87 250	17 200			9.12.85	Two units
33 Naldera Avenue	73 000	35 000			7.10.85	Property let to EHO on short term basis. House to be converted to two units
24 Pleasant Avenue	106 500	25 200			20.9.85	House to be converted to two units and additional unit built on surplus land.
24 Nottingham Crescent	100 000	30 000		27.2.85		House to be converted to two units and additional unit built on surplus land.
15 Beckman Street	56 000	4 090		28.9.84		
21 Beckman Street	70 000	1 000		17.9.84		
23 Beckman Street	55 000	2 720		27.6.84		Community Tenancy
47 Waymouth Street	50 000	5 600	27.6.84			
33 Beckman Street	53 000	9 130	27.6.84			
35 St. Georges Street	54 000	8 350	27.6.84			
25 Beckman Street	58 000	4 800	27.6.84			
51 Albion Avenue	57 000	5 340	27.6.84			
54 Albion Avenue	60 000	3 000	27.6.84			

2. To expedite this response the properties are treated as a whole. In general the level of upgrading reflects the standard of housing available on the market in a given location at a given time. The work necessary to bring dwellings up to rental standards varies depending on the condition of the house. However, each dwelling purchased is inspected and as necessary—

- electrical wiring is replaced and additional power points installed as required;
- necessary steps are taken to eradicate and repair the effects of salt damp;
- roofing is repaired or replaced as necessary;
- plumbing and plumbing fixtures are replaced as necessary;
- general repairs are carried out as necessary;

• as required internal and external painting is undertaken.

3. Upgrading is commenced immediately following settlement of each purchase with the objective of letting the dwelling within the shortest possible time. Dwellings purchased for some form of redevelopment are let on a short-term basis to the Emergency Housing Office until the necessary statutory and council building approvals are received.

Upgrading varies from 4 to 18 weeks depending on the amount of upgrading and whether the property is to be redeveloped.

MUSEUM RESTORATION PROJECT

28. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What was the original estimate of the cost of paving areas associated with the Museum restoration project, what now is the estimated cost and what are the reasons for any escalation?

2. What is the estimated cost to the Minister's department of managers' supervision of the project and is such supervision duplicated by main contractors and/or sub-contractors and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. On 14 January 1985 Cabinet approved funds to undertake siteworks associated with the South Australian Museum Redevelopment. At that time the total estimate for paving was \$564 300.

The current total estimate for the work is \$594 000.

Escalation has occurred at a rate of approximately 10 per cent over the duration of the paving works. The cost of completed works combined with the estimated costs of future work has resulted in the rise of \$19 700 in the total cost of the paving.

The funds allocation for siteworks made allowance for escalation and the above rise is within the budget.

2. The estimated cost of managers' supervision on phases B and C of the Museum Redevelopment project is \$342 900. The managerial functions on this provision are not duplicated by any of the on-site contractors.

HOUSING TRUST HOME LOANS

29. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many members of the State Parliament have home loans with the South Australian Housing Trust and what is the current rate of interest charged on each loan?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The process of checking each mortgage account to verify whether or not any members of the State Parliament have home loans with the South Australian Housing Trust would be very time consuming, and the utilisation of public resources for this purpose is not considered warranted given that such information is available through the Registrar of Members Pecuniary Interests. Should the member for Hanson wish to consult the register and subsequently desire additional information regarding the rates of interest charged, the Minister of Housing and Construction will, with the permission of the member concerned, be pleased to provide this.

POLICE HELICOPTER

30. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many complaints have been made against the use of the police helicopter at night in search for persons suspected of committing a crime?

2. How many times has the helicopter been used in the past 12 months in such cases?

3. How many successes has it had in leading to the arrest of persons wanted by police?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Six complaints in the period 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986.

2. Thirty-two times during the hours of darkness.

3. The Westpac State rescue helicopter was directly involved in the arrest of eight persons including some serious offenders.

MOBILONG PRISON

31. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Are builders labourers employed on the Mobilong Prison project paid a special on-site allowance and, if so, at what daily or weekly rate?

2. What is the reason for the allowance and who was responsible for negotiating it?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The awarded site allowance is 70 cents per hour worked on site.

2. On 24 February 1986 Commissioner Griffin of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission awarded the site allowance to all employees of the principal contractors and employees of all subcontractors engaged in the construction of Mobilong Prison. The allowance is to apply in view of the special rate applying to wet underfoot, dirty work, working in confined spaces, use of secondhand timber, fumes, etc. Factors considered by the Commissioner in handing down the award included:

- open and exposed site conditions;
- extremes of weather that will be experienced over the two year construction period;
- period that will elapse before work will be carried out in completed buildings;
- considerable walking required at certain stages of construction, and
- similar awards previously paid on similar types of projects such as Woodside Army Centre, the Morgan Filtration Plant and Nuriootpa Winery projects.

The site allowance was negotiated by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission as a result of a dispute pursuant to section 25 of the Act initiated by the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Australia on behalf of all building industry trades. For the information of the honourable member, the Mobilong project is proceeding under budget and ahead of schedule.

Mr S.F. CHAPMAN

48. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health:

1. When was Simon Fenton Chapman appointed as Director, Health Promotion Services Unit?

2. What classification is the position, what salary and allowances apply and are there any other benefits attached to it?

3. How many applications were received for the position and why was Mr Chapman chosen above other applicants?

4. Is the position a contract appointment and, if so, for how long?

5. What are Mr Chapman's qualifications for the position?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Dr Chapman commenced as Director, Health Promotion Services on 18 November 1985.

2. The Director's position is EO-1, salary \$48,011 per annum. Dr Chapman was paid relocation expenses in accordance with normal Health Commission rates and no other allowances or benefits are paid.

3. There were 26 applications received and, from those, six applicants were interviewed. The selection panel was of the unanimous opinion that Dr Simon Chapman had the most appropriate qualifications, training and experience required for the position. Dr Chapman had already distin-

guished himself nationally and internationally in the field of health promotion.

4. Dr Chapman is permanently appointed subject to the normal Health Commission terms and conditions of service for salaried employees.

5. Dr Chapman has outstanding qualifications and experience in health education and health promotion including:

- a PhD thesis on smoking and advertising;
- is a World Health Organisation consultant on smoking control;
- has been a consultant to a number of other international bodies and has worked for overseas health education authorities;
- has published numerous articles and other publications in the area;
- has been previously employed as a Research Fellow, as a Researcher and Lecturer at the University of Sydney in the Department of Preventive and Social Medicine and School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, and as a Health Education Officer and Senior Health Education Officer for the NSW Health Authority.

KESWICK CREEK

51. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will the Government investigate and take action to eliminate the foul odour emanating from the Keswick Creek at West Richmond and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department inspected the open portions of Keswick Creek between Anzac Highway and the Adelaide Airport on 11 August 1986. Although the creek was flowing only slowly, no odour was evident. It is possible that any odour that may occur in the lower reaches could emanate from silt deposits which become exposed when flow ceases. Every year, prior to the onset of winter, the accessible parts of the creek downstream of Anzac Highway are cleared of silt and rubbish to minimise potential sources of offending odours.

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

53. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Who are members of the Advisory Council of Correctional Services, what are the reasons for each member's appointment, when were they appointed, for how long, what salary or allowances were paid to each and what other privileges are afforded to them?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Correctional Services Advisory Council is a body established pursuant to section 10 of the Correctional Services Act. Membership of the council is as follows:

	Appointed	Period
Mr G. F. Barrett (Chairman)	12.6.86	5 years
Mr R. J. Kidney	19.9.85	3 years
Ms C. O'Loughlin	19.9.85	3 years
Ms V. Brodie	12.6.86	3 years

Members are appointed from a cross-section of the community in accordance with section 15 of the Act. Meetings are generally held on a monthly basis and the Chairman and members receive an allowance of \$100 and \$85 respectively, per session. Expenses and allowances for travel, accommodation, etc. are reimbursed in accordance with the rates applicable within the Public Service.

E&WS PIPES

55. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What was the total purchase cost to the E&WS of concrete/asbestos pipes produced by James Hardie in 1985-86?
2. What was the total cost of pipes purchased from all other sources?
3. Has the department evaluated the cost of using alternative types of pipes when the concrete/asbestos now produced by James Hardie is no longer available?
4. Does the department expect any variation in the functional life expectancy between the concrete/asbestos pipes and the alternative product they intend to use and if so, what is the expected variation?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. \$2 852 000
2. \$1 641 000
3. and 4. The Engineering and Water Supply Department recently initiated investigations into materials for water reticulation pipes replacing the asbestos cement type currently in use. At this early stage, it is not possible to say what the functional life expectancy of alternatives may be. However, the objective of the investigations is to select a product which will have an as good or better functional life expectancy as asbestos cement pipes.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT WORKS

56. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What major works (over \$1 million) are currently planned by the Highways Department for the Salisbury Council area over the next 10 years or for such lesser period as the Department may prepare its forward works program and what is the anticipated cost in current dollars, the relative priority and the anticipated commencement date of each project?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Major roadworks (over \$1 million) in the Salisbury Council area being undertaken or planned to be undertaken within the next six years (in relative priority) are:

	\$
• completion of McIntyre Road between Bridge Road and North East Road (commenced)	9m
• Salisbury Highway Extension	10m
• duplication of existing McIntyre Road between Bridge Road and Main North Road	2m
• Golden Grove—East-West Connector (in Salisbury Council area)	5m

The commencement dates of the latter three projects are dependent on the future availability of funds for roadworks and the satisfactory completion of preconstruction activities such as design and land acquisition.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OFFICERS

57. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. As at 30 June 1986 how many correctional officers were employed by the Correctional Services Department in each institution, including the new Adelaide Remand Centre?
2. What is the establishment or target level of correctional officer staffing for each institution?

3. How many additional correctional officers will be required for Mobilong when it is fully operational?

4. On what date is it anticipated that Mobilong will become operational?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Number of Correctional Officers (below Manager and Deputy Manager grade) by Institution (30 June 1986).

Institution	Correctional Officers
Adelaide Remand Centre	66
Adelaide Gaol	166
Yatala Labour Prison	203
Northfield Prison Complex	53
Port Augusta Gaol	35
Cadell Training Centre	25
Port Lincoln Prison	17
Mount Gambier Gaol	14
Sir Samuel Way Courts Complex	15
Dog Squad	5
Training School	14
Other	6

2. Establishment of Correctional Officers by Institution

Institution	Establishment
Adelaide Remand Centre	140
Adelaide Gaol	132
Yatala Labour Prison	184
Northfield Prison Complex	39
Port Augusta Gaol	33
Cadell Training Centre	25
Port Lincoln Prison	16
Mount Gambier Gaol	14
Sir Samuel Way Courts Complex	13
Dog Squad	5

601

It is pointed out the actual numbers of correctional officers over establishment in correctional institutions are due to be transferred to Adelaide Remand Centre when that institution is commissioned. The Department has approximately 40 promotional vacancies in the uniformed staff area. However, most of these positions are currently being filled in an acting capacity.

3. The number of base grade correctional officers required for the Mobilong Medium Security Prison is 66. This number should be achieved from within existing departmental human resources. However, this situation is being closely monitored in view of the present prisoner population at Adelaide Gaol—currently approximately 100 over the approved prisoner establishment for that institution.

4. The construction of Mobilong Medium Security Prison is currently ahead of schedule and the expected date it will become operational is September 1987.

POLICE COMPLAINTS AUTHORITY

64. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many FTE staff were attached to the Police Complaints Authority as at 30 June 1986?

2. How many complaints have been received since the formation of the authority up to 30 June 1986?

3. How many police officers were disciplined as a result of complaints before the authority?

4. What has been the total cost of operating the authority from its inception to 30 June 1986?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Five.

2. There were 333 complaints registered with the authority between 1 September 1985 and 30 June 1986. The investigation of some of these complaints has been completed while others are at various stages of investigation. A further 145 particular inquiries were received but were not registrable as police complaints.

3. To date the Police Complaints Authority, under section 35 (2) of the Act, has been notified of one police officer being disciplined.

4. The total cost of operating the authority is \$299 507. This includes \$67 558 for expenses to establish the office and \$231 949 for its operation to 30 June 1986.

POLICE FORCE

78. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many police cadets graduated during each of the years ended 30 June 1985 and 1986?

2. How many uniformed police officers were on strength as at 30 June 1985 and 1986?

3. What was the total police strength (excluding public service staff attached) as at 30 June 1985 and 1986?

4. How many administrative and clerical public service positions existed within the Police Force as at 30 June 1985 and 1986?

5. How many uniformed officers were employed in the mounted branch (horses) as at 30 June 1985 and 1986?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. 1984-85—95

1985-86—112

2. 30.6.85—3 263

30.6.86—3 192

3. 30.6.85—3 373 (includes 110 cadets)

30.6.86—3 492 (includes 300 cadets)

4. 30.6.85—409.3 FTEs

30.6.86—426.4 FTEs

5. 30.6.85—31

30.6.86—26

MENTAL HEALTH

92. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: What is the Government's policy regarding placement of people discharged from mental hospitals within the general community, what support does the Government provide for these people and what assessments are made with regard to their subsequent deterioration or improvement in mental health?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The needs of each patient and plans for discharge are determined on an individual basis by a multi-disciplinary team allocated to each case at the time of admission. All patients are provided with letters of referral when discharged, a wide choice of accommodation, follow-up visits and on-going monitoring by a social worker or community nurse.

Support is given to family or care givers and many outpatient, and day care programs are provided. Anyone at anytime can request assessment for any person causing concern and such requests can be dealt with as emergencies, if necessary.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

98. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How often are officers of the South Australian Housing Trust required to investigate the veracity of income details provided by persons in receipt of subsidised rental accommodation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: All applications for reduced rent must be accompanied by confirmation of income, which is usually a *pro forma* from the Department of Social Secu-

rity or a letter from an employer. Where assessing officers have any reason to believe that the declared income disclosed at the time of a rent review lacks veracity, the tenant is required to provide confirmation from all income sources. No statistics are maintained on the number of such verifications required.

FREEWAY COMPENSATION

107. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was any compensation provided to any authority or body representative of the community of Crafers either before, during or following the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway as a result of any inconvenience caused to, or adverse effects on, the residents of Crafers and, if so, what form did the compensation take and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Highways Department has no record of any compensation being paid to any authority or body representative of the community of Crafers either before, during or following the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway, nor would there appear to have been a case for the payment of such compensation.

SA HOUSING TRUST

108. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: For each of the past five financial years, what has been the total amount paid by the South

Australian Housing Trust on behalf of tenants for excess water consumption?

The Hon T.H. HEMMINGS: The South Australian Housing Trust has paid the following amounts on behalf of tenants for additional water, over the past five years:

Years	\$m
1981-82	1.720
1982-83	2.120
1983-84	2.070
1984-85	2.670
1985-86	2.570

POLICE FORCE

110. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What types of petroleum products are used by the South Australian Police Force and for each type:

- (a) for what specific purposes;
- (b) what stocks were held at 1 July 1985 and 1 July 1986;
- (c) what were the 1985 budget estimates for usage in terms of quantity and dollar value; and
- (d) what, if any, effect did the change of product cost have on the 1985-86 budget?

2. What was the cost to the Police of a litre of distillate, Avgas and petrol, respectively, on the first day of each month since 1 July 1985?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

- 1. See attached table.
- 2. See attached table.

COSTS PER LITRE AT CITY POINT OF SUPPLY BASED ON BULK DELIVERIES

Month	Super	Petrol	Distillate	Avgas
		Unleaded		
July 1985	.5044	—	.4630	.6492
August	.4728	—	.4667	.6522
September	.4711	—	.4505	.6376
October	.4548	—	.4505	.6376
November	.4548	—	.4505	.6376
December	.4548	—	.4505	.6376
January 1986	.4548	—	.4505	.6498
February	.4548	—	.4505	.6535
March	.4711	—	.4029	.5827
April	.4548	.4148	.3931	.5730
May	.4119	.4048	.3931	.5730
June	.4019	.4048	.3931	.5768

WHITE SIGMA

111. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: To which department or agency does a white Sigma registered UQE-328 belong and what Government business was the driver of the vehicle conducting at approximately 3.55 p.m. on 24 July 1986 in the Highway Inn Hotel, Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Government vehicle No. UQE-328 is allocated to the Southern Regional Office of the Department of Labour. At the time on the day in question it was parked in the car park between the Highway Inn Hotel and the shops adjoining that car park. The Senior Clerk of the Southern Regional Office was visiting shops in the shopping centre with the purpose of following up Industrial Premise Registration forms which were overdue from at least one proprietor in that shopping complex.

POTATO BOARD

112. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What was the value and description of all the assets of the Potato Board at the time they were vested in the Minister and what is the present disposition of those assets?

2. What consultation has occurred with the industry about the disposition of the assets since they were vested in the Minister?

3. In what way does the Minister intend to use the assets for the benefit of the industry in the future and what mechanisms for consultation with the industry are proposed?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

Question (1) as detailed in the draft audit report prepared by Touche Ross and Co.: the assets of the South Australian Potato Board at 14 March 1986 were:

	\$
1. Cash at Bank and on Hand	
Westpac Bank A/c No. 810812	
Bank Account No. 1	
Balance per bank statement 14.3.86	138 821.29
ADD unrecorded deposits	21 695.05
LESS outstanding cheques	(61 081.37)
March bank charges	(330.99)

Balance per General Ledger	99 103.98	
Petty Cash	250.00	
Total	99 353.98	
2. Trade Debtors		
Humphris Bros—property expenses	1 594.80	
Ben Madi	4 725.30	
Kevin Shannon	5 000.00	
David Lonic	7 800.00	
Department of Agriculture	2 621.47	
Westpac Insurance Services	3 001.77	
Australian Post—franking machine refund	23.71	
	24 767.05	
3. Fixed Assets		
Land and Buildings—at valuation		
85-91 King William Street, Kent Town	540 000.00	
79 King William Street, Kent Town	180 000.00	
	720 000.00	
4. Plant and Office Equipment		
Description	Cost	Written Down Value
Potato Elevator	440.00	81.00
Grader	440.00	86.00
Avery C/Scales	596.63	330.00
1315 Scales	272.00	180.00
Hawke Weighbridge	2 677.29	700.00
Power Conditioner	3 000.00	2 250.00
Fire Extinguisher	75.00	16.00
Steel Shelving	61.50	25.00
Roller door-depot	1 070.00	930.00
3 Air-conditioners-depot	980.00	40.00
Evap. Air-conditioner-admin	4 650.00	3 390.00
Air-conditioner-Computer room	4 910.62	3 300.00
Card Cabinet	147.00	40.00
Stationery Cabinet	51.35	18.00
Single door Cupboard	185.80	100.00
Various Furniture	83.83	60.00
Mobile Ledger Store	224.76	170.00
6 Draw, Desk and Chair	166.30	45.00
6'6" × 2'6" Desk	360.00	170.00
Chair—Clerical	196.98	130.00
2 Draw Desk	276.10	200.00
2 Draw Desk	276.11	200.00
Tube Framed Table	83.19	60.00
Carpet—Computer Room	370.00	140.00
Curtains	325.00	140.00
Carpets—Upstairs	3 334.00	2 200.00
Cheque Signing Machine	235.00	70.00
Franking Machine	615.00	400.00
National Speaker Phone × 2	476.00	140.00
Pager	272.50	75.00
Rank Photo-Copier	7 950.00	4 300.00
Two Way Radio	790.00	750.00
	35 591.97	20 736.00
5. Pool Operations		
Cash at Bank	\$	
Westpac A/c #810820		
Bank Account No.2		
Balance per bank statement 14.3.86	35 069.49	
ADD unrecorded deposits	24 759.89	
LESS outstanding cheques	5 581.30	
	54 248.08	
6. Contingency Fund		
1. Cash at Bank	\$	
Westpac A/c #810839		
Balance per bank statement	98 745.50	
LESS outstanding cheques	5 854.61	
	92 890.89	
2. Sundry Debtors		
Accrued Interest		
Partnership Pacific Ltd.	670.23	
3. Sundry Creditors		
Interest Payable to Retail Levy Fund	3 604.38	

7. Promotions Fund		Plant and Equipment	
Description	Cost	Written Down Value	
Transparency boxes	948.00	322.00	
Video Equipment	5 211.00	1 838.00	
Store	539.82	340.00	
	6 698.82	2 500.00	

8. Retail Levy Fund		
1. Cash at Bank		
ANZ Bank A/c #406345412		
Balance per bank statement		35 598.26
LESS outstanding cheques		4 000.00
Balance per General Ledger		31 598.26
2. Accrued Interest		
Name		\$
ANZ Bank		737.87
ex Contingency Fund		2 604.38
		3 342.25

3. Fixed Assets—Royal Adelaide Show Site		
Description	Cost	Written Down Value
Electrical Work	237.60	163.00
Glass Door	3 400.00	2 323.00
Paint	1 694.80	1 159.00
Miscellaneous Equipment	1 500.00	1 015.00
Heater and Oven	2 909.48	1 263.00
Fire Equipment	85.00	37.00
Show Ground Platform	2 704.40	2 036.00
	12 531.28	7 996.00

With the exception of the fixed assets of the Royal Adelaide Show Site which have been retained for use by the potato industry at the Royal show, fixed assets, plant and equipment have been sold.

The current disposition of the net realised assets is:

Sale of land and buildings	\$'000	861
Less estimated commission		26
		835
Balance of cash in trust account		33
Balance of cash in bank		209
Total		1 077

Question (2) A delegation representing the Combined Potato Industry Committee met with the Minister on 13 August 1986 to discuss issues related to the formation of the Committee that is to be established to manage the fund established by the Potato Marketing Act Amendment Act 1986.

Question (3) as per the Potato Marketing Act Amendment Act 1986 the net realised assets of the South Australian Potato Board will establish a fund to be used for the development of the potato industry. Legislation to establish a Committee to manage this fund will be introduced into the

House in the near future. Industry representatives will form part of that Committee.

TANK WATER

113. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the E&WS Department ever undertaken any research or investigation into the feasibility of using rain water collected from household rooftops and presently discarded as storm water, in a more productive way for such water intensive activities as agriculture and, if so, what was the conclusion of the research and what is the present disposition of the matter?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Roof run-off is mostly collected in stormwater drainage systems and discharged to natural or man-modified water courses. Suitable areas to store this water where it could be economically re-used are not available. Consequently, detailed research or investigation into roof run-off as a source of water has not been warranted.

ACTS AND REGULATIONS

114. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the cost of printing the loose copies of Acts and Regulations in 1985-86?
2. What was the revenue from the sale of such documents during the same period?
3. What was the cost of printing the most recent annual bound volume of Statutes, how many copies were printed, how many were sold and how many were distributed gratuitously?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Expenditure against Treasury line 'The Legislature, Misc., Printing of Parliamentary Bills, Acts and Regulations' etc. for 1985-86 was \$1 468 000.

The above amount was represented by the following:

	\$
Bill, Acts and Regulations	335 000
Notice Papers, Votes and Minutes	129 000
Bound Statutes	176 000
Parliamentary Papers	544 000
Annual Reports	284 000
	1 468 000

2. Gross revenue from sales of the above-mentioned publications for 1985-86 was \$737 000. It is not possible to ascertain the amount of revenue received specifically from sales of 'Bills, Acts and Regulations'.

3. The cost of printing 1 296 copies Annual Volume of Statutes 1984 was \$90 483.

Sales of this publication from 3 April 1986 to 15 August 1986 totalled 617 copies.

No copies were distributed gratuitously.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

115. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What proportion of the extra \$1.8 million recently allocated to CFS will be used for:

- (a) CFS headquarters and administration; and
- (b) local brigades?

2. Is it CFS policy that tenders be called for all new fire fighting units?

3. Has a prototype fire unit been ordered from Victoria for the CFS and if so:

- (a) at what price;
- (b) were tenders called for it and if not, why not;
- (c) by whom;
- (d) from which business or authority;
- (e) for which CFS brigade; and
- (f) was the order placed with Board approval and if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) \$205 000 of the extra \$1.8 million is allocated for CFS administration.

(b) The remaining \$1 595 million is for the direct or indirect benefit of local brigades throughout the State as follows:

	\$
Training	275 000
Regionalisation	250 000
Subsidies	210 000
Publicity and Promotion	140 000
Communications	120 000
Supplementary Development Plan	80 000
Research and Development	65 000
Fire Operations	65 000
Bushfire Prevention Council	40 000
Salary Restructure	175 000
Extra Workers Compensation Cover	105 000
Contingencies	70 000
	1 595 000

2. In accordance with the purchasing policy as determined by the State Supply Act.

3. Consideration has been given to acquiring a prototype unit from Victoria, but no decision will be made until the possibility of local supply has been ascertained.

CFS PERSONNEL

116. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Is it intended that the CFS will employ more personnel this year and, if so:

- (a) how many;
- (b) what will their duties be;
- (c) what salaries will be paid at each classification; and
- (d) which classifications will be provided with the use of a vehicle and what is the anticipated cost of the vehicles?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes

- (a) Eight.
- (b) (i) Manager Training and Development—Develop and implement volunteer training programs.
- (ii) Bushfire Prevention Officers—4 officers fire prevention activities with Bushfire Prevention Council and Mount Lofty Ranges Supplementary Development Plan.
- (iii) Assistant Regional Officer—Assist regional officers in country areas.
- (iv) Secretary—Typing and clerical.
- (v) Junior Clerk—General clerical.
- (c) (i) \$29 908-\$32 512
- (ii) \$24 825-\$27 553
- (iii) \$19 175-\$24 378
- (iv) \$17 236-\$18 283
- (v) \$9 273-\$13 898

(d) Manager Training and Development and Assistant Regional Officer at a capital cost of \$14 000 and estimated annual cost of \$6 000.

- (e) Vehicles will be issued in accordance with the Government's memorandum 'Use of Government Vehicles'.

FIRE PREVENTION OFFICER

117. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Is it the Government's intention to make it compulsory for those local governments that have CFS to employ a fire prevention officer and, if so, who is it proposed should meet the cost of such an officer?

2. Is it planned to exclude any local government representative from any committee on which the fire prevention officer sits and, if so, why?

3. If fire prevention officers are appointed, is it planned that there will be a right of appeal for those charged by such an officer?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government has not given consideration to these matters at this stage.

AMALGAMATION OF SERVICES

118. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Is it the Government's intention to amalgamate the CFS with the Metropolitan Fire Service?

2. Do any paid officers of the CFS have a financial interest in any businesses that trade with the CFS and, if so—

(a) who;

(b) in which businesses do they hold an interest; and

(c) what dealings have such businesses had with CFS?

3. Does the director have control over all CFS units and, if so, does that give him power to direct a unit anywhere in the State for whatever period of time he desires?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is not currently considering this matter. In the event that the Government, at some time in the future, considers the matter, all interested parties will be fully consulted.

2. I have no knowledge of any officers having such interests.

3. The Director, CFS has control under the Country Fires Act to direct persons engaged in fire fighting operations. In applying for registration as a CFS Brigade the organisation agrees to attend any fire within its own district—or when requested, in an adjacent district.

NEW CFS UNIT PURCHASE

119. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Has a new unit been ordered from Stocks Engineering for the CFS and, if so:

(a) at what price;

(b) were tenders called and, if not, why not;

(c) by whom;

(d) what proportion of the cost will be met by the local council, the local brigade and CFS headquarters;

(e) for which CFS brigade;

(f) was the order placed with Board approval and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No. Stocks Engineering are at present building an appliance for the District Council of

Robertstown, which under new subsidy arrangements will be fully funded through CFS Board subsidy funds.

The order for, and negotiations with, Stocks Engineering have been organised by the District Council of Robertstown, as is the normal procedure.

E&WS MAINS

121. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Are there sewer and water mains under the E&WS Department's control which have reached the end of their effective life and require replacement in the near future and if so:

(a) how many kilometres of each;

(b) in which suburbs;

(c) what is the estimated cost of carrying out the replacement work in today's values;

(d) has any of the work begun and if so, where and to what degree;

(e) what suburbs are to be given priority and approximately in which year is it anticipated each suburb will be completed; and

(f) have work gangs been transferred from laying essential new services in areas such as the Stirling District Council to allow for replacement work where mains are faulty?

2. Will sewer and water mains laying work in the Stirling area be let out to private contract if machinery and manpower resources are not available within the department?

3. Are any reports regarding the age of sewer and water mains available in the department and if so, will the Minister make them available to the Parliamentary Library?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) and (b) The Engineering and Water Supply Department currently operates of the order of 23 000 km of water mains and 6 000 km of sewers throughout the State. The average expected economic life of these assets is estimated to be 80 years. Statistically, a period is being reached where a proportion of the department's mains are either approaching or at the end of their effective life. However, it is necessary to note the following points:

—a proportion of the older mains would have already been replaced or abandoned as a result of system augmentation due to population growth;

—the age of a main is only the broadest indicator as to its likely condition and cannot be reliably used in isolation to predict the location of mains in need of replacement.

Mains are currently replaced on an 'as needs'/reactive basis geared to maintaining a service to the public rather than a predetermined, methodical replacement program for older mains. As such, detailed statistics on the length of mains requiring replacement and/or the suburbs to be affected do not exist.

(c) There are no reliable estimates of long-term replacement requirements.

(d) As indicated earlier, replacement work is carried out on an 'as-needs' basis and consequently does not conform to any particular suburb-based pattern. Current levels of expenditure are of the order of \$1.5-2 million per annum.

(e) See (d) above.

(f) As stated previously the replacement of mains is an on-going task that is currently being carried out as and when required at relatively stable resource levels. No additional resources have been transferred to the task from other activities.

2. The Engineering and Water Supply Department presently has the necessary machinery and manpower to carry out work in the Stirling area that can be justified on the current economic criteria. Decisions on the letting of private contracts in future will be made according to circumstances prevailing at that time.

3. There are reports on the age of sewer and water mains. However, they are internal documents prepared for the Minister's consideration, and as such are not appropriate for release to the Parliamentary Library.

ARCHIVES

122. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Is the Minister aware that the only holograph letter written by E.G. Wakefield in 1837 held by the State Library Archives has been listed as 'missing' and that such early material is not available on microfilm?

2. Is the Minister aware that in the current reference/desk/reading room layout at the Archives, staff are not able to exercise any scrutiny and supervision of the use of archival material by archive users because of staff shortages and visual obstruction between their work station and the research reference facility?

3. How many other valuable original documents relating to the State's early history and Parliamentary development have been stolen or are 'missing' from the Archives because of the antiquated security arrangements and facilities provided for public research and scrutiny of them?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The missing holograph letter has been located. The letter has been transcribed, copied—'for use only' and filed correctly.

2. The staff scrutinise the use and handling of records. Users must read and accept conditions of the reading room before being issued with an annual reader's ticket. The reading room is half glazed and there are generally two desk staff adjacent at all times. Researchers are not allowed to take bags into the reading room and bags brought into the building may be searched at exits.

3. One other record in recent years was discovered missing. The matter was reported to the police; however investigations have not resulted in charges being laid.

FLUORIDATION

126. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the annual cost of fluoridation of Adelaide's water supply?

2. Where does the Government obtain its supply of fluoride?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The total cost of fluoridation for 1985-86 was \$348 000.

2. From the local manufacturer Adelaide Chemical Company.

RURAL WATER MAINS

129. **Mr MEIER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many water mains in rural areas of the State are currently considered inadequate and if any, what are the reasons for the inadequacies?

2. Where are these mains located and what plans are there to upgrade them?

3. What provision is being made to extend water mains in the rural areas to areas not yet having a reticulated supply?

4. What was the total cost in rural areas paid out in wages and material to repair faulty mains during the past financial year and have the increases in water rate charges kept up with operating costs of the E&WS?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The Engineering and Water Supply Department operates of the order of 23 000 km of water mains throughout the State. Based on the commonly used figure of 80 years for the average expected economic life of these assets, it might be expected statistically that a period is being reached where a proportion of the department's mains are either approaching or at the end of their effective life. However, it is necessary to note the following points:

- a proportion of the old mains have already been replaced or abandoned as a result of system augmentation;
- the age of the main is only the broadest indicator as to its likely condition and cannot be reliably used in isolation to predict the location of mains in need of replacement;
- mains are currently replaced on a needs basis geared to maintaining a service to the public rather than a predetermined replacement program for older mains. Detailed statistics on the length of rural mains requiring replacement therefore do not exist.

3. None.

4. The total cost for 1985-86 was approximately \$650 000. The increases in water rate charges in 1985-86 for Country Waterworks have not kept up with the operating costs. The total Country Waterworks deficit increased by approximately 0.5 per cent over 1984-85.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

130. **Mr MEIER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many persons are employed in repairing and maintaining roads under the Highways Department control?

2. Has an efficiency study been carried out in the past three years to determine whether a more efficient method of repairing highways is available?

3. What accountability has each local office to head office in terms of:

- (a) money spent;
- (b) work undertaken;
- (c) standard of repairs; and
- (d) standard of road construction?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. 632—this number does not include departmental and contract employees engaged on bituminous surfacing or resurfacing projects as that work is a combination of construction and maintenance, and the number of persons employed by contractors is not known.

2. Maintenance procedures are under continual review. The department is currently implementing a sophisticated Maintenance Management Scheme.

3. (a) Each Regional Engineer is subjected to tight budgetary control and expenditures are reviewed monthly.

(b) While routine maintenance operations are controlled by Regional Engineers, major repairs and improvements require approval by Head Office.

(c) The standard of repairs is monitored by a specialist Maintenance Engineer based at Head Office.

(d) Design and construction standards for National Highways are set by the Commonwealth Government.

Project briefs, encompassing design and construction standards, for all other projects on roads for which the department is responsible, are approved by Head Office.

STA DEFICIT

131. **Mr MEIER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How does the Minister plan to decrease the STA deficit and by how much is it hoped to decrease it by 30 June 1987, and 30 June 1988?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The size of the subsidy required by the STA depends on the extent to which fare revenue covers the costs of STA operations.

On the revenue side the Government has recently approved a fare rise for the STA, which in 1986-87 will reduce the subsidy required by an estimated \$5.3 m (and \$5.8 m in a full financial year). A decision on a fare rise in 1987-88 will not be made until next year.

On the expenditure side the Government is currently reviewing a number of options to reduce the costs of providing public transport. These options range from service rationalisation to productivity improvement. In taking measures to reduce costs the Government is concerned to keep to a minimum any adverse impact on the travelling public. However, poorly patronised services may be withdrawn in order to free-up resources to meet growth in demand in other areas.

The STA is taking measures to improve productivity, where it is in its power to do so. Examples are the introduction of improved maintenance management procedures and more efficient timetabling and rostering. In addition, the Government and the STA are working to identify a number of other service and productivity options.

SPORTS FINANCES

132. **Mr MEIER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Recreation and Sport: Does the Recreation and Sport Department intend to increase its contribution to sport or will greater reliance be placed on individual sporting bodies to finance themselves?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department of Recreation and Sport in the present economic climate is unable to increase its financial contribution to sport. Therefore greater reliance will be placed on individual sporting bodies to finance themselves. It is an objective of the department to increase both the level of performance and the number of people participating in recreation, sport and fitness activities. To assist the department in achieving this objective, the range of specific purpose grant schemes previously offered by the department have been replaced with a new funding policy. The new funding policy requires State associations to submit a long term development plan on which the department will make its funding decisions.

A Development Plan is the written strategy an association will be undertaking in the areas of programs, management, finance and facilities over a three year period to meet its objectives. It is considered that planning and sound management are crucial to the long-term growth and development of State associations and it should be supported from within the resources of the association and not be dependent upon Government funding. A Development Plan will only

be of value if it is directed towards the needs of the association rather than the requirements of the Department of Recreation and Sport. Funding will be given as a block grant to assist with the agreed elements of the Development Plan.

PHOTOCOPYING MACHINES

134. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What was the total cost of maintaining and repairing the photocopying machines located in the electorate offices of all members of the House of Assembly during 1985-86?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: During the 1985-86 financial year \$15 914.86 was spent on maintenance of photocopying machines located in the electorate offices of all members of the House of Assembly. Maintenance contracts are based on the number of copies produced at a cost of 0.8 cents per copy for Canon copiers and 1.6 cents per copy for Minolta copiers. This maintenance charge covers call out charges, labour, parts and toner. Extra charges are only incurred if the machines are damaged as a result of operator negligence.

URAILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

135. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Where is Uraidla Primary School placed on the replacement school list and when is it anticipated that the rebuilding will commence?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Department has a Statewide Major Works Program of identified projects which is established up to and including the 1988-89 financial years. This program is compiled as a result of assessing each individual area's nominated major works projects. As Uraidla Primary School does not have a position on the current Statewide Major Works Program, it is not possible to anticipate the timing for any proposed building.

Whilst the established program is fixed, minor variations such as timing of projects are inevitable. On an annual basis, a major review of the established program is undertaken, and at that time the program is adjusted to accommodate the next three-year period, with nominated major works.

CHILD ABUSE

140. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. What is the number of Department for Community Welfare officers involved in the Child Abuse Section of the department and

- (a) how many are male;
- (b) how many are female;
- (c) how many have children of their own;
- (d) how many have been married;
- (e) how many are married;
- (f) how many are supplied with a Government motor vehicle;
- (g) how many are migrants or first generation migrants, other than Anglo-Saxons; and
- (h) how many are Aboriginal?

2. How many more such officers will be appointed for 1986-87 and how many will be male and female respectively?

The Hon. G. J. CRAFTER: The Department for Community Welfare does not have a specific 'Child Abuse Section'. Child abuse cases are handled by any or all of the department's staff of Community Welfare Workers and Senior Community Welfare Workers attached to District, Branch and Regional Offices throughout the State. It is emphasised that these staff handle the full range of services provided by the Department and are not specialist child abuse case workers.

The Department also has one Regional Child Protection Planner in each region providing a consulting advisory and co-ordination role relating to child protection services and one position of Senior Planner Child Protection Services based in Central Office responsible for the overall development and implementation of the Child Protection Program on a Statewide basis.

The following information relates to the staff referred to above:

(a) and (b)

	Male	Female
Community Welfare Workers	77	176
Senior Community Welfare Workers	30	24
Regional Child Protection Planners	1	4
Senior Planner Child Protection	—	1

(Note: These figures represent actual staff and not full-time equivalent figures)

- (c) The Department does not keep records of how many have children of their own.
- (d) The Department does not keep records of how many have been married.
- (e) The Department does not keep records of how many are married.
- (f) The staff referred to all have access to Government motor vehicles for the performance of their duties. The vehicles are allocated to the office in which they work.
- (g) The Department does not keep records of how many staff are migrants or first generation migrants other than Anglo-Saxon.
- (h) The Department does not keep records of how many Community Welfare Workers or Senior Community Welfare Workers are Aboriginal.

The 1986-87 Budget provides for the employment of an additional 14 Child Protection Workers during 1986-87. These officers will be appointed on the basis of merit so it is therefore unknown how many will be male and female respectively.

141. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Will there be emphasis placed on appointing equal numbers of male and female Department for Community Welfare officers to investigate child abuse in the future?

2. What are the qualifications of each classification of officer working for the department in the Child Abuse Section, what is the salary for each classification, how many officers are there in each classification and are any expense allowances provided to any of these officers and, if so, how much and to how many?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The appointment of Community Welfare officers to investigate child abuse will continue to be on the basis of merit and not based on employing equal numbers of males and females.

2. The Department for Community Welfare does not have a specific 'Child Abuse Section'. Child abuse cases are handled by any or all of the department's staff of Community Welfare workers and Senior Community Welfare workers attached to district, branch and regional offices throughout the State. It is emphasised that these staff handle the full range of services provided by the department and are not specialist child abuse case workers.

The department also has one Regional Child Protection Planner in each region providing a consulting advisory and co-ordination role relating to Child Protection Services and one position of Senior Planner Child Protection Services based in central office responsible for the overall development and implementation of the Child Protection Program on a Statewide basis.

The following information relates to the staff referred to above.

Community Welfare Workers

Classification: SWO-1
 Salary: \$17 816 to \$27 789
 Qualifications: The Associate Diploma in Social Work is sought as a minimum qualification. However, some unqualified staff who possess specific and relevant skills have been employed.

Number of Employees: 253 Community Welfare Workers (June 1986)

Senior Community Welfare Worker

Classification: SWO-2
 Salary: \$25 278 to \$29 047
 Qualifications: The Associate Diploma in Social Work is sought as a minimum qualification. However some unqualified staff are currently employed.

Number of Employees: 54 Senior Community Welfare Workers (June 1986)

Regional Child Protection Planners

Classification: SWO-3
 Salary: \$29 202 to \$30 928
 Qualifications: Appropriate tertiary qualifications are essential.

Number of Employees: 5 Regional Child Protection Planners (June 1986)

Senior Planner Child Protection

Classification: SWO-5
 Salary: \$33 912 to \$35 485
 Qualifications: Appropriate tertiary qualifications are essential.

Number of Employees: 1 Senior Planner Child Protection (June 1986).

Expense allowances are not paid to any of the staff referred to above. However where employees are required to travel in connection with their official duties they may be reimbursed expenses actually and necessarily incurred in accordance with Public Service Administrative Instructions.

COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICERS

142. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many Department for Community Welfare officers have a home telephone for which the rental and all

calls are paid for by the department and how many receive payment for rental only?

2. How many officers of the department are supplied with a motor vehicle?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 79 staff whose telephone rentals are paid for by the department. There are no officers whose calls are paid for by the department.

2. It is assumed that the question is directed to the number of officers who are supplied with a motor vehicle on a permanent basis. On that basis there are 13: the Director-General, Deputy Director-General, Assistant Director-General, seven directors and three Family Maintenance Enquiry Officers.

RESERVOIRS

144. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Are all reservoirs on land owned entirely by the Crown and, if not, which reservoirs are not and what are the circumstances relating to the land tenure in each case?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The land tenure of water storages used for water supplies shows that all but Penneshaw are on Crown lands. The district council of Dudley leases two dams from private owners for the reticulated supply to Penneshaw.

BOLIVAR STOP WORK MEETINGS

146. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister given permission for shop stew-

ards at Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works to hold their meetings during working hours?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No.

HILTON HOTEL FUNCTION

151. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was the function arranged at the Hilton International Hotel at 7.30 p.m. on 29 July 1986, for which a general invitation was issued to the media, paid for by the Government and, if so, what was the cost of the function?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that the only function held at the Hilton International Hotel on 29 July 1986 was the Liberal Party Conference, the cost of which was not paid by the Government.

BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY STATION

154. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the Government that the Bridgewater railway station should not be staffed and, if so, why?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to upgrade or replace the station toilet facilities and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The requirement for a station master at the Bridgewater railway station is the prerogative of Australian National who own and staff this railway station.

2. The station and toilet facilities are owned by Australian National.