

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 September 1989

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation,
Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment,
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2),
Land Tax Act Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment,
Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act Amendment,
Summary Offences Act Amendment.

PETITION: HUNTING AND FISHING

A petition signed by 446 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to further restrict hunting and fishing was presented by Mr Olsen.
Petition received.

PETITION: MAREEBA CENTRE

A petition signed by 1 244 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the establishment of a pregnancy termination clinic at the Mareeba Centre was presented by the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy.
Petition received.

PETITION: GAWLER BYPASS

A petition signed by 2 445 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to urgently implement the eastern bypass of Gawler was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.
Petition received.

PETITION: PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

A petition signed by 218 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the status of Pinnaroo Area School was presented by Mr Lewis.
Petition received.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, on a point of order. I am sure that other honourable members share my interest and concern about petitions that are presented by members from time to time to this House. I wonder whether it would be

possible for the microphone amplification system to be modified so that we can hear the reading of petitions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that there is anything wrong with the amplification system. There appears to have been a minor hitch with the operation of the system today, and I am sure that the Leader of *Hansard* will ensure that it does not occur again, if necessary, in consultation with the Minister of Public Works.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 10, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 33, 42, 45, 66, 97, 99 and 100.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the 1988-89 financial year.
Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1988-89.
- By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.
State Bank of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.
South Australian Housing Trust—Financial and Statutory Reports, 1988-89.
- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Chiropractors Act 1979—Regulations—Registration Fees.
Drugs Act 1908—Regulation—Hydrogumime and Ivermectin.
Medical Practitioners Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulation—Compensable Patient Fees.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and other Purposes) Act 1986—Regulations—Grants.
Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946—Regulations—Licence Fee.
- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
Licence Fees (Amendment).
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Licence Transferability.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Highways Department—Approval to Lease Departmental Properties, 1988-89.
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Photographs on Licences.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1988-89.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenchan)—
Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Backyard Burning.
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Country Fires Act 1989—Regulations—General.

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—
Regulations—Volunteer Fire-fighters.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Forestry Act Proclamation—Second Valley Forest
Reserve.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Boating Act 1974—Regulations—Fees.

ADELAIDE ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table an erratum to the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Adelaide Entertainment Centre.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

MARINELAND

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I address my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. In view of a lawyer's letter in my possession, will he now admit that he misled the Parliament on 12 April about the Marineland redevelopment? On that date the Minister was asked whether the Government had told Zhen Yun it would not support the construction of a hotel on the Marineland site unless the developer scrapped plans for the oceanarium. The Opposition asked this question after receiving reliable information that a senior officer of the Minister's department had given this ultimatum in a telephone call to Zhen Yun three days before the Minister announced, on 13 February this year, that the oceanarium would not proceed. In his reply the Minister said:

The Government did not blackmail Zhen Yun nor did the Government put pressure on Zhen Yun to change its plan to delete an oceanarium from its proposal.

This answer is contradicted by a letter dated 6 February this year written by solicitors for Zhen Yun to solicitors for Tribond, the company that had been commissioned by the Government to develop the oceanarium. In that letter, Tribond was specifically advised by Zhen Yun that the redevelopment was not proceeding because, and I quote:

The firm consent of the Department of State Development and Technology to our client's original proposals in relation to Tribond has not been forthcoming as required.

This confirms that it was the Department of State Development and not Zhen Yun which made the vital decision that the Marineland redevelopment should not proceed.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reality is that what I have said in the House previously is in fact the case. The situation is that Zhen Yun decided not to proceed with the Marineland component of the development. That was on the basis of a telephone conversation between me and Mr Lawrence Lee of Zhen Yun, in which conversation he advised that within 48 hours Zhen Yun would be coming back with a new proposal that would not have a Marineland component—and that that was because of aspects of financial viability, and coloured by what was seen to be a growing community concern at such enterprises. That is the advice that I gave at the public press conference in February; it is the advice that I have given this House at all stages subsequent to that time and, therefore, I have not in any way misled the House. The honourable member referred to a letter of 6 February from Zhen Yun: I will have to check out that letter. I do not seem to have a copy of that letter with me, but I reiterate that I have not misinformed the House.

HOMESTART LOANS PROGRAM

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction explain the main benefits of the new HomeStart Loans Program that was launched today by the Premier? This major program, announced today, is designed to provide an opportunity of affordable home ownership to thousands of South Australian families.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Newland for her question. I was present today at the launch. The excitement of my office and of the Government was shared by the representatives of the housing industry and the banks who were present today. In a nutshell, the main benefits of the new HomeStart Loans Program are as follows. It provides for increased borrowing power. That is because of the low start nature of the HomeStart loans, whereby borrowers should be able to borrow more than banks or building societies would lend under a conventional loan. It also has the added attraction of requiring a low deposit. The minimum deposit is only 5 per cent of house valuation, and borrowers are required to contribute a minimum of only \$1 000 of their own savings as a part of the deposit, and up to 95 per cent of the house valuation is available as a loan, depending on the individual circumstances.

The repayments are very affordable. Payments are generally set at 25 per cent of the initial household income, and increase every year in line with the increases in the consumer price index. There is protection from interest changes. Borrowers' payments are protected against the effects of sudden increases in interest rates and the strain that this often places on the household budget. Lastly, and most importantly, there is a flexible loan term. The maximum loan term is generally 27 years, but this can be altered later to meet the changing needs of the borrower.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct a question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Why is the Government still trying to cover up the real reasons for the Marineland redevelopment not proceeding? On 3 August the Minister announced that he was approaching companies and individuals who have received pay-outs from the Government following its decision to scrap the Marineland redevelopment, seeking their permission to make public information about the amounts they have been paid. I have in my possession a lawyer's letter from one of the parties involved which demonstrates, however, that the Government is still trying to be selective and secretive in the amount of information it is prepared to make public. In response to the Minister's request, this party replied in part as follows by letter dated 3 August:

Such consent is subject to and conditional upon our clients being at liberty to make such responses to the media as they may consider necessary and appropriate. You will no doubt be aware that our clients have been repeatedly warned by the receiver, Mr John Heard, of Messrs Arthur Anderson and Company, that any public comment by them on this or any other issue relating to Marineland will result in their immediate dismissal. We therefore seek your written assurance that public comments by our clients will not result in termination of their employment.

However, again the Government has refused to give this assurance.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Minister, I remind members that the guidelines for admissible questions that we have adopted from Erskine May would normally rule out of order questions which 'seek an expression of opinion or contain arguments, expression of opinion,

inferences or imputations', or which contain 'epithets or rhetorical, controversial, ironical or offensive expressions'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Yes, I have seen that letter. It came into my hands just today and the information in it indicates that, with the condition given by the lawyers, we could issue a figure as compensation payment to the Abels. They have given an undertaking, provided they have the opportunity to respond to that issue. On that basis, I believe that the information should be made available. The amount in question is \$590 000.

Mr Olsen: Do you deny them the ability to talk about anything else?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, the situation is that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson was given the call for a question. No such call was given to the Leader of the Opposition to interject with a further question.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for an action that is tantamount to contempt of the Chair. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am quite happy for my officers to sit down and discuss with them the nature of anything they believe should be made public. The point is that I am quite happy to have all of these figures completely available subject to the agreement of all parties. We were asked a question about the matter of compensation payments. I have addressed that matter and we have provided that information. As I have just indicated, they have said they are happy for us to release that figure, so I have announced it to the House. If there is other information in that agreement that they would like us to canvass, we will certainly canvass that as well.

As to the \$5.63 million that has been expended on the receivership and winding up of Marineland to date, that includes \$900 000 for the maintenance of the dolphins and other fauna; \$2.45 million relating to the development aspects of the Tribond proposal, including costs associated with planning and design undertaken by Tribond as part of efforts to identify the developer; and \$1.63 million to the creditors of Tribond. The balance is made up of other payments, including receiver's fees and the \$590 000 that I indicated a moment ago.

I should inform the House in response to a matter raised earlier this afternoon, because it is pertinent to a previous question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I refer to a copy of a fax sent from the Department of State Development and Technology to Mr Lawrence Lee of Zhen Yun on 3 February. This is the advice given to Zhen Yun on 3 February:

This is to confirm the main issues discussed... by telephone on... 2 February 1989. Please review and confirm your understanding of the issues detailed below:

1. That given perceived construction and operational difficulties with the Marineland redevelopment it may not prove viable and therefore it may be in Zhen Yun's interest not to proceed with the redevelopment and in consequence not proceed to acquire the shares of Tribond Developments Pty Ltd.

2. If the Marineland redevelopment were not to proceed the Government would encourage Zhen Yun to develop a hotel and convention centre at West Beach and the South Australian Government would address the question of the future of Tribond Developments.

Zhen Yun will submit a proposal to Department of State Development and Technology re a hotel and convention centre proposal.

I repeat, I am not certain what is in the letter dated 6 February referred to by the Leader, because it was correspondence between parties that did not include the Government. It was a lawyer's letter. The Leader of the Opposition

referred to 3 February and advice from the Department of State Development and Technology. That is the advice received on 3 February.

HOMESTART LOANS PROGRAM

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House who will be eligible for a HomeStart loan? The new HomeStart loan initiative is a highly exciting program and it would be of interest to all members to learn more about who will benefit from this innovative program.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for Fisher for his question. Perhaps I should now place on record the Liberal Party's complete opposition to this program. I will have great delight in telling the community of South Australia that the Liberal Party is totally opposed to any new, innovative scheme designed to help people who would otherwise be unable to get into home ownership. HomeStart loans are available to all South Australian residents, regardless of income. One does not have to be a first home buyer to qualify. However, HomeStart loans are only for the purchase or refinancing of homes that will be the principal place of residence. People must not own any other residential property.

HomeStart loans are available for purchase of an established home or to build a new one. There is no restriction on the value of properties that may be bought but, where properties are of significant value (currently set at more than \$125 000), the loan will attract a higher rate of interest and as a result the borrowing capacity will be partially reduced. If people are already a home buyer but are experiencing difficulties in meeting current mortgage payments, they may be able to refinance an existing loan with a HomeStart loan. During the remaining months of this financial year it is expected that up to 1 500 households will have settled their loans by 30 June 1990. This is in addition to the 2 500 households that will receive assistance under the concessional loan program during the phase-out process. In 1990-91 an estimated 4 000 households will settle their loans under HomeStart in that year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HOMESTART LOANS PROGRAM

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction confirm that the HomeStart program the Government released today is identical in purpose and principle to a Home Low Start Loans policy promised by the Premier in the 1985 election campaign and that the 1985 policy was never implemented? Therefore, what assurance can the Government give that there will be a greater response to this latest attempt to defuse record interest rates?

Labor's 1985 housing policy included a policy for 'Home Low Start Loans' which the Premier said would have an initial fund of 'about \$50 million' and 'allow buyers to defer some interest and capital charges to later in the life of the loan'. However, after the 1985 election this policy was not implemented and not a single loan was made available under it. The program that the Government is now promising is identical in purpose and principle, that is, to capitalise interest repayments until later in the life of a loan. Contact with building societies this morning indicates that previous low start mortgage instruments they have offered have met with only very limited success. The general expe-

rience has been that, once intending home buyers realise that such schemes simply defer rather than reduce total loan repayments, they are reluctant to take them on.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That question demonstrates the total incompetence and failure on the part of the Opposition to understand the difference between a low start loan and what was launched under this exciting and innovative launch, that is, a capital indexed loan. I have every reason to believe that the member for Bragg should be propped up, and after Question Time I shall be only too pleased to have officers of my department give him a full briefing on the difference between a low start loan scheme, which is being offered interstate and overseas and a capital indexed scheme. The unique feature of a capital indexed loan is increased borrowing power, as I mentioned to the member for Newland. One can borrow up to 2.8 per cent of household income compared to around 1.8 per cent with a conventional loan. That opens up the floodgates and makes people eligible who have previously been locked into private rental with no chance of getting a loan.

I would have thought that the combined brain power of members opposite would be able to grasp that. At least they had 72 hours notice prior to the launch today, but they could not understand it. Their Leader, the most negative person I have ever met, was saying that it was a mortgage relief scheme. That is the problem that the Leader of the Opposition has: he is the most negative person in this State. If the Leader suddenly woke up tomorrow morning with a head of hair, he would be the first person to complain about the price of haircuts. This capital indexed loan is available in New South Wales and supported by the Greiner Government—supported by the Leader's friends in New South Wales. The scheme is running in Victoria, Western Australia, North America and Europe. It is not a low start loan but, rather, a capital indexed loan. When we have received the flood of inquiries from those people desperate to get into home ownership, having been locked into private rental and wanting to take advantage of the scheme, I will tell them that the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to the scheme.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

STATE DEVELOPMENT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Has the Minister of Labour's attention been drawn to statements made about developers, employers and employees in this State by members opposite and their Federal counterparts? Will the Minister advise the House whether the statements are undermining the State's industrial record and whether they are likely to impact on further investment in this State? In the past two weeks both the Federal member for Mayo (Alexander Downer) and the State Opposition spokesperson on industrial relations have made widely publicised comments on the Myer Remm site and on supposed union activity at the Royal Adelaide Show. Those claims have been refuted, but people in my electorate want to know what the effect of these statements is likely to be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We cannot proceed with the Minister's reply until the House has come to order and the microphone system is operating correctly.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question because the matters he has raised are of real concern, particularly when members opposite and their Federal counterparts, who do not understand the mat-

ters on which they are commenting, not only make untrue and unfounded statements in South Australia but also are prepared to repeat them in the Federal Parliament in an attempt to get nationwide coverage. Certain matters regarding the Myer Remm construction site were agreed nearly 12 months ago, and the comments made are inaccurate and are repudiated in a full page advertisement in the *Advertiser* setting out the facts.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The obscure member for Davenport comments all the time and he makes snide remarks, but he is not prepared to get up and ask questions on this matter. He ought to appreciate that it is the largest building site in Adelaide, including a huge investment that will see a major change in retail shopping in South Australia. Since its inception we have had constant carping about that site from members opposite but on each occasion when their comments have been examined they have been found to be untrue. As to the comments of a member in another place concerning the Royal Show and workers being forced to join unions, a newspaper reporter checked up and found that claim to be untrue also. This just indicates that members opposite have no understanding of what is happening. Members opposite are constantly peddling falsehoods and damaging investment prospects in South Australia. It is about time that the member for Mitcham got his job back. At least when he was the shadow Minister of Labour we had some reasonable comment from him, even if it was sometimes ill informed.

MURRAY RIVER FEES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Will the Minister of Lands give an assurance that the Government will not proceed with a proposal by the Department of Lands to increase licence fees for boat mooring and launching facilities on the Murray River up to 800 per cent? I have in my possession a Cabinet submission, which was prepared within the Department of Lands for the Minister's signature, proposing that these licences should be increased from \$15 to up to \$200 a year. The submission, which gives no justification for the increase, states that no additional resources will be necessary to administer the licences. Therefore, it is a further example of backdoor taxation. The submission anticipates very strong reaction to this proposal by also stating:

It would seem prudent to introduce the new fees in a phased manner and at a time when such rises can be sustained against the media campaign.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As usual, the honourable member has his facts completely wrong. I state categorically that I have not seen that submission, if indeed it exists. I have certainly not seen it and, most importantly, I have not signed it. Thirdly, it has not been to Cabinet nor discussed by Cabinet. If some zealous public servant in Lands wishes to engage in the preparation of a submission that does not even get to me and chooses to leak such a draft to the Opposition, that is one matter. Let us clearly get on the record that the Minister of Marine—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not think that it is very significant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I remind the House that my colleague the Minister of Marine is responsible for any such charges. I have absolutely no responsibility in that area. Certainly, the mooring charges have not been transferred to

the Lands Department and I have not seen the draft submission referred to. I understand that it exists—I have not seen it. My signature is not on the bottom, and I want to place on the record categorically that I have not seen it; it has not been to Cabinet; it is merely a vain attempt by the Opposition to curry up some kind of fear and scare in the community; and it is a total failure in doing that.

HOMESTART LOANS PROGRAM

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the existing concessional loans scheme offered through the State Bank will continue in tandem with the exciting new HomeStart Loans Program.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Bright about using such loaded adjectives as 'exciting', regardless of his feelings on the matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bright still has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! No honourable member should be subjected to that sort of harassment. The honourable member for Bright.

Mr ROBERTSON: I realise that after the Minister's previous answer this might be seen to be a case of the 'hair of the dog', but I am sure that many people will no doubt want to know how the two schemes interact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is trying to make out whether or not it was sense, let alone whether or not it was comment. The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call, not the Deputy Leader. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Members should make sure that they read the front page of the *News* which refers to this \$1 billion exciting boost to the South Australian community. In regard to the concessional loan program, new applications to the existing scheme will no longer be taken as of today. People already registered on the waiting list will have a choice of a loan from either the old or the new scheme.

The inability of about half the qualifying applicants to take up their loan was the prime reason why 12 months or so ago I instigated a review of the existing scheme. The scheme was rapidly being overtaken by rising house prices and an increasing inability on the part of applicants to raise the ever growing deposit necessary to breach the gap between the \$48 000 maximum loan available and house prices. Although the existing scheme successfully provided 16 300 new loans over the past six years, another problem looming was the steady erosion of its funding base.

Continuation of the scheme would have required, in coming years, increasing the current grant support from the State's resources. Even that would not have overcome the problem facing many applicants who still could not have raised a sufficient deposit or gone into higher repayments if the loan had been increased. During 1989-90 the existing scheme will process 2 500 loans, with another 1 500 loans being settled under the HomeStart Loans Program, making 4 000 applications in the present financial year.

SPORTS INSTITUTE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what is the value of equipment purchased by the Sports Institute from Pursuit Performance Pty Ltd? What products were purchased? What assurance will the Minister give that the purchasing was done on an open tender basis, and that the Director of the institute, Mr Nunan, and an employee, Mr Craig, as principals of Pursuit Performance, played no part in the decisions to purchase this equipment?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will obtain a report from the Chief Executive Officer in relation to those questions. I am confident that the Chief Executive Officer will ensure that the business of the Sports Institute is conducted properly, and I am sure that all the transactions have been overseen in a proper way. I will ensure that the matter is investigated and I hope that this is not a witch-hunt by the member for Coles against particular individuals—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Murray-Mallee interjects. I wonder if that could apply to the Opposition. However, I will investigate the matter and bring back a report.

FIXED ODDS BETTING

Mr RANN (Briggs): Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport concerned about the withdrawal of support by the South Australian Jockey Club for fixed odds betting as a result of some country clubs seeking certain guarantees? Is the Minister aware of reforms in New Zealand that are designed to modernise and improve the efficiency and accountability of racing across the Tasman? Punters in my electorate are extremely angry that the South Australian Jockey Club has rejected fixed odds totalizator betting. They have also expressed their frustration—

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN: That shows the concern of the Opposition for punters. They have also expressed their frustration that the South Australian Jockey Club has failed to consider the interests of punters who are the lifeblood of the industry in this State. It has been put to me that the SAJC should examine reforms that have now been established in New Zealand to streamline and rationalise an outdated racing system, including the re-examination of racing dates and an upgrading of public amenities available to non-club members. I understand that the new New Zealand system followed a deputation to the Government of race-horse owners, jockeys, trainers, harness racing representatives, and punters, who all called for major reforms.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has raised this question in Parliament today due to the strong support that has been exhibited by the ordinary punter for the introduction of fixed odds betting.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Bragg has indicated his position on this. The situation has to be made clear to the community in relation to the origin of fixed odds betting, and how the proposal came before Parliament in a Bill.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Bragg to cease harassing the Minister with repeated and out of order interjections.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The industry approached the TAB which consequently approached me as Minister on the

question of the introduction of fixed odds betting. It was seen then by industry representatives as an opportunity for them to explore a fairly exciting new betting system for the industry in this State. As has been referred to by the member for Briggs, this provides an opportunity for punters to be sure of the odds when they place their bets with the TAB.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Bragg had two bob each way—and he did not pick the winner, as usual. The night before this House voted on the fixed odds betting proposal, the honourable member put before this House an amendment which, in fact, would have opened up the whole of the fixed odds system to include not only off-course betting but also on-course betting. Some 24 hours later he made a public statement withdrawing from that position. So, his track record on this matter is not too flash.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Has he apologised?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, he has not apologised yet—that is still to come. The proposal, seen by the industry as an opportunity to offer to punters in this State a system providing better odds and a better opportunity for investment, has now been taken away from them, unfortunately, by the same industry that made the original recommendation. That decision has been made only in the past couple of days. This is an opportunity that has been missed.

I note from a press release issued today that the TAB is going to try to sell the system to other States and overseas. I wish the TAB luck with that. I would say, though, that in the circumstances it will have a much harder case to present, because the system is not up and running. With our being unable to support the proposal, the industry, which was the original proponent of the proposal for fixed odds betting, has withdrawn its support. I sought to convey to the Parliament, on behalf of the industry, that it would be an innovative step in relation to the support of racing. However, I am not able to proceed to support that. Obviously, there might be other opportunities to consider it. If I were the member for Briggs, I would certainly encourage my constituents in relation to this again being an option for the future. We will need an ongoing commitment from the industry—and it has given that to me over time.

On two separate occasions it gave me an ongoing commitment of support to introduce it. It was only last Friday, having had a third glance at the system, that it made a decision not to support it. I understand from a press release that because certain guarantees could not be given by the SAJC to country clubs, the SAJC withdrew its support. That is the history of the circumstances leading up to today.

All the experts who have looked at fixed odds betting and have given an opinion on it in fact have concluded that it would have worked and it would have been an opportunity for the community to have a new and exciting betting system. It would have offered the opportunity for us as a State to sell the system not only interstate but also overseas, and it would have been the first automated computerised fixed odds betting system tried in the world. What the New Zealand punters have seen regarding the industry is important. We need to work with the industry, and I have said that many times. We need to encourage attendance at various meetings to make the turnstiles tick over. We need to encourage people to come back to all forms of racing, and we must take steps to ensure that that occurs. That includes providing better facilities on-course, in conjunction with the Racecourse Development Board. The more we do that and support the system, we will be providing opportunities for—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may not be interested in the industry but I am

sure many of his colleagues are. We will work with the industry to encourage people to come back to the races in a general sense of the codes. The member for Briggs can convey to his constituents that this Government is committed to ensuring they are provided with the sorts of facilities that they enjoy as ordinary punters whenever they are at the races.

RURAL ASSISTANCE INVESTIGATION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Will the Minister of Agriculture explain how a person who is bankrupt and under investigation by the Police Fraud Squad can receive a rural assistance loan from his department? The person to whom I refer had been running a feed lot at Murray Bridge to fatten cattle. He did not own the cattle, but contracted to fatten and sell them, then pay the owners of the cattle. He was declared bankrupt in May owing about \$700 000 to about 30 people, and is being investigated by police for allegations that he sold the cattle and did not pay the owners. However, I have been informed that six weeks after he went into liquidation, he received a re-establishment loan of \$28 000 from the Department of Agriculture.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have become aware of this matter in recent days and am very concerned at the situation. On the face of it, some very serious misjudgments may have been made in a decision-making process for rural assistance. I have sent a memorandum to the Director-General of Agriculture to have this matter thoroughly investigated. I understand that there have been allegations of misappropriation or fraud and that the Fraud Squad may be involved in this matter. I have asked for all information of all inquiries on this matter to be made available to me. When I have a report, I will certainly advise the House.

YOUTH HOUSING PACKAGE

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say what procedures are being established in South Australia to take advantage of the \$10 million youth housing package announced in the recent Federal Budget? The Burdekin report on the problems of youth homelessness has received widespread support in the community, and a number of submissions were made by South Australian youth organisations, particularly organisations that are part of the inner city youth network. They have all worked hard for many years to provide emergency and long-term accommodation for unemployed and homeless young people, and are now anxious to know how they will be involved in the allocation of the resources made available in the Federal Budget following the acceptance of many of the recommendations contained in the Burdekin report.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I congratulate the member for Adelaide not only for his question but for his continuing support for homeless young people who, in most cases through no fault of their own, find themselves in a position where they need Government assistance. As the honourable member has said, the \$10 million Burdekin package provided South Australia with \$850 000, which will be channelled primarily through the Crisis Accommodation Program. Additional funding of \$598 000 will be provided either for a supported assistance accommodation program or an additional crisis accommodation program. An additional \$685 000 has been allocated to South Australia for the local government and community housing program.

Mr Burdekin is on the record as saying that the South Australian Government, of all State Governments, has picked

up its responsibility in providing long-term accommodation for homeless youth. In the light of dramatic crises and problems facing young people referred to in the Burdekin report, that is something for which the Government should be congratulated. In the area of youth housing, where finance is provided primarily by the Federal Government, in January 1990 there will be an increase in the young homeless allowance of \$7.50 per week and automatic indexation. The rate will rise to \$95 a week. A level of payment equivalent to the Job Search Allowance will be made for those young people who are living away from home. These measures will considerably assist young people who seek private rental accommodation and will allow others to make a greater contribution towards Housing Trust rents.

MARKET RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Premier table in the House, at the earliest opportunity, all questionnaires used in taxpayer-funded Government market research since 1984 to assure the Parliament and the public that these questionnaires have not included voting intention and personal approval questions and, if not, why not, and why has all of this information been provided to the State Secretary of the Labor Party to help in planning the Government's election campaign? In 1984, the Premier issued guidelines for the conduct of this market research after the Opposition has proved, following denials by the Government, that in a poll which cost taxpayers \$32 000, ostensibly to assess community attitudes to drugs, 11 of the 26 questions had been Party political in nature. I am sure all members opposite can remember that. It addressed issues such as the personal approval—

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for introducing comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I ask for the indulgence of the House. It is very difficult for the Chair to make sense of some members' questions because of the difficulty we are having with the amplification system, which I hope the Minister will deal with quickly. I request the indulgence of members. The honourable member.

Mr S.J. BAKER: However, according to Dr Cornwall's just published book, those guidelines—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is explaining his question, not giving a book review.

Mr S.J. BAKER: However, according to Dr Cornwall's just published book, those guidelines have not stopped Party political polling continuing at the expense of taxpayers. I quote Dr Cornwall's key assertion:

In practice, the guidelines enabled the development of a sophisticated use of market research which simultaneously monitored community issues and Government performance.

Since these guidelines were issued, about \$1.2 million has been spent on Government research and there is a further allocation in this year's budget of more than a quarter of a million dollars. I have been reliably informed that all the results of this taxpayer-funded research are automatically made available to the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party. The Opposition would also like them. Since 1987 it has been carried out on an exclusive basis by ANOP, the Labor Party's official political polling organisation. The Premier has been quoted as saying that nothing improper is being done. He can prove this by tabling all the relevant questionnaires immediately.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, let me say how interested I am in the honourable member quoting with approval the words of Dr Cornwall. Dr Cornwall would have been delighted had he been afforded the same courtesy in relation to his credibility whilst a member of this place.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition interjects. Perhaps he ought to check with his colleague down the line a bit. Back in 1984 he was telling this House, in relation to the Hon. Dr Cornwall:

The Minister is a political monster who continually hurls personal abuse and venomous insults at anyone and anything when he thinks he can get away with it. He tries to frighten, intimidate and belittle people who in any way dispute his actions or his own point of view.

It is most important that I draw the next comment to the attention of the member for Mitcham. The Leader of the Opposition stated:

Instead of truthful replies to questions about this matter all the Minister has been prepared to give Parliament is more abuse; instead of information, feigned indignation; instead of behaving responsibly, he has acted recklessly.

If that is not a trumped up piece of rhetoric, I do not know what is. The Hon. L.H. Davis in another place stated:

The Hon. Dr Cornwall is not only shifty—he is also untruthful. The Hon. Martin Cameron also went on, and I could quote numerous references. However, let us get one thing straight at the start: I do not mind that questions are asked, but I will not accept—and it is rough on Dr Cornwall—the former Minister's words being used by members opposite after what they have been saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Dr Cornwall is no longer in Parliament. He is undertaking a new career. He is no longer involved in politics. How about leaving him alone? It would make a difference. Let us have no more of his authority being used by members opposite, as opposed to others who might have a better standing using his authority. I refer to the surveys referred to by the honourable member. He is rehashing a lot of old nonsense and linking it to an entirely different program and sequence of events. The 1984 situation was adequately and totally canvassed in this place. And it is interesting that, even in the reference to which the honourable member alluded, a couple of omissions were made, which a reference to *Hansard* would make clear. The details and nature of that survey were tabled and laid out.

From that time also certain guidelines were introduced in relation to research projects being undertaken in government. I remind the House that these things have taken place for many years. Under our predecessors in office they were also undertaken. The findings are used, appropriately, in the formulation of departmental policy, assessment of programs and so on—a very proper and legitimate activity. We have regularised, formalised and consolidated the program. The honourable member is quite right in referring to the fact that since late 1987 there has been a formal Government research program, won by ANOP on a tender basis from an evaluation by an independent committee.

As I have said in this place many times, it is true that ANOP is also hired by the Australian Labor Party and is paid for political advice and information on polling. What it does in that area is not connected with the Government research program. Much is made of the fact that a Party preference question was included in a particular survey. In fact, I believe the member for Bragg was asked his views on a range of subjects. I hope that the surveys allow for bias in relation to the member for Bragg, although perhaps he answered truthfully, because the results of the survey

showed that the public was very satisfied with the services. The honourable member obviously answered truthfully.

As has been carefully explained to the House, the Party political preferences are standard checking to ensure that the sample is correct in any polling of this nature. The information gained there is no different from what we see in the *Bulletin* and many other sources from time to time—and probably about as reliable. As to the publication of the results, I am not willing to come in and place this material before the House. No Government has been willing to do that and it is not appropriate to do so. However, the results of surveys will be and are being progressively released.

Let me give an example: in the crime prevention policy recently published by the Government there was clear reference to the ANOP survey which was used to test those programs. In fact, there is an appendix devoted to the findings of that survey. There are a number of others in train, for instance, one on education, which has formed the basis of future policy planning on the curriculum guarantee, and details concerning that will appear in a forthcoming edition of *School News* (I think that is the name of the publication) and so on. Where opportunities arise and where it is appropriate to do so, this information will be placed before the House.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Health confirm that the State Government has brought down a health budget allowing for real growth in this financial year?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is important that this matter be addressed because there are possibly people in the community who are confused about it. On the Friday morning following the budget, the *Advertiser* came out and clearly said that there had been a cut in the health budget. The next day it ran a story from me—without editorial comment—saying that there was real growth in the health budget. Both stories cannot be correct. Let me explain to the House as briefly as I can, because this may save time in the Estimates Committees, how I think the confusion arose in the minds of the journalists.

Let me talk about journalist A (it does not matter about the name). Journalist A, who works for the *Advertiser*, was in the lockup with a senior officer of the Health Commission on the Thursday lunch-time. It was explained to journalist A by that senior officer that the health budget allowed for 5 per cent real growth. It might have been better if he had been told that the health budget provided for 12 per cent expansion in the amount of money to be spent. It amounts to the same thing but, in any event, he was told that it was 5 per cent real growth.

However, journalist A was not the person to write the article. Journalist A has an interest in health or, in any event, that is the job assigned to him by his superiors. The article was to be written by journalist B who has an interest in political matters or, at least again, that is the task assigned to him by his superiors. Journalist A told journalist B that the health budget was increased by 5 per cent, and journalist B said, 'Hang on, inflation is 7 per cent, so there must be a cut,' and so the article came out in that form.

I read it and understood that the journalists were confused, and I tried to contact journalist B, who was not available. In the meantime, the Chairman of the Health Commission had contacted journalist A, and there were further discussions, as a result of which my release on the Friday was published in the *Advertiser* on the Saturday

morning. However, that is not the end of the story, because journalist C then enters the whole argument. In fact, journalist C does not work for the *Advertiser* at all: journalist C works for a different newspaper. A couple of days afterwards journalist C came out and said, 'Hang about, there are still some problems here because, if you look at what was actually spent by the Health Commission last year, it amounted to \$1.01 billion; this year they have estimated \$1.06 billion and that is not much of an increase.'

What journalist C did not understand is that not all of what health is going to spend is in the health budget any more than that not all of what education spends is in the education budget. Although the health budget allows for full inflation of purchases of equipment, it allows for no inflation of salaries and wages because, to use the jargon of the Treasury, that is all in round sum allowances.

Of course, there will be a call on these round sum allowances this financial year. There will be the normal adjustments that occur under the accord, usually in line with inflation. It is not impossible, as a result of award restructuring and the like, that nurses may get increases above that. There are discussions going on at present with resident medical officers. All of that will have to be met from the round sum allowances.

Our best estimate is that once that is taken into account, whether one compares the estimates from last year with the estimates of this year, or whether one compares the outcome of last year with the probable outcome of this year, there is 5 per cent real growth in the health budget, and that is a good deal for the hospitals and for the health units throughout this State.

POLITICAL REVELATIONS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Following revelations by Dr Cornwall in his book of political memoirs about the role played by the Premier in a conspiracy to force Mr Norm Foster to support the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, will the Premier issue a public apology to Mr Foster and his family for the personal torment and anguish that he helped to put them through; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Unfortunately, I just cannot lay my hands on a very juicy quote of the Deputy Leader's assessment of Dr Cornwall, but the Deputy Leader is into the same thing. I do not think it needs my statement, although it is already on the public record concerning this matter and the interpretation of events. I leave it eloquently to Mr Foster himself, who quite rightly said that it was absolute nonsense, and he ought to know.

ALBERTON RAILWAY STATION

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Transport say what temporary provision has been made at the Alberton railway station for rail passengers to cross the tracks, and when the pedestrian overpass will be back in service? The old passenger pedestrian crossover bridge at this historic station has been temporarily closed for safety reasons.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The bridge has been closed because it is assessed to be unsafe. The timber work for its decking and handrails is in an advanced stage of decay. Maze-type pedestrian crossings have been provided as an interim measure. The bridge is a heritage listed item. Correspondence has been entered into with the State Heritage Section of the Environment and Planning Department, as

well as the Port Dock Station Museum, with regard to its future. If the bridge is to be restored to its original condition, it will still be unable to meet current Australian standards pertaining to structural strengths for bridges, and it will not meet the requirements for access by disabled people. The STA is to dispose of the bridge as a redundant asset. Port Dock Station Museum has expressed interest in re-erecting the bridge at its museum. The STA has expressed preparedness to discuss this proposal with the museum and the Department of Environment and Planning.

POLITICAL REVELATIONS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Can the Premier say whom the Parliament should believe about the circumstances which led to the resignation of Dr Cornwall—the Premier or the former Minister of Health? On 4 August last year, the Premier issued a press statement in which he said:

Dr Cornwall considered that if the highest standards of ministerial propriety were to be maintained he should step down from the Ministry. I commend him for his attitude.

Later that same day in this House the Premier said:

I did not force Dr Cornwall to resign.

Both these statements are diametrically opposed to revelations by Dr Cornwall in his political memoirs, in which he states of his dealings with the Premier at the time:

Quite simply he asked for my resignation. Just as simply I refused to go.

Dr Cornwall reveals further discussions with the Premier in which he refused to resign, and ultimately alleges, contrary to the Premier's statement to this House, that he had been forced to resign.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is canvassing matters of history, of which there will be a number of versions. I suggest that the honourable member wait until I produce my book, which will be some time in the next century when I retire.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DOMESTIC AIRLINES DISPUTE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I make this statement in this place on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Tourism in another place who similarly has made this statement about the domestic airlines dispute. One of the ironies of the current situation is that it has highlighted to everyone the enormous contribution that travel and tourism makes to the economic livelihood of this country. It has done so in a way that the industry could not have achieved through any normal means.

It is to be greatly regretted, however, that the catalyst for this increased awareness of the travel sector has been an industrial dispute with the ramifications that we are now witnessing. The economic impact of this dispute will be felt by Australia for many years to come. Indeed, it is possibly through the longer term tarnishing of Australia's image and reputation as a reliable tourist destination, rather than the day-to-day income losses as aircraft lie idle around the nation, that we will ultimately judge the extent of the damage that has been done.

It is the loss of corporate traffic that is being felt most acutely by South Australia's tourism and hospitality businesses. The adverse impact on individual operations, and

particularly the high standard business hotels and convention venues, remains severe and, as the business segment is the highest value part of the State's tourist markets, the aggregate income loss to South Australia is substantial.

It is still premature, however, to talk about job losses which can be attributed to the dispute. Advice to the Minister of Tourism late last week, following checks by Tourism SA, the Australian Hotels Association, and the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority amongst the hotel, restaurant, attraction and ground transport operators, was that staff are being asked to take holiday leave, and that stand-downs and retrenchments will be delayed until the last possible moment.

In recognition of the seriousness of the present situation, Tourism SA has developed an 'action plan' of short and longer term initiatives to minimise the damage that is taking place now, as well as that which will carry forward into the future. The main components of this action plan are as follows:

- Provision of a weekly updated status report to key industry leaders.
- Fortnightly meetings with the industry to consider off-setting cooperative marketing tactics.
- Weekly discussions with the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority and the Adelaide Convention Centre to plan steps to assist conference organisers in going ahead with their functions.
- Direct mail campaign directed to overseas and interstate travel agencies to provide accurate information on existing air and alternative ground transport availability.
- The appointment of officers in the SA Travel Centres interstate to provide intending travellers with assistance regarding travel arrangements, and media advertisements to advise travellers of this service.
- Liaison with the Australian Tourist Commission regarding appropriate overseas 'marketing recovery' campaigns in which South Australia can participate following the resolution of the dispute.
- Extended interstate advertising activities to ensure that South Australia reclaims 'deferred' domestic travel demand.

There is no suggestion as yet that we should be attempting to charter aircraft as some of the more remote States have been forced to do on behalf of their much more inaccessible tourist regions. But the dialogue that we have set up with the industry will enable this option to be considered, amongst the other plans which are progressively advanced, as the situation demands.

Fortunately, South Australia's geographic position is such that interstate road and rail travel is still a feasible option for many travellers—unlike the more remote centres of Tasmania, Western Australia, Northern Territory, and the north of Queensland. It is evident that coach, hire car, and rail operations to and from Adelaide are at maximum capacity.

The deregulation of South Australia's intrastate air services a decade ago has meant that, unlike other States, our regional services are unaffected and some interstate operations by regional carriers have been scheduled, for example, Kendell to Melbourne via Mount Gambier and Lloyd to Alice Springs.

Also, there is now additional capacity available to Adelaide from Qantas, the foreign internationals, and the RAAF, and the domestic airlines are now moving to charter overseas aircraft and crews to recommence a stop gap interstate service.

I stress that the Government will do whatever it can to further reduce the exposure of the State's tourism operators

in the losses arising from the pilots' dispute. Obviously there are issues of fundamental national importance which are bound up in this dispute. The dispute is an unforgivable hijack of Australia's major export earning industry, and by their actions the pilots are jeopardising the future of every Australian. I urge them to return to the negotiating table to achieve a quick and lasting resolution of this devastating strike.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR PLUNKETT

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move:

That a further four weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Peake (Mr Plunkett) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That the Sessional Orders for the establishment of the Estimates Committees contained in the schedule that has been distributed be adopted.

With the indulgence of the House, I will not read the Sessional Orders because of their length, but they have been circulated to honourable members and are in the same form as last year.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Although the Deputy Premier has said that the Sessional Orders have been circulated, I do not recall having received a copy. If that is not the case then I apologise, but so far I have not received it. I think that some consideration of the actual detail of these Sessional Orders is required and I have previously raised informally the view that this House should not exclude from consideration the actual detailed provisions of the Bill itself.

The Appropriation Bill consists of two very essential parts: first, seven clauses, some of which are quite trivial and some of which are quite substantial; and, secondly, as all honourable members will be aware, the schedules, which are referred to the Estimates Committees for detailed debate and report back to this House. However, the clauses of the Bill itself are not the subject of the Estimates Committees deliberations, and by provisions contained in the Sessional Orders the House is proposing and has previously excluded from debate the actual provisions in the Bill itself.

I do not mean to suggest that the clauses of the Bill are the subject of any great controversy. However, that is true also of many other measures that come before this House. The fact that there is a degree of unanimity, bipartisanship, or whatever one might like to say about the individual clauses of the Bill, is no reason to exclude those clauses from debate. It is somewhat anomalous in my view that the Legislative Council, which has no power to amend a money Bill, has the full right to debate the provisions of those clauses even if it does not have the right to amend them.

This House is for no particular reason excluding from consideration and amendment those clauses of the Bill. The normal Committee process should prevail, in my view; not to start a fresh Estimates Committee debate—and that would not be possible because one would have to restrict debate to the terms of the clauses before the House. It is in the Government's hands to move time limits in respect of these

matters if it believes that that is an essential consideration. Therefore, I move (in respect to paragraph 26 of the circulated Sessional Orders):

Leave out 'The question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate, "That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to"' and insert in lieu thereof: The House will resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for further consideration of the Bill.'

That will allow the House in Committee, as is the normal case, to debate the individual provisions of the Bill not to reopen the Estimates Committees debate. That is not my intention. What I propose will take place after that debate. I believe that it would ensure that the House is able to exercise its historic prerogative of examining the terms and provisions of every Bill that comes before it. I do not see why one of the most important Bills of the session—the Bill which appropriates all of the funds to the annual services of the Government—should be excluded from that kind of consideration. Simple debate during the Estimates Committees of the schedules is a reasonable innovation and a very productive exercise, but why exclude from consideration the clauses of the Bill? The House is denying itself an ancient prerogative, and I believe that this amendment will set that right.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): The Government opposes the amendment. This will do what the honourable member believes it will not do, that is, it will allow another round of Estimates Committee debates. As the honourable member has said, the Estimates Committees' procedure affords honourable members a very valuable opportunity to examine the budget in considerable detail, and that has been a worthwhile innovation in this place in recent years. To try to duplicate that in some way or to review it I think would add little to the process. We should stay with the system that I believe serves the Parliament and the community well.

Amendment negatived.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to.

Mr LEWIS: I wish to speak to the proposition before the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has had his opportunity—as did the member for Elizabeth, who moved an amendment, which amendment has just been defeated.

Mr LEWIS: It has nothing to do with the amendment. I have another point altogether.

The SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee could have made his comments or moved an amendment when the motion was under discussion. The motion is now being put to the House.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, my understanding is that, following debate of the member for Elizabeth's amendment and the vote on that having been taken, you called the question that the motion be agreed to, and I rose to my feet before the question was put.

The SPEAKER: The Minister has replied. We are not in Committee: the Speaker is in the Chair and we are in full session of the House. We are not in Committee of the House, with the Chairman of Committees conducting the proceedings under different rules.

Mr LEWIS: At what point were members of the House given the opportunity to speak to the motion before the vote on the amendment was taken?

The SPEAKER: At one stage both propositions were before the Chair—the original motion and the amendment. The amendment has been disposed of by way of decision of the House, and the motion is now before the House under the same procedure.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I do not think you advised the House that if the Minister spoke he closed the debate. I think that is where the confusion has arisen.

The SPEAKER: I refer the honourable member to Standing Order 210, which provides:

Amendments proposed shall not be put to the House until the debate is closed and each amendment shall be then at once put and determined singly . . .

The debate was closed by the amendment being put. Further, Standing Order 211 provides:

When amendments have been put but not made, the original question shall be at once put from the Chair.

However, with the indulgence of the House—if no member objects—I will provide an opportunity at this stage, notwithstanding the formal procedures, for the member for Murray-Mallee to make his contribution. That being the wish of the House, leave is granted.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I will not detain the House for more than a few minutes. I want to draw to the attention of the House a situation which may, through mischief, result in any of the two Estimates Committees being denied the opportunity to further examine the vote under consideration. I refer to a combination of the effects of the provisions in Sessional Order (13), which relates to participation by other members and (17) which relates to disagreement with the Chairman's ruling. A member, not being a member of the committee may participate in the proceedings of a committee at the discretion of the Chairman. If such a member is disaffected by the way in which the Chairman is dealing with him or her, that member may, under the terms of these Sessional Orders, put, in writing, an objection. Sessional Order (17) states:

If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, such objection must be taken at once; and having been stated in writing, the Chairman shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day, provided that the Estimates Committee may continue to meet, but shall not further examine the vote then under consideration.

By that contrivance it would be possible for a member to completely torpedo the consideration of a vote before the committee at the time. I think that we need to address that unfortunate anomaly in subsequent years. I do not propose that there is a means by which we can resolve the matter at this time, but I think the House should be aware of the situation to which I have drawn attention.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for the second reading of the Appropriation Bill and the noting of grievances be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 7 September.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Long

Service Leave (Building Industry) Act 1987. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The portable long service leave scheme established by the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act commenced on 1 April 1977. The scheme allows building industry workers in certain occupational categories and paid under the prescribed awards to become eligible for long service leave benefits on the basis of service to the industry rather than service to a particular employer.

The benefits are 13 weeks long service leave after 10 years of service in the industry with pro-rata benefits payable after 7 years of service. At present, however, while electrical contracting and metal trades workers may be regarded as building workers, because they are subject to the provisions of the Federal Metal Trades (Long Service Leave) Award 1964, they do not enjoy the portability (able to carry entitlements from employer to employer) and long service leave entitlements of their building industry counterparts under the State legislation. Under the Federal award workers are entitled to long service leave after 15 years (10 years pro rata).

A proposal to extend the State scheme was first raised by the Electrical Trades Union in March 1988. At the request of the then Minister of Labour an Industry Working Party was set up comprising representatives from the Electrical Trades Union, Electrical Contractors Association, Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, the Engineering Employers Association and the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board.

I am pleased to report that after extensive negotiations agreement was reached on the key areas of portability, date of operation, employer contribution rate and retrospective service. The working party also agreed existing employer contributors should not be disadvantaged by having to fund the new industries liabilities and costs associated with setting up the enlarged scheme. To this end it is proposed to establish a separate Electrical Contracting and Metal Trades Fund. It is proposed this will be the subject of legislation to be introduced in the 1990 autumn session of Parliament.

This Bill will allow the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board in the interim to expend moneys from the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund to meet the establishment costs of the enlarged scheme. The Bill will also provide for the repayment of any such funds used and also make provision to cover the loss of income earnings to the fund.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 inserts a new Schedule 3 into the principal Act relating to the proposed extension of the Act to persons employed in electrical contracting and metal trades in the building industry. The Board will be required to take such steps as are necessary in contemplation of the proposal. In particular the Board will be empowered to use money from the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund under the Act for the purposes of fulfilling its obligations under the schedule. Money paid out of the fund will bear interest at a rate determined by the Treasurer, after taking into account the matters set out in section 1 (4) of the schedule. The money will be a charge on a new fund that is to be estab-

lished when the provisions of the Act are extended in the proposed manner. The Treasurer will guarantee the repayment of the money to the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 August. Page 634.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the budget as being a budget of a Treasurer who has his eyes only on the next 10 weeks, for the budget has no vision for the next 10 years. It is a budget which takes our State into the last decade of the twentieth century with a declining economy and with no answers from this Government. This seventh budget of Labor has seven precise reasons why seven years of Labor are enough for South Australia.

Those seven reasons are as follows. We have a Premier who will not lead, a Ministry which cannot manage, an economy which has continued to fall behind those of the other mainland States, and record tax growth and record spending increases. Despite massive rises in Government revenue, we have declining standards in the basic services in education, health, community safety and transport. There has been a gross waste of taxpayers' money in unnecessary or mismanaged Government operations. There has been a cover up of these failures by a Government which refuses to be accountable and which, again with this budget, has deliberately deceived the people it was elected to serve.

In this budget reply, I will elaborate on each of these reasons. I will state the case against Labor. I will show why South Australia needs an answer, and certainly a Liberal answer. The Premier began his budget speech by claiming it sets 'priorities for the coming year and for the beginning of the next decade'. Any Government of vision would have put those priorities in place a long time ago for we live now within 16 weeks of the 1990s.

Fortunately for South Australia, our State is also within four months of a new era—a 'Liberal era'—because Labor has forfeited its right to go on governing. As much as this budget refuses to admit the failures of the past, it offers no hope for the future. Labor is like the *Island Seaway*—rudderless—becalmed in a sea of inaction, with a Premier who admits he only follows a survival mentality. He says he will take no risks—even if the rewards for showing some courage and some daring may be great for South Australia.

Good governing is all about a continuing sense of purpose and vision, a sense of knowing what we need to achieve to improve the individual and community well-being of the people we serve. But under Labor, we have had the shop steward style of government—privilege, protection preference and power for mates—no matter what the majority may want or need. The Premier asks us, in his budget speech, to believe that 'we can look forward to the 1990s with confidence'. He says that the 'State is today reaping the rewards of this Government's good economic and financial management'.

I challenge him to repeat that to the 108 000 South Australian children of parents whose principal source of income is public assistance. The number has increased by another 4 000 over the past 12 months, at the rate of more than 10 a day, and the Social Justice Paper admits this, but the Premier says it was a good year for South Australia. His mate, the Prime Minister, suggests that, with 1990 around

the corner, none of our children will be in poverty. Let them try to tell that tale in the poverty traps of our city and our State where we have the highest rates of poverty in Australia. Let the Premier go with his other mate, the Federal Treasurer, and tell the recent home buyers of South Australia that they can look forward to the 1990s with confidence.

The Premier, the Federal President of the Labor Party, is so compromised by Bob and Paul that all he can say in his budget speech is that 'the level of interest rates is a major concern, particularly because of its impact on home buyers'. It is hardly surprising that the Premier cannot bring himself, just once, to confront the policies that have produced Labor's record interest rates. In this budget, he does nothing to ease the pressure on home buyers. They are being crippled by Labor to reduce demand in the economy, while this budget increases demand, with total State public sector spending estimated to rise by 11.5 per cent this financial year, or a real 4.5 per cent. This will produce a financing requirement—the difference between total public sector outlays and receipts—of more than half a billion dollars in 1989-90.

Some of our major public trading enterprises will go into deeper operating deficit. Last financial year, the Housing Trust had an operational deficit of \$38 million; the Engineering and Water Supply Department had a deficit of \$4 million; and the Electricity Trust, a deficit of \$700 000. This financial year the results, according to the budget, will be much higher. The estimated net operating deficit of our public trading enterprises in 1989-90 is \$205 million, a rise of \$92 million. One has to go to page 88 of the financial statement to find out these things. They were not mentioned by the Premier in his budget speech.

The Premier is fond of talking about the total public sector when he wants to discuss the capital program, but the recurrent side is one of more direct relevance to most South Australians. Of course, one of the reasons for the Premier's reluctance to discuss this is his habit of manipulating the operating results of authorities such as ETSA and the Housing Trust for his own electoral purposes. Just as in 1985, again in this election year he is artificially holding down the charges. With another year of Labor, undoubtedly they would break out again, just as they did after the 1985 election. These agencies cannot go on sustaining escalating operating deficits. We need to keep the cost of these services to the public as low as possible. But this Government has done nothing to seek productivity and efficiency gains which will reduce operational costs and which will ensure that charges can be contained in the longer term, without rising deficits and more borrowing to cover them. This is just one of the frauds contained in this budget. Under Labor, the inevitability is that Housing Trust rents, electricity tariffs, water rates and the cost of other vital services will be on the rise in real terms next year. This debate is an opportunity to analyse Labor's performance over seven budgets.

Let me begin that analysis in detail with reference to what the Premier has said about the result last financial year. When announcing the revenue measures contained in this budget to the House on 8 August, he said:

The budget result has been achieved through sound financial management by the Government.

That result was an overall improvement of \$27.2 million against budget predictions. But how much of this, if any, can be attributed to so-called 'sound financial management'? What the Premier did not tell the House on that occasion was that the Government had saved \$65.8 million—more than twice the budget improvement—because the round

sum allowance for salary rises and other contingencies was not called upon to the extent estimated. This had nothing to do with the Government. It was the result of decisions of industrial tribunals. As well, tax collections exceeded budget estimates by \$63.25 million. This put the budget well into surplus but was offset by departmental over-spending of almost \$32 million.

The major contributing factors to the difference between last year's estimated and actual results were taxpayers paying much more—a delay in anticipated wage rises flowing on—and departmental over-spending. But the Premier calls this sound financial management by his Government. Looking further into this Government's financial performance blows this myth even further out of the water.

Departmental over-spending over the past six budgets has totalled more than \$107 million. This has been offset by the call on the round sum allowance being in total about \$90 million less than budgeted for. However, overriding these factors have been tax receipts exceeding budget estimates by almost \$190 million. Again, the Premier must thank taxpayers rather than any sound financial management for actual budget results making available much more money than budgeted for. This budget returns to hard pressed taxpayers less than one-third of the unexpected money the Premier has collected from them since he came to office. Even with the revenue measures in this budget, it will mean a rise in total State tax collections of just over 163 per cent since this Government came to office. This will be real growth in tax of more than 93 per cent by June 1990.

Only one other State has so far introduced its 1989-90 budget, and that is Victoria. Its tax measures will mean a rise in total collections of 155 per cent since 1982, or 8 per cent less than in South Australia. At the time the Federal and State Labor Governments came to office, per capita Federal income and State taxation amounted to \$34.27 a week in South Australia. On the 1989-90 Federal and State budget estimates, this will rise to \$71.99 a week. This budget means that State tax collections this financial year will be the equivalent of \$17.17 a week for every man, woman and child in South Australia—almost \$10 a week more than in 1982.

Detailed figures in the budget papers show how much of a high taxing and big spending Government South Australians have had since 1982. The seven year average ratio of total outlays to gross State product is 20.4 per cent for South Australia—the highest of the mainland States and 2 per cent above the level of the six States combined. South Australia's ratio of tax revenue to GSP for the same period is higher than that for Queensland and Western Australia. This average is 4.5 per cent, but it has moved from 4.3 per cent in 1981-82 to 4.8 per cent on the latest comparison. This tax record belongs to a Premier who came to office with this promise, and it is well for us to remember it:

The ALP will not re-introduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing rates during our term of office. We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections and any changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

This was the Premier's promise in his 1982 policy speech. It was the most deliberately dishonest promise in South Australia's political history, for there has been no tax inquiry, and no intention of a tax inquiry—once again another perception-setting exercise just before the election campaign. But there has been one new tax—financial institutions duty—charged at the highest rate in Australia, a tax which will cost South Australians an estimated \$49 million this financial year while the rates of half the other State taxes have been increased by this Government.

As a result of these broken promises and this budget, the following record of tax revenue collections will be left behind by this Government: total tax collections up 163.1 per cent; land tax, a massive rise of 262.7 per cent; revenue from car registrations and drivers licences, 116.4 per cent; payroll tax, 88.8 per cent; financial institutions duty, 70.1 per cent since the first full year of collections in 1984-85; stamp duties, 206.9 per cent; the sales tax on gas, 186.1 per cent; the tax on beer and other liquor sales, 171.1 per cent; petrol tax, 234 per cent; tobacco, 262.3 per cent; and the sales tax on electricity, up 146 per cent. The only South Australians to escape the Premier's tax grab are those who do not own a car, a house, a bank account or a gas cooker, who do not smoke or drink and who are asleep before lighting up time.

With inflation at just under 70 per cent for this period, this record will mean that collections for every tax have risen in real terms. Of the 10 separate tax measures I have listed, collections from seven will be double the inflation level by the end of this budget year. The record is the same for a range of State charges. The revenue from water and sewerage rates, estimated in this budget, will mean a rise in total collections of 117.76 per cent since this Government came to office—a real rise of almost 50 per cent. Last financial year alone, revenue from water and sewerage rates was \$19 million above budget predictions.

Looking at some other charges having wide impact, we see that this Government has been responsible for a 348 per cent rise in collections from fishing licences and registration fees. A 465 per cent rise in revenue from business regulation licences issued by the Department of Labour, and a 288 per cent rise in company code fees. This budget will bring the increase in revenue from on-the-spot fines to 116.2 per cent. Yet when this form of fines was introduced by the last Liberal Government, the Premier had this to say in a press statement on 25 February 1982:

I am most concerned that the police are being put in a position where they are being forced to act as unofficial tax collectors for the Government. That is not their role.

What a hide you have! What absolute hypocrisy!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader knows he must direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: I am the Leader, not the Deputy Leader. Last week this Government introduced revenue-raising measures of 150 per cent for DUI. At the same time, it brought in a budget that reduced by \$2.9 million the allocation for road safety measures. Clearly this Government is using this measure as a form of back-door taxation. What hypocrisy on the part of the Premier, who has been exposed by his own actions.

I turn now to some other costs of this Government's budget strategy. Last year's budget estimated the interest cost of previous and new borrowings to fund the budget at \$534.4 million. The final cost was \$592.1 million, courtesy of Mr Hawke and Mr Keating. This financial year, a further massive rise in interest payments is forecast. The 1989-90 interest bill is budgeted to be \$657.2 million, more than three times the police budget, about three-quarters of the education budget and more than half the health budget. It means that 50c of every tax dollar collected will not provide new, much needed services but will instead pay interest.

Despite record increases in taxes and charges, the seven budgets of this Government have required borrowings of more than \$1.953 billion to fund them. They have added well over \$260 million a year to the interest bill. Spending more to pay off debts means that more and more, our schools, our Police Force and our hospitals have been denied essential and important service and resources. Members will recall the campaign of deceit and dishonesty that the Premier and the Minister of State Development and Technol-

ogy orchestrated against the last Liberal Government. But the last Liberal Government's last budget allocated 24.6 per cent of total recurrent spending to our primary and secondary schools. In this budget, the proportion is down to 18.6 per cent. And this figure includes an allocation from the round sum allowance in proportion to the estimated share of the total budget for education. For police, 5.25 per cent of recurrent spending was provided in 1981-82; this financial year, the share is 4.3 per cent.

Nothing that the Premier says will convince anyone that his Government has not downgraded the importance of education—not even more false promises from the Premier. In his 1985 education policy, he said:

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

Recurrent spending on education in 1985-86 was 22.2 per cent of the total budget. It has therefore declined a further 3.6 per cent since then. In 1985 the Premier also promised the following in his education policy:

I can announce today that a State Labor Government will continue to retain teacher numbers, in spite of decreasing enrolments.

However, the budget papers expose a decline of 700 teacher numbers over the past four years. Since 1982, when the Premier ran around our schools inciting strikes and promising an increase in the number of teachers, teacher numbers have declined by 850. But at the last election, the Premier's promises did not stop with maintaining teacher numbers. He also committed his Government to appointing 100 new ancillary staff each year for schools, and in this budget speech he claims:

The Government will complete its commitment to the provision of more ancillary staff in schools with provision for 100 extra staff in a full year. With a cost of \$1.4 million, a total increase of 400 ancillary staff.

An honourable member: That's fraud.

Mr OLSEN: It is a fraud, because elsewhere in the budget papers it can be proved that the total increase in average employment of ancillary staff on a full-time equivalent basis has been only 64.8 positions since 1985. To put this fraud, or this con, into its true perspective, I point out that the number of weekly-paid staff and school assistants employed last financial year averaged 2 610.1 FTEs, according to the budget papers. This is in fact 8.6 positions less than in 1982, according to the 1981-82 report of the Public Service Board. These are not my figures; they are figures from the Public Service Board. The Government is trying to defend these broken promises by telling lie after lie about education spending. The Minister was at it again in the latest *Sunday Mail*. In a letter to the Editor, he took to task Randall Ashbourne for an article he had written before demonstrating how education spending was being cut in this budget—not increased as suggested by the Government's propaganda.

The Minister accused Randall Ashbourne of comparing apples with oranges because he had not made allowance in his article for spending on anticipated salary increases during this financial year. But even if this is done, there is a real cut in spending on primary and secondary school education in this budget. The Minister said in his letter that in a full year pay rises for teachers flowing from the latest national wage decision would total about \$34 million. Conveniently, he did not say what proportion of the round sum allowance for salary rises he expected the department to receive this year, for if he had, he would have to admit the real cut in spending.

The provision in the budget for Education Department spending in 1989-90 is \$796.3 million. The total education allocation in the budget is just under 20 per cent. A reason-

able assumption for the Education Department's share of the round sum allowance for salary rises would be an estimate in proportion to the department's share of allocated spending. This would add \$22.98 million to the departmental allocation and bring it to \$819.274 million for 1989-90. This represents an increase of 5.6 per cent on actual spending in 1988-89, or a real cut of 1.4 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We will get to the packaging of resources.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Per student!

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Exactly! That is what it is all about. We have an admission from the Premier. It does not stack up in the total numbers, so we now talk about the number of students and resources per student, because we get a different formula—a different figure. I am pleased that the Premier has entered the debate because he has just confirmed it. The Minister's letter to the *Sunday Mail* made further completely untrue statements about capital spending on education facilities in the budget.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will have his right of reply in due course. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He will have no reply.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: It will be interesting to see how he gets it together this time. The Minister stated:

This year, capital works funds will be increased a hefty 45 per cent to \$61 million.

He was referring to proposed capital spending for education buildings, TAFE and Children's Services Office buildings. For 1989-90, the proposed spending is \$61.9 million, according to the budget papers. This compares with actual spending in 1988-89 of \$67.552 million. That is a money terms cut of \$5.6 million; in real terms, it is a cut of \$10.4 million. If the Minister's claim of a 'hefty 45 per cent' rise in capital spending were true, the budget allocation would be almost \$98 million. In other words, the Minister's letter to the *Sunday Mail* was a \$37 million lie—that is, the difference between what actually has been allocated and what the Minister misrepresents as the allocation. His claim of a real increase is in fact a very significant real cut. This Minister, when he is forced out of office in a few weeks and out of his seat also, will be remembered as the worst Education Minister in our State's history, because he cannot even add up. While he has presided over a decline in resources in our schools, his weakness has allowed the education bureaucracy to expand. At June 1986, the Education Department employed 860.4 full-time equivalents under the Government Management and Employment Act.

At this time, the Minister of Education promised a reduction of 65 positions in the bureaucracy, to give more resources to schools. However, this budget reveals that the number of public service positions in the department has not decreased by 65 but has increased since 1986 by six positions. Once again, the Government puts out a public release, tries to set a perception and then does the opposite. That is what it is on about—perception and no substance.

It has been the same story, the same fraud, with the equally sensitive issue of police numbers. Two days before the presentation of this budget, the Premier released a publication called 'Confronting Crime' in which he promised the 'most comprehensive crime prevention strategy developed in Australia'. A centrepiece of this strategy was to be the appointment of 122 additional police officers by 31 December 1990, according to the Premier's press release. However, the budget papers reveal that only 55 of the purported 122 officers, at the most, will be employed on

general police duties or on the beat. The spending provision for those positions is \$215 000 for this financial year. That might employ six people if we are lucky, so obviously the additional officers will not be recruited well into the 1990s and, when they are, the number will only just cover the number of police officers who left the force last financial year.

The budget papers reveal a reduction of 48.3 over the past 12 months in average police employment. Further, the figure they give for total police numbers means that since 1982, there has been an increase of only 154.8 full time equivalents. However, just to make up for the introduction of the 38-hour week in the force from 1986 would have required the employment of an additional 187.4 full time equivalents. In other words, the force remains under-resourced compared with 1982, and over this period we have seen crime rates soar.

For every 100 000 South Australians, the number of violent crimes has increased from 92 in 1981-82 to 186 on the latest available police figures—a massive 102 per cent rise. Rates of property crime have increased over the same period by 43 per cent; the number of break-ins is up by 117 per cent; the level of robberies has increased by 75 per cent; the number of rapes and attempted rapes is up by 182 per cent, and the rate of drug offences is up by 152 per cent. It is little wonder that, with this rapidly rising crime rate, and declining resources to deal with it, police morale has slumped to an all-time low under this Government. This has not been helped by Government attempts to suggest that police are adequately resourced.

In a press statement on 11 April this year, the Deputy Premier said the police budget was a 'staggering \$217 million'. Where he got that figure from, I do not know. No-one can find anything like that figure anywhere. For last financial year, total recurrent and capital spending by the police department was almost \$20 million less than that, according to the Premier's budget papers. The irony is that, if the police did have the budget suggested by the Deputy Premier, an additional 200 much needed officers could have been employed.

The Deputy Premier has found that his habit of misrepresenting figures has been needed even more in his new portfolio of health. He claims that spending on our hospitals is increasing in real terms in this financial year. He was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 26 August as saying that the health budget had a record \$1.6 billion allocation. However, this compares with \$1.02 billion last financial year. So that is a real cut of 3 per cent—not a real increase. To match the level of spending, the Minister says there will be 12 per cent more than last financial year, requiring an allocation of \$1.14 billion. I would also invite the Minister to ask Adelaide's major public hospitals what they think of this Government's budget strategy.

We have obtained figures from the seven major metropolitan hospitals which show that last financial year, they received \$4 983.9 million. To just keep pace with inflation this financial year, they would receive an allocation of more than \$528 million. However, further information we have obtained from each hospital indicates that their preliminary allocations total \$517.2 million and this figure takes into account additional funding they hope to get during the year to cover rising costs such as wage movements, termination leave and superannuation payouts. Discounting for these factors indicated a basic guaranteed figure at this stage of \$500.2 million—just \$6.3 million more than they received in 1988-89. This would be a very significant real cut.

On the capital side, there are also figure fiddles. While the Government has boasted publicly about spending \$74.9

million, \$1.2 million of this sum will be privately funded for the Noarlunga hospital. The Government has added that sum into its budget allocations. This means that the Government's commitment to capital spending on health will be only \$3.8 million more than the level last financial year, and this year's spending includes some funds budgeted but not used last year on projects such as the Lyell McEwin Health Service and the Riverland Regional Hospital. Last year's program announced new works for the Marion Community Services Centre and the Port Pirie Regional Health Service. These are nominated as new projects again this financial year because nothing was in fact spent on them in 1988-89. So, in several instances we have recycled announcements. Because the Government did not spend anything in these initiatives, they are announced as new projects again this year.

The Government has tried to promote as increases actual cuts in resources for education, for police and for health, and consistent with this manipulation of the budget presentation in the treatment of a social justice strategy. Such a strategy is not criticised by the Liberal Party. Indeed, it is sorely needed by many in a State with the highest rate of poverty anywhere in Australia and the highest mainland unemployment. But, the Government has gone completely overboard in its presentation of the purpose of this strategy with some of the items it has included in this budget. For example, it has included under the social justice umbrella spending to recruit public sector trainees; to build new schools; to upgrade and redevelop police and court cells (and we are talking about the social justice strategy); to upgrade a boat building facility; for pre-vocational training places; for establishing new pre-schools; and for new STA services.

Mr Lewis: Sounds like a fabricator.

Mr OLSEN: It certainly does not bear any resemblance to the truth in terms of a social justice strategy for people. The spending to which I have referred amounts to about one-third of the social justice budget. When the Premier first announced the Government's social justice strategy in August 1987, he said that above all it would be for 'disadvantaged people'. I thought that a Government built police cells primarily for criminals or potential criminals, not necessarily for disadvantaged people. I thought that a Government built schools and provided bus services because, above anything else, population spread dictates where they are needed. It is the basic infrastructure build up of a Government responsibility.

The Government's including some of these items under the social justice strategy suggests to me that the Government found its original commitment was thin and desperately sought out ways to arbitrarily extend the concept of social justice—the Government packaged it together. Again, the Government's priority was not any matter of principle but the need, in an election year, to be seen to be more caring than it really is. As Dr Cornwall has said in his just-published political memoirs:

Social justice, South Australia style, can cover anything . . . to water filtration.

If the Government did really care about the disadvantaged, it would be spending more on them and less on some business ventures to which I will refer in a moment. But while I am dealing with the Government's attempt to sell this budget as something it is not, let me also scrutinise the capital works program, for here the Government's efforts to create false perceptions have known no bounds. Immediately after the presentation of this budget, the Government tried to sell the story that the capital works program budgeted for would create many thousands of jobs. The Premier put out the traditional press release. However, a

close analysis of the budget papers shows that the capital works budget for the total budget sector has been underspent to the tune of \$104 million over the past two financial years. There was underspending of \$40 million in 1987-88 and \$64 million last financial year.

I do not criticise underspending when it means that planned work has been achieved for a cost lower than was estimated: I support and praise that. However, there is clear evidence that the Government each year is deliberately exaggerating the capital works program to suggest that it is more extensive than resources allow. Last year's underspending included \$10 million on education buildings and \$19.7 million on the Housing Trust program. Over the past four budgets, there has been underspending of \$15 million on STA bus, train and tram services. And again this financial year there is no commitment of significant STA funds to the long promised move of its depot from Hackney to Mile End.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Nothing—after all that talk! Nothing at all.

Mr OLSEN: No. Members will recall the 1985 front page of the *Advertiser*, with the Premier standing in front of the Hackney bus depot (another PR job undoubtedly thought up by his adviser). The Premier in 1985 said that this move would be completed by 1990. The only allocation in this budget is \$660 000 for design work.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Which we will implement.

Mr OLSEN: We certainly will. The Minister of Water Resources also has been big on promises. In a press statement on 30 April last she promised spending of \$25 million this financial year by the three Murray River States and the Commonwealth in connection with land degradation and the Woolpunda Salinity Reduction Scheme. However, the Federal budget's allocation for this work is \$3.56 million this financial year, South Australia's allocation, according to our budget papers, being \$2.879 million, and there is no specific allocation in the Victorian budget at all.

With less than \$6.5 million of the promised \$25 million clearly committed, it appears the Minister's announcement was premature—to be generous—if not deliberately false. Indeed, she has quickly won a reputation as someone whose words speak very much louder than her actions. Everyone on both sides of the House knows what that means. In February, she called for a report on pollution of Lake Bonney. In March, she foreshadowed a proposal to Cabinet on foreign ownership of land which is yet to materialise publicly. In May, she was calling for reports on marina sites, the EIS process, and turning mangroves into a conservation park. In June, she set up a task force to deal with pollution problems in the Onkaparinga estuary which have been evident since 1985. Also in June, she set up an independent group to report on water pollution in the South-East. In July and again in August she was planning to study the establishment of a paper recycling plant. The Minister was also found out in the last week of parliamentary sittings, when all she could do was promise yet another report into a serious problem of lead pollution in the Adelaide Hills which had been known to her department for more than three years. She is a Minister who is so busy calling for reports that she has no time to get anything done.

Then what happens if you are the Minister of Recreation and Sport and you need a local planning issue fixed? It is unfortunate for the sake of sport and recreation that the Minister does not devote as much time to getting things done in his portfolio area. In the past four budgets, \$15.53 million of capital funds has been allocated for recreation and sport facilities. However, less than half of this amount has been spent. Projects such as the velodrome remain no

more than a press release and yet another broken promise. This underspending has occurred despite the capacity given for the Government to expand capital spending funded by an accelerated program of asset sales, and public sector employment rationalisation.

Let me now look at some examples of the hypocrisy of this Government over the past seven years. This budget estimates that the sale of land and buildings will bring in more than \$41 million this financial year. This will take to more than \$114 million asset sales since 1986 by a Government—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: I thought it was opposed to that.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, we all remember that. I remember it quite vividly. I remember promises by a Government which undertook at the last election not to have a bar of any proposal to rationalise public property—'selling off the silver', or a similar phrase used by the PSA and the Government, comes readily to mind.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Lost the shirt, was one.

Mr OLSEN: Yes. The sale of primary and secondary school properties has been a special cash windfall. This budget will bring to more than \$20 million revenue from the sale of school properties, over four years. This is almost double the budget plan over this period. Clearly, the Government has not wanted to telegraph too many of its intentions in this area. I can just imagine the opposition a Liberal Government would have faced from the Labor Party and the union movement—from some of the union mates of the Labor Party—if we had proceeded with a similar program. The sheer inconsistency and hypocrisy of the Labor Party and those groups aligned with it have in the past opposed rationalisation and efficiency measures. It is also exposed in the decimation of the public sector weekly paid work force which has occurred in recent years. Again, under the last Liberal Government, this was an issue Labor and the union attempted to exploit. Certainly, the Premier encouraged them.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They must have made many enemies in their own ranks. This is what appears when we door knock.

Mr OLSEN: Yes.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We have done more doorknocking than you have. Given the range of leaks coming in from the public service—the well oiled machine is not so well oiled anymore. It has become a little rusty. On 8 October 1981, the Premier issued a press release under the heading, 'Criminal run-down of vital public service'. In it, he complained about the last Liberal Government's initiatives, in the interests of taxpayers, to make the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department more efficient. Our measures included reductions in weekly paid employment in the department's construction and maintenance work force. The Premier talked in 1981 about these moves causing 'potentially serious threats to public health'. But what has his Government done since? As at June 1982, the Engineering and Water Supply Department's total staff numbered 5 131. The latest figures available show there has been a further reduction of 1 078 positions under this Government—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: And not a word from the unions. Exactly the point.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They can't even turn off the flushing taps on the weekend.

Mr OLSEN: They let the taps run for the whole weekend. Most of this reduction has occurred in the weekly paid work force. In the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it

is down by 871 since 1982. While overall public sector employment has grown significantly under this Government, the reduction since 1982 in the weekly paid work force has been 2 156.4 full-time equivalent positions. This trend accelerated in 1988-89 with a further reduction of 333 positions.

Yet we have heard not a squeak from the Government's union mates in relation to that policy direction. Quite clearly, opposition to necessary public sector rationalisation depends on who is in Government. The approach of the Labor Party and its union mates to this issue has been nothing less than gutless hypocrisy. They tried to use industrial as well as political agitation to stop the last Liberal Government beginning public sector rationalisation which had been made necessary by the inefficiencies and extravagances of the Dunstan decade.

Now, this Government has continued the process and presided over the silent decimation of more than 20 per cent of the public sector weekly paid work force. Obviously the feigned concerns of Labor and union officials in this State for public sector rationalisation have only a political motive and are only to be voiced when Labor is in Opposition. But what I am now exposing means that never again can Labor, with any credibility, attack the only Party—the Liberal Party—which has with consistency and conviction pursued this issue in the interests of taxpayers.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And openly and honestly.

Mr OLSEN: Certainly openly and honestly. I wonder how much this Government has offered the unions for silence. Is it the promise to implement the hidden agenda for union-controlled industrial democracy and much more general economic regulation after the next election? Labor's plan for more control of industry and business in this State was suggested in the significant increase in staffing of the Department of Labour last year. The increase in average employment was 18.6 full-time equivalent positions, or 7 per cent.

While this Government will use this department to regulate industry more, in other areas it is reducing resources to encourage industry. Spending from the South Australian Development Fund is budgeted to reduce by a real \$1.27 million this financial year. The Department of State Development and Technology, which administers this fund, was forced to pay out more than \$5.1 million last financial year for the Government's Marineland bungle, while a further \$863 000 will be required for this purpose this financial year.

An honourable member: So far.

Mr OLSEN: So far. Had these funds been available instead for targeted programs to encourage regional development, this could have assisted significantly in the revitalisation of rural South Australia. I also relate the Government's spending on Marineland to the priority it is giving to home buyers. The allocation of almost \$6 million to Marineland is nearly three times as much as the allocation in this budget for mortgage relief and interest rate protection. The scheme the Premier announced in March with such a fanfare will help, at the most according to these budget papers, about 850 families.

The budget allocation of \$2.2 million is little when the amount the Government has spent on advertising the scheme is taken into consideration. In May, the Premier announced that there would be 'extensive advertising in newspapers and on radio' of the scheme. This is another example of the Government being more interested in setting a perception than in offering practical help. As it is, the budget allocation of \$2.2 million is less than the \$2.6 million by which the Department of Housing underspent its budget

allocation for mortgage and rent relief last financial year. Road safety is another important area where the priorities of this Government are wrong. There is to be a real cut of \$2.9 million in police and Department of Transport spending on road safety this financial year.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That's an awfully big cut!

Mr OLSEN: It is a big cut. At the same time the Government looks forward to a revenue bonanza with increases of up to 150 per cent in fines for drink driving offences. With the road toll rising, and with the Government so keen to support the Grand Prix, it should, as a matter of consistency and commonsense, review this spending decision. Priorities like these could have been accommodated had the Government been prepared to be resolute in ensuring efficiency in its total spending. Consistently, it has failed to do this. As a result, we now have an unsustainable budget strategy under a continuation of Labor Governments.

The budget provides for net new spending of \$59.7 million this financial year. In a full year the net impact is \$93.6 million. Against new spending commitments, the Government says that it has found only just over \$19 million of savings this financial year, and those savings are not precisely identified in the budget papers.

Even if they do exist, they represent only 0.43 per cent of recurrent spending this financial year. This is hardly a saving when matched with the productivity improvements being demanded of industry to make our economy more competitive. This budget provides for public sector growth of a further 549 full-time equivalent positions. There is no doubt that in some areas, more staff resources are needed. The Government has failed to look for savings in other less essential areas to contain the cost to taxpayers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I will come to that. If the honourable member will sit through this budget speech he will see that I will give details of where the Government ought not be spending money. The cost to taxpayers of this further rise in public sector employment will be about \$19.7 million in a full year. This is occurring despite the commitment given by the Premier in 1987 to an indefinite freeze on public sector recruitment. His press statement of 5 June 1987 referred to this commitment covering all public sector agencies, except the State Bank and SGIC, so that:

From now on positions in the public service will have to be filled from existing staff levels and within existing budgets.

They are the Premier's words. He also said this would mean: The number of public service positions could be substantially reduced over the next couple of years without having to resort to retrenchments.

However, the Economic Paper accompanying the budget shows for an all States comparison that between March 1986 and March 1989 State public sector employment in South Australia increased by 3 300. Over the same period for all the States public sector employment fell by 2 700. The commitment in this budget will mean an extra 6 731.4 full-time equivalent positions created since 1982. The full year salary cost is more than \$240 million. This has locked the State budget into high real levels of spending increases. In addition, the capital budget is under pressure to maintain real spending commitments. The capital works paper published with the budget identifies specifically, by project, \$227.8 million of spending on new or continuing projects this financial year.

If the schedules for these projects announced in the budget papers are to be maintained, spending on these same projects next financial year must be at least \$287 million—almost \$60 million more than this financial year. I have projected into 1990-91 the levels of recurrent and capital spending committed in this budget and adjusted all other

spending levels for a CPI estimated (in the Federal budget papers) at 5.5 per cent. This indicates total recurrent and capital spending through the budget of about \$5.4 billion in 1990-91. However, receipts to fund this spending program will be more than \$240 million short of outlays based on projections in this year's Federal budget papers of allocations to the States for 1990-91 and the following two financial years, and assumptions that all other revenue resources will be maintained with inflation.

Looking further ahead, in 1991-92 and 1992-93 the Federal budget papers show significant real cuts in Commonwealth funding to the States which will increase the pressure on the State budget. In fact, on certain reasonable assumptions, it can be predicted that the State budget will be in deficit by almost \$300 million by June 1993 under a continuation of this Government's budget strategy. And, if our share of Commonwealth funds continues to fall, and if SAFA is unable to further significantly increase its contribution as the key balancing item in the budget, the position will deteriorate even more.

Let me examine these two items of receipts. This financial year, South Australia's share of total Commonwealth funding to the States is 10.2 per cent. At the last Premiers' Conference attended by the last Liberal Government of this State our share was 11 per cent. That conference took place in June 1982. The result for South Australia did not stop the present Premier from trying to undermine our efforts. In a press statement while the conference was still in progress, on 27 June 1982, he said:

Dr Tonkin should have come out fighting, rather than buckling under; in effect, he had conceded South Australia's new, less favoured position.

That is when we got 11 per cent of the cake. When John Bannon fights, South Australia loses. The record speaks much louder than this sort of rhetoric. The record shows that no Premier in South Australia's history has been less successful than the present one in getting a fair deal in Canberra for South Australia. This is another example of South Australia being compromised by the two hats the Premier tries to wear. Bob and Paul know he will not make waves, so they give a better deal to other Premiers who obviously will. Had South Australia maintained, this financial year, the share of Commonwealth funds it received in the last year of the last Liberal Government, our budget position would have been better off by almost \$190 million. This financial year, our position would have been even worse without the Grants Commission's relativities update. This update assessed South Australia's taxing capacity to have eroded—another indicator of our declining economy. However, as the budget papers concede, other States are dissatisfied with the Grants Commission outcome for this financial year, and the situation is volatile. Without a Premier prepared to confront Canberra over South Australia's needs, our budget position will decline markedly in the next few years.

I also refer to the contribution of SAFA to the budget. This financial year it will total \$385 million made up of \$325 million from this year's operations, and \$60 million held over from last year. SAFA's operating surplus last financial year actually fell short of its budgeted contribution by \$13 million, but the Premier was able to hold back some of this contribution this year because of higher tax receipts and the much lower cost of wage rises. In 1988-89, SAFA's contribution to the budget was the equivalent to 5.3 per cent of recurrent spending. The increasing reliance of the budget on SAFA's performance is indicated by the fact that this year's contribution will be the equivalent of 8.7 per cent of recurrent spending.

To maintain this level of contribution in 1990-91 will require SAFA to make at least \$406 million from its operations, which would represent a rise of more than 41.5 per cent over two years. This appears to be achievable only if interest rates remain at record levels. If this level cannot be maintained, SAFA's reserves may have to be eroded. The value of those reserves, established as a buffer against fluctuations in SAFA's profitability, has already fallen in real terms by more than \$20 million since 1987. The strategy enshrined in this budget locks South Australians into funding continuing real increases in Government spending under another term of Labor. With great uncertainty, particularly over future Commonwealth allocations to South Australia, this strategy is unsustainable on the revenue side without very large increases in borrowings, further rises in rates of State taxation or a combination of both. The record of this Government for seven years shows that under another term of Labor taxpayers will pay much more and have the futures of their children mortgaged even more because of the cost of escalating borrowings.

The Government has taxed more, borrowed more and spent more because it has repeatedly ignored warnings about the cost effectiveness of its operations. The inevitability is that this would continue under Labor because it still believes in extravagant, non-accountable and wasteful spending of other people's money. It says something about the priorities of a Government and its willingness to protect taxpayers from unnecessary spending that we have in this budget an allocation of \$10.7 million for a secure centre to accommodate just 36 juvenile offenders. This is the equivalent of almost \$300 000 per inmate. They are supposed to be going to this centre for correctional purposes—not to receive Hyatt or Hilton style accommodation. The cost of this centre has escalated by almost \$2 million in just one year. In last year's capital program, the figure was budgeted at less than \$9 million.

A major area where there has been a gross waste of public money is in the provision of computing facilities for Government departments and agencies. The annual report of the Public Accounts Committee has had a lot to say about this matter. The annual report was tabled on the last sitting day and so far it has not received any public attention—but it should. It contains a bipartisan condemnation of the failure of this Government to come clean about its financial failings and do something about them.

I refer first to the committee's examination of the Justice Information System. The committee's report is a particular indictment of the Premier because it accuses the head of his department of unjustifiably withholding information from the committee. I refer, for example, to the committee's comment about a letter it received from Mr Guerin dated 30 November last year, in response to requests from the committee for information about the Justice Information System. I quote the committee's view as stated in its annual report:

The committee considered the information provided in that letter to be inadequate. With only one sitting day remaining before the Christmas recess of Parliament, the committee abandoned its attempts to bring down a report on the JIS before the House rose on 30 November. The documents which were withheld were considered by the committee to be necessary for efficient inquiry. The acquisition of evidence in lieu of the documents withheld prolonged the inquiry and required the commitment of additional resources which would otherwise have been directed to other inquiries.

What this says is that action for which the Premier must take responsibility unnecessarily prolonged this inquiry and caused a delay of more than four months in advice to Parliament on the escalating cost of this project. The committee was not able to report to the Parliament until early

April. When it did, Parliament found out that, without changes to the JIS, the cost of establishing the system would increase from an estimated \$19.8 million in 1985 to \$75 million. The committee also found that cost benefits of the system may be only half of those originally estimated.

As a result of the Liberal Party's probing of the financial mismanagement, and the report of the committee, in July the Government announced a revised strategy for its implementation. The Attorney-General said the system would be modified to cost only \$34.1 million. However, what he did not admit in his press statement of 4 July was that the original estimate of just under \$20 million assumed that the courts would be part of the JIS. Subsequently, an independent system has been established for the courts, at a capital cost so far, including the provision in this budget, of more than \$6.5 million.

The Attorney-General's statement also revealed that operating costs of the JIS will be \$6.4 million annually once the system is fully operational in three years. This compares with the original estimate that by 1991-92 introduction of the system would represent a net cash benefit to the State of \$3 million a year. With the turnaround, the escalation in the cost of the JIS and a computer system for the courts, the waste of money through Government mismanagement will therefore be in the order of \$30 million by 1992. The annual report of the Public Accounts Committee refers to:

... serious defects in project management, especially poor initial planning and lack of controls.

However, what must be of equal, if not greater, concern to this Parliament regarding this waste of money is the continuing unwillingness of the Government to own up to the problems. The committee also reported that it had:

... experienced considerable difficulty when trying to establish exactly what task had been approved by Cabinet and the associated schedule of costs and benefits.

The committee has had a longstanding interest in the purchase and installation of computer facilities. In September 1984, in its thirty-fifth report, it made recommendations for the post-implementation review of computer systems, to assess their cost and benefit and to ensure future acquisitions were managed as efficiently as possible. In reply to this report, in a minute to the committee of 7 May 1985, the Premier said:

The general thrust of the committee's report makes good management sense... The Government will be seeking to ensure that a greater emphasis on systems and policy review is built into the management procedures of Government agencies.

However, in its fifty-sixth report made last year, the committee revealed that the Premier had not followed up this advice with any action. The report referred to:

... widespread non-compliance with guidelines in submissions seeking approval for expenditure on computing equipment. Too often, important information such as financing data is missing or submissions are incomplete in material ways.

The committee identified the following departments and agencies as having failed to comply with procedures that the Premier promised more than four years ago would be in place: the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Department of Services and Supply, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, the Department of Technical and Further Education, the Marine and Harbors Department, the Department of Environment and Planning, the South Australian Health Commission, and the Centre for Remote Sensing. Yet, as shown in its latest annual report, the committee is still having to report inaction by the Government.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Still being put under the carpet.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, still being put in the too-hard basket. If there is a problem the idea is to close the door and wait

for it to go away; however, the problem does not go away; it compounds. The latest annual report, tabled on the day that we last sat, refers to:

... the very slow rate of improvement in the frequency of conduct of post-implementation reviews.

The Government's culpability in this matter, in allowing millions of dollars to be wasted on computer purchases is compounded by the fact that, while it does nothing to ensure a cost-effective approach, it has greatly accelerated spending in this area. The budget provides more than \$18 million for capital spending on computer purchases. In the previous four budgets, this spending amounted to almost \$38 million. While this has been occurring, the Public Accounts Committee has warned repeatedly that there are no effective checks to ensure that this money is being spent responsibly and efficiently. It has found faults right through the system. The committee's latest annual report refers to:

... too many instances of poor quality financial analysis in submissions seeking approval to undertake expenditure on computing systems.

As well as the Justice Information System, another notable example in relation to this matter concerns the Department of Transport's purchase of a computer for the Motor Registration Division. The first Cabinet decision on this project in 1985 approved it on the basis of benefits exceeding costs by \$5.5 million over a five-year period. Subsequently, there has been a \$9.2 million turnaround, with costs exceeding benefits by \$3.7 million.

The committee complains that the Department of Transport provided 'misleading information' to the Data Processing Board on this project and that, in turn, the board had been seriously deficient in its analysis of the information. Further, and in terms reminiscent of its experience with the Justice Information System, the committee also reported that its inquiry had been made:

... more difficult than necessary as a result of the inaccurate or incomplete information that was at various times provided by the Department of Transport.

The increased cost to taxpayers caused by this sort of care-free and unaccountable attitude is still adding up. The budget papers show that last financial year some \$466 000 of overspending by the Department of Transport was caused by 'difficulties experienced in maintaining the existing computer system and general operating costs'. There are many other examples of major waste of taxpayers' money by this Government. The Public Accounts Committee's last annual report also points to the re-organisation of the Education Department. This was estimated to save more than \$6 million, but the committee now reports that the difference in pre and post-departmental running costs is 'small'. In considering why the efficiencies promised by the Government were not achieved, the committee expressed the view that 'the department's consensus style of decision-making requires reconsideration, given how costly this can be in absorbing staff resources'.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Meetings, perpetual meetings.

Mr OLSEN: Meeting upon meeting. Put another way, the committee is condemning the well-known weakness of the Minister of Education to take any difficult decision. Recommendations on improving the efficiency of the STA, particularly through new work practices, have been before the Government for most of this year. However, the budget suggests that rather than anything being done, the STA will become even more inefficient. The cost to taxpayers of covering the operating losses of the STA will be almost \$125 million this financial year. This has more than doubled under this Government.

However, traffic receipts for 1989-90 are budgeted to fall in real terms by more than \$3.1 million, which suggests a further decline in patronage of our buses, trains, and trams despite the considerable amounts of money the Government has invested in trying to promote these services. The budget provides for real growth in STA wage and salary payments of about 6 per cent. This means the recommendations of the Fielding report on efficiency measures have been put in the 'too hard basket' in this election year. Public attitudes to these services will not improve while we have a Government prepared to allow its union mates to dictate what can and cannot happen in the STA.

The cost to taxpayers under the Government's obligations to various components of the ASER project will be \$9.72 million this financial year according to the budget papers. This compares with the Premier's estimate of \$1.25 million as a maximum just after he signed the ASER agreement in 1983. This Government's belief that it knows more than professional designers about how to design a ship means another continuing burden for taxpayers. The completed cost of the *Island Seaway* exceeded original estimates by at least \$10 million. Yet only last week, the Government-designed vessel had to turn back to Port Adelaide in rough weather on the very same day the 100-year-old *Falie* was able to make the journey to Kangaroo Island. The very same day! The *Falie* could get there, and the *Philanderer*, but the *Island Seaway* could not get there.

Increasingly, taxpayers must count the cost of this Government's determination to take risks with their money. Moody's Investors Service of New York has had something to say about this in its latest assessment of South Australia. I acknowledge that Moody's is not flavour of the month with the Federal Treasurer or the Prime Minister, but previously the Premier has acknowledged its expertise. In answer to a question in this House on 11 November 1987, the Premier referred to Moody's as 'one of the two major American rating agencies' and he endorsed its prevailing rating of SAFA.

In Moody's latest assessment of SAFA, it questions in general terms the trend of the Central Borrowing Agencies of the States to take an 'activist approach to State economic development.' It states:

Using taxpayer funds, the CBA's are becoming entrepreneurs or commercial risk-takers in enterprises of inherently uncertain and sometimes dubious value. The distinction between Government and business becomes blurred.

We had some classical examples of that in the past month or two. While traditionally in South Australia our approach has been more conservative than in some other States, the distinction Moody's referred to has become significantly more blurred under this Government, and it continues in this budget.

The capital program allocates more than \$16 million for spending on projects of a commercial nature. These are activities like desk-top publishing and the questionable scrimber project of the Timber Corporation. In State Services, for example, the Financial Statement at page 63 refers to the fact that 'this is the second year that the department will operate under its commercial financial charter'. Page 81 of the same statement refers to the 'development of commercial products relating to the registration of property interests.' There is no elaboration, but these references show that at a time when basic services in education, community safety, health and transport are under so much pressure, the Government is prepared to risk resources that, on commercial ventures already being provided in the private sector, it could have had at no risk to the taxpayer.

Nothing more starkly exposes the mismanagement and the misguided approach of this Government than the con-

tinuing failures of the Timber Corporation. When the Minister of Forests came in to this House at the beginning of the session and suggested Satco's performance had improved, what he did not reveal was that SAFA has written down its equity in the corporation by more than \$17 million. What he also did not reveal was that during last financial year, SAFA had provided the corporation with further capital of \$5 million, then converted it to equity which now has been written down.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, it is scandalous, a real scam. As part of this shuffling around of the Timber Corporation's debt, SAFA has taken further equity in the Woods and Forests Department against the advice of the Auditor-General. At current interest rates, this scam saves the Timber Corporation well over \$2 million a year. In anyone's language, the corporation remains bankrupt.

The Clothing Corporation is in a similar position. It was another agency to have SAFA equity written down last financial year—in this case, from \$600 000 to \$300 000. The budget last financial year also provided a grant of \$524 000 to the Clothing Corporation to keep it afloat. As the budget had allocated only \$164 000 for this purpose, it is quite clear that 1988-89 was yet another disastrous year for the corporation. The House must await an analysis of the Auditor-General's Report for the most up-to-date assessment of the performance of all of these commercial agencies. But what is already known about this Government's record after seven years is that it has allowed its commercial agencies to operate generally inefficiently, so that most are a drain on, rather than being of any benefit to, the people who must fund their losses—the taxpayers of South Australia. Government inaction and inertia have seen them plunge into more and more debt.

Repeatedly, the Government has ignored warnings from the Auditor-General about the failures of agencies like the Timber Corporation and the Clothing Corporation. Repeatedly, the Government turns its back on recommendations to improve efficiency and reduce the cost to taxpayers because its union mates will not allow change. In the Housing Trust, for example, the trust has had a consultant's report recommending that more open tendering for trust maintenance work would reduce costs. The latest annual report of the Public Accounts Committee reveals the view of the Auditor-General that he considers this issue as a matter of high priority. It is to be hoped that action on this recommendation will not take as long as the saga of school bus services.

In May 1983, more than six years ago, the Government established a School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee. It reported in April 1985 on ways to improve services and reduce costs. We are not talking about just a few dollars: the school bus service costs well over \$15 million a year to run. However, in the best 'Yes Minister' tradition, the Government sent the committee's report off to a working group to develop 'a policy and procedures statement'. This was in July 1986 and the issue has remained buried in the bureaucracy ever since.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Did you say it has done nothing in six years?

Mr OLSEN: Nothing. This is despite the fact that, again according to the latest annual report of the Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor-General has identified the potential for more than \$1 million of savings through greater use of subcontractors in the provision of services and changed procedures on mechanical repairs and maintenance.

This Government runs the biggest business in our State. It is the largest employer, so the example it sets is important.

I suggest that the failures of this Government, the failures I have referred to in detail so far this afternoon, are a key reason why our economy continues to fall behind. As an operator of businesses itself, the Government is a failure, but this failure flows on into frustration and disincentive for the people who must pay for these failures. Many are South Australians in business, paying more tax so the Government can compete with them. There is no longer any clear line identifying what are legitimate Government activities and what are unnecessary and wasteful. In the meantime, South Australia just muddles along, leaderless and directionless. Increasingly, this is showing up in our economic drift.

This budget—the budget which takes us into the last decade of this century—the budget the Premier says contains the vision—is based on a slowing economy. It comes at the end of seven years during which, under Labor, we have fallen further and further behind the other States on all the key economic indicators. Let me analyse them:

Gross State Product: The Federal Budget papers allow an estimation of growth for all the States between 1985-86 and 1989-90. They show that South Australia's growth in GSP over this period lags behind all States except Victoria. These budget papers put South Australia's share of gross national product at 7.7 per cent—about 1 per cent below what it should be on a per capita basis.

Employment: In employment, growth in South Australia since the election of this Government has been 16.3 per cent—the lowest on the mainland and 5.6 per cent below the average for all the States. In the budget economic paper, the Treasury Department's survey of 88 major manufacturing businesses in South Australia puts total employment at June 1989 at just over 56 800. This is a decline of more than 6 000 since June 1983. On the latest figures for total manufacturing employment, South Australia is down from 104 900 in 1981-82 to 89 800—a fall of 15 100. On the July figure, South Australia has 10.6 per cent of the nation's unemployed. Our rate is the highest of the mainland States. For each of the past seven years, our participation rate has been lower than the national average.

Population: With fewer job opportunities, our population decline relative to the other States is accelerating. Western Australia now is almost 1 per cent ahead of us in share of national population. Over the past six years, Western Australia's population has increased by 228 400 compared with our 86 300. Fewer migrants see us as a desirable location. Over the past 12 months, our share of national net overseas migration was only 4 per cent, and it should be 10 per cent.

CPI: With higher intakes of migration, another lead South Australia traditionally had over the other States was our lower costs. However, in four of the past seven years, Adelaide's CPI was higher than the weighted average of the eight capitals. The rise in our CPI of 62.9 per cent since the September quarter of 1982 has been exceeded only by Melbourne. Over that period, the contribution of selected State

and local government charges to our inflation has been greater than in all capitals except Brisbane. Adelaide's urban transport fares have increased more than anywhere else. The rise in the cost of education and child care also has been highest in Adelaide, while our health service cost movement has been exceeded only by Brisbane. Rent for Government-owned houses has increased more in Adelaide than in any other capital except Sydney.

Savings: With much higher taxes and other costs, and slower economic growth, South Australians have found it increasingly difficult to save, simply because there is no incentive. Savings bank deposits per head of population, on the latest figures, are lower in South Australia than in any other State except Queensland. The rise in the latest 12 months for which these figures are available was lower in South Australia than in any other State. As the budget economic paper shows, household income per capita in South Australia over the past 10 years has lagged significantly behind the national growth.

Financial pressures: With less ability to spend and to save, increasing financial pressures under which South Australians labour are showing up in a range of other indicators. Last financial year, South Australia had more than 17 per cent of all bankruptcies in the nation—double what we ought to be having. The growth in our retail trade since the election of this Government has been the lowest of all the States. The monthly level of car registrations is 42.7 per cent below what it was in December 1982. Only Tasmania has had a greater decline.

Future Economic Trends: Looking to the immediate future, investment trends are the most reliable guide. New private capital expenditure in the first nine months of 1988-89 was down 10 per cent on the same period a year earlier in current dollars. Spending on equipment, plant, and machinery was down 13 per cent; on building, by 1.2 per cent.

In tourism, the economic budget paper indicated that on the latest figures, our share of international visitors and domestic tourism has been declining; while the outlook for the next 12 months is for further slowing. A reason given for this in the budget economic paper is reduced consumer confidence. I suggest, however, that a great obstacle to tourism in South Australia is the lack of investor confidence. The way this Government has dithered with and mismanaged major developments has produced a crisis of confidence. The prospects for our immediate future are not bright under this Government. With no direction, we face further decline.

We face more of the same. Over the past seven years, our share of employment, of population, of retail trade, of motor vehicle registrations, of value of total buildings, has declined relative to the other States. We have been outperformed by all the mainland States in all these key economic indicators. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table which substantiates this point.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA AS PERCENTAGE OF AUSTRALIA

	December 1982 %	July 1989 %	Change on Dec. 82 %	
Number employed (seasonally adjusted)	8.8	8.39	16.3	S.A. growth lowest on the main- land
Number unemployed	9.38	10.60	15.0	S.A. growth lowest on the main- land
		March 1989		
Population	8.73	8.48	6.47	S.A. growth lowest on the main- land

	December 1982 %	July 1989 %	Change on Dec. 82 %	
Retail trade	8.5	7.75	28.2	S.A. growth lowest on the main-land
Motor vehicle registrations	9.99	July 1989 6.59	42.7	S.A. growth lowest on the main-land
Value of total building	8.62	7.32	134.2	S.A. growth lowest on the main-land

Mr OLSEN: Each year under this Government, the Premier, with each budget, has promised a better economic performance. In 1984, his budget economic paper predicted that South Australia would:

Closely match continued improvement in the Australian economy as a whole.

Tell that to the public at the moment! In 1985, he suggested that:

The condition of the South Australian economy broadly reflects the State of the national economy.

In 1987, he said:

The outlook for the South Australian economy in the medium term is moderately encouraging.

Last year, he claimed:

1988-89 should see this State performing more strongly.

This year, there is no summary of forecasts in the budget economic paper—silence. While the Premier advertises in a colour paper in the marginal seats that this is a budget of vision with an answer, his own budget papers show that he has no idea where his government is going. In a press statement on 8 February this year, he foreshadowed a 'major economic development strategy'. He promised it would be published 'soon' to 'outline the government's priorities for the next five years'. Seven months later, we are still waiting. It seems the Premier believes visions are the things you have only when an election is coming.

As Dr Cornwall says in his book, the Premier's personal values probably have been compromised by the political imperative of perpetually seeking popularity. But what South Australia needs is good government all the time; government of purpose—not perception; government of conviction—not by cowards; government of honesty—not hypocrisy; government of vision through setting practical targets we can achieve together, by working constantly at those targets. By setting its own example with its own set of fundamental values, good government can inspire others.

The next Liberal Government will give the highest priority to managing the State public sector in an efficient and effective manner. Under a Liberal Government it will be possible to provide more resources in vital services like health, education, and community safety without raising taxes. Already, in more than 30 specific policy announcements, I have explained some of our program in areas like public administration, environmental protection, and vocational training. In public administration, we will work with public servants on productivity targets and other procedures to encourage efficiency gains, and ensure the resources are where they are most needed—at the point of service delivery, in our hospitals, our schools, and our police stations. We will aim to find savings of 3 per cent on present levels of recurrent spending so that resources can be re-ordered to areas of greatest need.

The next Liberal Government will be a fully accountable Government—an open Government. The Treasury will coordinate for parliamentary and public scrutiny, the preparation of cost benefit analyses for major new spending

programs. We will enhance the evaluation of outcomes of spending programs with a strengthened role for the Auditor-General. We will have comprehensive freedom of information legislation. We will apply productivity targets for departmental running costs which will allow departments to retain savings in excess of their targets to be allocated for further productivity improvement. Last year's budget allocated \$1 million for a productivity improvement fund to encourage programs in departments. However, there is no reference to the fund in this budget. It has sunk without trace. It is just one more example of this Premier setting a perception without any intention of putting the promise into practice.

We will give public servants more freedom to act within overall objectives laid down at a central administration level. We will break down the organisational structures which have impeded efficiency and productivity gains. There will be a comprehensive audit of all the State's assets to readily identify surplus assets able to be sold with the proceeds going to reduce public debt.

A Liberal Government will recognise its responsibility to set the example. We will not expect South Australians to pay their tax money to the Government just so it can run inefficient businesses in competition with them. We will aim for a more ethical approach to running the business of Government to set the example for the rest of our State. But we will not regard it as the role of Government to go on creating its own business enterprises when resources are so stretched in the areas which are the real business of Government.

We will set achievable targets for the rest of the community to work with us. In exports, the key to our economic future, we will work for 7 per cent annual real growth to lift our Gross State Product to the national average. In population growth, we will work to be at the national average growth by the end of the next decade. It is important for South Australians to appreciate why these targets are necessary.

This Government is frightened to set them because it is afraid it will not be successful. We have a Premier who will not take risks with anything except other people's money. We will dare to succeed because, if we do not, South Australia will fall further behind. Our population target will mean demand for an additional 17 000 houses over the next 10 years, and this has a spin-off into all sorts of other employment areas such as furniture manufacture, appliance manufacture and so on. Our target can mean an extra 5 000 jobs. It can mean we can set a target of wiping out youth unemployment by the middle of the next decade.

On present trends, our home construction industry faces bleak times in the next few years. There is a fall in family formation, with the number of women aged between 20 and 29 years declining as a proportion of our population. This means that for the longer term, unless we do something about it, the number of home starts will be no higher than it is currently, and there will be a move away from the traditional detached dwelling type with the ageing of our

population. We can envisage, without change, thousands of people moving out from areas north and south of the city during the next two decades, adding to pressures on the nearer city areas. We need a sudden and substantial upturn in the State's population but we will not get it under this Government, because it does not dare to work to succeed.

Similarly, our export effort is crucial to growth. On the latest figures, the value of our exports last year show a real decline of more than 5 per cent. This is at a time when we must be exporting more to create jobs and, just as importantly, to play our part in turning around our disastrous balance of payments problems. Since this Government has been in office, our performance in developing exports has been the worst of those of the mainland States. The challenge begins in our schools. We need to encourage the right attitudes and aspirations to succeed in business.

In my Address in Reply speech two years ago, I called for stronger links between schools and business. I said we must even consider working to encourage students to start up their own businesses. For two years I was calling for that: I am pleased that at least some initiative has been taken in that regard. We will take out the gap in between by giving teachers more opportunity to work with industry to ensure there is a new culture in business to take us into the twenty-first century. Over the next 10 years, we must inspire a more productive culture, a culture which insists on quality and excellence in everything we do, not only for the export market but also for import replacement programs. As I have said, Government has the responsibility to set the example. A Liberal Government will do this.

If this was a budget of vision, the Premier would have raised some of the issues I have put forward today for the future. Instead, he has had to concentrate on the public perception of this budget, rather than on what it means in practical terms. He has had to do this to deflect attention from the wasted opportunities and the failures of the past seven years. This afternoon I have stated the case against Labor. I have argued the Liberal cause.

The case against Labor rests on: the failure of the Premier to lead and to inspire this State; the mismanagement of his Ministers; a State economy which has fallen behind that of the other mainland States; record tax growth and record spending increases; falling standards of basic services; gross waste of taxpayers' money; and an orchestrated attempt to cover up these failures, continued in the presentation of this budget. The Liberal cause is for a better South Australia based on open, honest and straightforward government—government which sets an example, government which leads and inspires people to want to do more for themselves and therefore for their State, and government which encourages more people to want to invest and work in our State. Soon, South Australians will have their opportunity to show what their answer is. With this budget, I am confident that the answer will be Liberal, because the Labor years are finished.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is a pleasure to follow the Leader. His speech would be one of the most comprehensive analyses of any State budget that anyone in this House would ever have heard including certainly the member for Briggs. It was a most comprehensive analysis of the budget and trends in this State during these long Labor years. The Leader has been eminently successful in pointing out just how phoney are the perceptions which the Premier seeks to noise abroad in our community compared with the reality of the situation. It has been a completely phoney pre-sell of the budget. When we look at it we realise (and the Leader has pointed

out to all who have listened or who care to read it) just how phoney is the exercise.

The point is that we have the dual problem of a Federal Labor Government tied with a State Labor Government the Leader of which happens to be the Federal President of the Party. Under the leadership of Keating and Hawke, aided and abetted by our Premier, the nation is nothing short of insolvent. What has happened to our international debt under this genius Treasurer Keating? Our international debt has reached the stage where people overseas are having a good hard look at Australia and questioning the future of this country. What are the great national leaders saying? What has Sir Arvi Parbo been warning for years about our indebtedness? What are our leaders doing about it? All Keating can do is pull one lever to give us record levels of interest rates which are crippling everybody.

We do not hear much from the Premier about the level of interest rates. This phoney package today was a recycle of his 1985 scheme—nothing more and nothing less. It helped few people, but was dressed up with a big bang! It got a good headline in the afternoon paper.

Mr Hamilton: Yes, good one.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, a good one. But when it comes to the crunch and the public find out about the scheme, people will realise that they will continue to pay through the nose a bit longer.

Mr Hamilton: You'll learn.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If Hollywood listens to what I have to say, he might learn himself. What does it mean to the average borrower who is paying a 17 per cent interest rate? On the normal term of the loan, he will have paid back that amount of money to the lender after six years but not a cent off his home. That is what it amounts to. They are the sorts of conditions under which householders are being asked to live by Labor Administrations. What is it doing to small business?

The Liberal Party—all of us—was involved in a survey of business in our electorates. How are those people surviving when paying up to 22 per cent interest on some of the money they have to borrow? That is the record of Labor Governments in this nation. In South Australia we are at the bottom of the heap. I cite one example of the dual effect of Labor Governments. We have a wonderful Medicare scheme, which seeks to throw everybody onto the resources of Government. That is Labor philosophy: the more people it can hook on to the Government, the more public servants it can get on to the pay-roll and the better off everyone will be. That is a completely false philosophy and has led to many of the problems we now encounter in this country.

I well remember reading early on in my political career a critique by an English writer on the welfare state in Britain—a state advocated by the Labor Party. As the Leader pointed out, in the social welfare document one of the highlights is the increasing number of people being thrown onto the welfare system. This commentator observed that the welfare state was dreamt up as a great humanitarian dream to look after people from the cradle to the grave but, in effect, if we take away from people what should be their natural responsibility—to look after themselves, their families and their old folk—within a generation we breed a race that is callous, uncaring and selfish.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And improvident.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and improvident. It is a hand-out mentality fostered over the years by Labor Governments. One point that the Leader mentioned in the latter part of his speech is that South Australia is on the bottom of the ladder in terms of savings. For many

years when the Liberal Party was in office South Australia headed the nation in terms of savings. However, what did we see accelerating during the 1970s and in the life of this Administration? We saw no emphasis on being provident for oneself or one's family, instead, more and more hand-outs and more and more gambling facilities—you name it. The Government provided no incentive for people to look after themselves, their families and their dependants. Here we have a Labor budget, a phony budget and a budget which gives further expression to Labor philosophy.

Let us consider Medicare. We are pushing more and more people onto the Government system. Once South Australia headed the nation in terms of the number of people who were willing to insure themselves to meet their health needs. Once between 80 per cent or 90 per cent (I forget the exact figure) of people insured themselves, but now about half of the South Australian public wish to insure against health needs. This is because we have this universal 'free' health scheme.

What do we have in South Australia? We have a situation where there are more and more people making more and more demands on the public sector, with fewer people looking after themselves, and we have a cut in real spending on health in the budget. The public system cannot cope. Members should consider what is happening at the Royal Adelaide Hospital this year, one of the major teaching hospitals. The situation is an absolute disgrace. Members should talk to anyone associated with the hospital in the medical profession. They should talk to the nurses.

I have had people and nurses ringing me at night when this matter was at its height; I heard from people working in the hospital. The situation applying at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a disgrace for the premier teaching hospital. What happened there? The public system cannot cope and, as a result of this budget, the problems will be further exacerbated. In the traditional areas of need in this community, where the Labor Party has pushed more and more people onto the welfare system, fewer and fewer resources are available to various instrumentalities. As I say, and as my Leader pointed out in the latter part of his speech, the budget papers tell us clearly that South Australia is now at the bottom of the heap.

We always have churned out a heap of optimistic stuff: we got it last time; we get it every year that there are indications that things are improving but, at the end of the year when we talk about the sum total of where South Australia is at, we find that we have not got far at all. The Government is hell bent on getting into entrepreneurial activities. We are in the timber business in a big way; we are writing down our investment. We are in the Clothing Corporation, in the wash-house. We have the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA) which the Liberal Party advocated getting into entrepreneurial activities but which is writing off fairly major losses.

I have had a good look through the SAFA report again. It intrigues me. I cannot make head nor tail of the finances of ETSA in terms of how they are detailed and what ETSA has done with its assets. I doubt whether anyone in the community can follow that. Certainly, the financial reporters with whom I have talked have not the faintest idea of ETSA's financial details. The public has a right to know how its money is being spent and how the major instrumentalities are being financed.

Far too much is dismissed by Government frontbenchers in terms of commercial confidentiality. We saw the disgraceful situation at Marineland where \$6 million was spent. Dolphins are swimming around in the pool and we cannot catch them to determine whether or not they are healthy

enough to be transferred. We do not know the details because the matter is commercially confidential.

If matters are not commercially confidential, the Government puts the heat on the people involved and demands that they do not talk publicly about what is obviously a scandalous situation. I do not believe that the Government has much to be proud of. For example, what has happened to the cost of electricity during this Administration? We were told until about 12 months ago the cost of electricity in this State was about the average cost in the rest of the country, but the IAC decided to look at electricity costs and productivity around Australia in an attempt to improve productivity. Certainly, productivity is the 'in' word with everyone—so it ought to be, if this nation is to have any future. We have to improve productivity dramatically; we have to get more for our money.

The IAC gave the lie to the Government's claim. I heard the Premier give an address two years ago to the engineering employers group (it was either that group or the Chamber of Commerce on Greenhill Road); the Premier claimed that the cost for electricity in this State was about the national average—that was one of the pluses of the speech. However, that is not what the IAC tells us in its recent report this year. At page A9 it has produced a series of graphs showing South Australia at the top of the ladder in terms of the cost of power. South Australia now has the singular distinction of having the dearest electricity in the nation, and that is shown clearly in the IAC report. The cost of electricity has increased in South Australia steeply. Once we were at the middle level. Certainly, if we consider the average cost of electricity, in 1982 we were at the bottom of the list. The cost of electricity has increased steeply since 1982 when the present Administration came into office. We are now at the top of the list and South Australia has the dearest electricity in the nation. Of course, we know that the Government lifted about \$50 million from the top; last year it took about \$38 million based on 5 per cent turnover. That was an innovation of the Dunstan Government. We managed to restructure the long-term loans at low interest rates and gave that to SAFA to look after, but now it charges the common interest rate and that cost ETSA a lot of money.

In terms of productivity under the Labor Administration, I refer to what the IAC had to say: it states that New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia have all experienced significant productivity growth. It further states:

In contrast, total factor productivity in South Australia and Tasmania has declined in recent years.

Of course, that decline is not as significant in Tasmania, which has by far the cheapest power in the nation because it had managed to develop hydro power, until the Greenies blocked off the latest efforts. I do not know where Tasmania will go in the future, but it has by far the cheapest power so the situation is not so significant there.

There are further references in the IAC report about what has happened to the cost of electricity and to productivity in South Australia. There is also an interesting discussion in the report in respect of the interstate interconnection. Members know that the unions have dictated that that shall not be used for any base load power, but there is an interesting discussion in the IAC report about what we could do with that energy connection, perhaps to minimise some of our costs.

I now refer to the actual budget papers. Although I am going over some of the ground traversed by my Leader, I refer to 'Economic Conditions and the Budget'. The Government is condemned in its own budget papers in terms of where we are. As I have already said, we are at the bottom of the heap. If we did not have farming and mining

sectors, we would be completely insolvent. Although the rural community is largely disfranchised in terms of population distribution, the contribution of our rural community to our economy is proportionately higher than in the other States. That is acknowledged in the budget papers, and at page 12 the following statement is made:

South Australian GDP has grown slightly below the rate of growth in national GDP since 1977-78, the first year for which State estimates by the ABS were published, averaging 11.1 per cent nominal growth per annum versus 11.7 per cent nationally.

Further down we are told:

ABS estimates are also available for household income . . .

If ever there was a condemnation of a Labor Government, it ought to be in terms of how the average householder is faring, and they have fared poorly under the Labor Government. It is further stated:

In South Australia, household income per capita has risen at an annual rate of 9.8 per cent in the 10 years to 1987-88, or 1.1 per cent per annum in real terms . . . the national average real growth of 1.4 per cent . . .

In other words, household income has risen by just under a third—25 per cent to 30 per cent—of the national average. What sort of record is that for a State Government, when the State's average households are becoming relatively poorer compared with the rest of the nation? Without some of the initiatives of the Liberal Government at the beginning of this decade—the international airport and new mines—I do not know where this State would be. But, we have fallen behind even with those initiatives coming on stream. It is further stated:

In the six years since the trough in the June quarter 1983, total South Australian employment has risen by . . . 20.1 per cent, versus a national rise of . . . 23.1 per cent . . . Part-time employment in South Australia rose by 5.3 per cent . . . compared with 7.1 per cent nationally.

And so this sorry litany goes on. Yet, we are always told that we should look at the last three months. We hear this from Ministers. The Hon. Lynn Arnold tells us that things are on the move and to look at the last three months. We have been looking at the last three months for the past seven years and, at the end of the day, we are still at the bottom of the heap. Then we see this optimistic comment:

Strong employment growth in South Australia through 1988-89 led to a drop in unemployment of 12.2 per cent, despite record high labour force participation. National unemployment fell by an even greater 16.3 per cent . . .

So, South Australia is not performing anywhere near as well as we are nationally. The document goes on and outlines the sorry tale of where we are compared with the rest of the Australian community. I believe that one of the biggest problems was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in the closing part of his speech—that is, what is happening with our population. We all remember the Premier—and I certainly do—in 1982 shedding crocodile tears on the banks of the Torrens or somewhere—he was trying to look natural, but he had a job in doing so—saying that the greatest tragedy that had befallen our State was its declining population. All I can say is that that tragedy has been greatly heightened by the deprivations of this Government.

If one looks at the demographic trends during the life of the Bannon Labor Government one will see that South Australia is falling further behind the rest of the nation in relation to its population. All in all, where are we? The Labor Party has put South Australia at the bottom of the heap. It will stay there while we have this timid Premier who will not take on his mates in Canberra. Even though he is the Labor Party's Federal President, he is so timid that he encourages people to spend millions of dollars on development and, because of a puff of opposition, he cuts the ground from under their feet. What hope does this State

have of attracting investors when that occurs? I suggest that it has none, and it is time that the present Administration was turfed out of office.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I also commend the Leader of the Opposition for his detailed response to the budget. I have been in this place for a number of years and it is by far the most detailed response I have heard to any budget presented in this Parliament. The Leader's speech is well worth the time it would take any South Australian to read. It shows the real financial position of South Australia and the sheer hypocrisy of the Premier's statements over a long period. The Leader of the Opposition not only dealt in detail with the present budget but also provided an excellent summary of the accumulated long-term effects since the Bannon Government came to power some seven years ago. We all recall the statement in 1982 of the then Leader of the Opposition that he would not introduce any new taxes or increase existing tax rates during his Government's term in office. One only has to look at what has occurred during the period of the Bannon Government to know how false that statement was.

In fact, total tax collection has increased by 163 per cent, land tax has increased by a massive 262 per cent, revenue from car registrations and driving licences has increased by 116 per cent, payroll tax has increased by 88 per cent, and financial institutions duty has increased by 71 per cent—and that is only taking into account the period since its introduction in 1984-85. Also, stamp duty has increased by some 206 per cent, sales tax on gas has increased by 186 per cent, the tax on beer and other liquor has increased by 171 per cent, petrol tax has increased by 234 per cent, tobacco tax has increased by 262 per cent, and sales tax on electricity has increased by 146 per cent.

That is not bad for a Leader of the Opposition, seeking to win Government, who says that he will not introduce new taxes or increase existing tax rates during his term of office. It is a disgrace that the Premier was prepared to increase taxes and charges in South Australia to the extent that occurred during those seven years—and, of course, it continues to this day. Earlier this afternoon I raised with the Minister of Lands a draft Cabinet submission under her name which seeks to increase boat mooring charges on the Murray River by some 800 per cent. The Minister vehemently claimed that she knew absolutely nothing of this Cabinet submission. If she knew nothing of it then I pose the question: who is running the department? Obviously, the Minister is not. From my experience, if a senior departmental officer desires to put something before Cabinet, that person discusses the issue with the Minister concerned and, with his or her concurrence, a draft submission is prepared for consideration by that Minister. I find it remarkable that this Cabinet submission has been prepared by the Department of Lands, presumably for the attention of the Minister of Lands, yet she claims to have absolutely no knowledge of it. I suggest that this draft Cabinet submission was not meant to see the light of day until after the election—in fact, I firmly believe that this is the situation.

Earlier in this session I gave notice that I would move that this House oppose any move by the Government to annex the Department of Marine and Harbors or transfer its specific responsibilities to the Department of Environment and Planning. When I did so the Premier indicated his amusement at such a motion being placed on the Notice Paper. However, this Cabinet submission clearly indicates that that move is afoot, marked as it is: 'To the Premier for Cabinet. Proposal: to transfer the responsibilities for administration of boat mooring and launching licences on

the Murray River from the Department of Marine and Harbors to the Department of Lands'.

Quite obviously, the Department of Marine and Harbors will be systematically dismantled and spread amongst other Government departments—principally, the Department of Lands and the Department of Environment and Planning. So, there is a great deal of credibility in the notice of motion that I presently have on the Notice Paper. That is borne out also by this draft Cabinet submission, of which the Minister claims to have no knowledge whatsoever. I find great difficulty in accepting the explanation that was given by the Minister of Lands this afternoon.

On the question of interest that this State is paying, some \$657 million goes just on paying interest on existing loans. That is an enormous amount, and it is increasing year by year. Naturally, the State Government is paying high rates of interest, as is every individual in this State and nation. Many young people are confronted with an absolutely hopeless situation in relation to the high interest rates on home loans.

I honestly cannot imagine how some of these young people are surviving. The burden that they are facing is beyond belief. With no chance of increasing their disposable income to meet the ever increasing burden of high interest rates, those young people are faced with an absolutely impossible situation, and how they can continue, I do not know. The Government simply continues to increase its charges, and it is up to the public to meet the Government's increasing interest costs. Certainly, young people cannot do that. The impact goes far beyond young people who are buying homes. The impact on industry and commerce is absolutely enormous. This relates very much to the reason why we are in our present situation.

I refer to the situation that exists in relation to the Education Department and the Police Force. As to the number of teachers that we have, we find now that the actual number of teachers in our schools has declined by 850 since 1982. That is a far cry from the undertaking given by the then Leader of the Opposition—now the Premier—back in 1982. A fall of 850 in the number of teachers must have a significant impact on the schools and students in this State. The police are in exactly the same situation. The Government claims that the Police Force has increased in numbers. Since 1982 there has been an increase of 154 full-time equivalents but, in reality, with the reduction in working hours of police officers, from a 40 hour week to a 38 hour week, the number of police officers actually out there on the ground has been reduced. The reduction in hours to a 38 hour week has meant that effectively there has been a reduction in the number of police out there on the ground.

Statistically, whilst the Premier might be correct in one way, the number of police out there at any one time has been reduced. As a result, we have seen a dramatic increase—75 per cent—in the number of robberies. Rapes and attempted rapes are up by 182 per cent, and drug offences are up by 152 per cent. All these things must be related directly to the strength of the Police Force out there on the ground. Certainly, in my area, in the Riverland, there is enormous concern amongst the community about the level of patrols, particularly at night. I believe that this concern is quite justified when one considers the increasing crime rate over the past seven years. Although over the past seven years financial commitments in successive budgets have increased enormously, the number of people on the Government payroll, those people providing the services, has decreased over that time, and this relates particularly to teachers.

As to the capital works program, I refer in particular to what has occurred in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin. During the past few weeks we have heard a great deal from the Prime Minister and the South Australian Minister of Water Resources about the greater commitment that is to be made to the Murray-Darling Basin. The Minister promised spending of some \$25 million this financial year by the three river States and the Federal Government. However, once again that funding has not been provided. On numerous occasions in this House and outside I have said that, unless we are prepared to provide funding to rectify the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin to the tune of some \$100 million annually, we will make little progress. That amount is four times that which was proposed by the Minister of Water Resources and probably 10 times more than what has actually been provided by the Governments concerned.

I believe that there is a total lack of understanding by the State Government and the Federal Government of the magnitude of the problem that exists in the Murray-Darling Basin. Unless funding of the magnitude to which I have referred is provided, the situation will continue to deteriorate. I believe that we can use the resource to its fullest, but we have a responsibility, a moral obligation, to hand over that resource to the next generation in a better condition than is the case at the moment.

This resource generates enormous capital. It has been estimated by successive Federal Governments that the resource is worth \$10 000 million annually. A more recent assessment is that the figure is probably closer to \$14 000 million annually. So, calling for a genuine commitment to be made in relation to that resource is not calling for an expenditure to come from the population or from taxpayers as such: it has the ability to generate resources to correct its own problems. Unless a percentage of that generating power is put back into the resource, it will continue to deteriorate.

Over a long period I have proposed that it will require about 1 per cent of the value that that resource generates every year. In other words, \$100 million annually over the next 10 years would correct most of the problems that have been created during the past 150 years. During the period of the Liberal Government, the total number of employees within the E&WS Department was reduced by between 1 000 and 1 500. During that period I had regular (about three-monthly) visits from the present Minister of Labour, as Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, on the basis that, if we had not started sacking people, we were about to. However, it is interesting to note that, since the Bannon Government has been in office, the number of E&WS Department employees has reduced by over 1 000, yet there has not been one comment from the present Minister of Labour or any of the members of the Trades and Labor Council in response to the action that has been taken.

Former Premier Dunstan once said that things are different when they are not the same. I suggest that in many instances, the statements made by the present Premier and various members of his Cabinet fall very much into that category: things are different when they are not the same. Members opposite said at the time that we were irresponsible and that our actions would lead to the downfall of this State. In fact, the Government has done exactly the same thing in many instances.

Once again, I commend the Leader of the Opposition for his detailed analysis of the budget that is currently before the House. I suggest that every person in South Australia reads that assessment. As a result of reading the response

by the Leader, they will have a much clearer understanding of the difficult position that currently faces South Australia.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I pay a tribute to the Leader's analysis of the Premier's budget speech because he took it apart bit by bit to show the sham that it was. I never question the Estimates of Receipts and Estimates of Payments documents presented to the Parliament because they are actual figures. They show the estimate of receipts of last year as against the actual receipts and the budget estimate for the following year. All the figures have had to be scrutinised by the Auditor-General, so there is some modicum of control as to what those figures show. Also a general audited statement is presented to this Parliament.

However, what has always amazed me since I have been in this place—and I might add that I am never critical of the officers who prepare those documents, because they do so on the instructions of their departments and they do it truly and faithfully to the best of their ability—is how different the actual figures are as presented in the financial documents as against those referred to in the speech given by the Premier and Treasurer. When one reads it, it gives a completely different picture, and the Leader very succinctly and at length today went through what the Treasurer claims in this two-bit document that he delivered to the Parliament the other day. No doubt it was written, aided and abetted by the fabricator because it really is from stem to stern a fabrication of the facts in the budget. It is indeed a fabrication of the Government's performance over the past 12 months. The Leader took it apart and showed time and again where the facts were completely different from what was written in that budget speech.

In the time that is available today, I will highlight a few lines from the Premier's speech and discuss what really are the facts as against what was stated in that speech. Half way down the first page of the speech, the Premier stated:

However, the past seven years have been a period of recovery and growing optimism. We have rebuilt the foundations of our economy. Dollar by dollar, we have restored the State's finances. The 1989-90 budget confirms how benefits can flow from proper economic management.

If one looks at where South Australia really stands in relation to other States of Australia, we see a vastly different picture. We see that the number of employed people in this State has had the lowest growth of any State on the mainland. Those are factual figures, all of which are available in the budget. South Australia has had the lowest decline in the number of unemployed people of any State on the mainland. In retail trade, which is a barometer of the economic level and whether or not the State is healthy, South Australia has the least growth of any mainland State. Motor vehicle registrations also are a barometer of the standard of living and of whether or not the economy is booming, and South Australia has the highest decline in motor vehicle registrations of any mainland State.

Mr Groom: We are the lowest taxed State.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The most important indicator is building activity, and it is quite obvious when one looks around the skyline of Adelaide that not much is happening. I had the undoubted privilege to visit Victoria last weekend and was staggered at the amount of redevelopment occurring there as compared with South Australia. South Australia has the lowest building activity growth of any mainland State. If this shows that we have been under the banner of Bannon's good management, God help the rest of Australia—that is all I can say. It is nonsense for members opposite, the has beens on the backbench—who know absolutely nothing about economic reality whatsoever—to try

to say that we are the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Both of you are responsible for some of this decline in the State's activities. I do not have the time to explain in single syllable words exactly where this State is at present. Members opposite cannot get away with this lowest taxed State nonsense, because it is not factual. We have the lowest economic activity of any State in Australia. We have the greatest amount of bankruptcies, and the State is in economic decline, as shown by the budget figures. However, the Premier, in his beat-up, is trying to purport something else. Further on in his speech, the Premier stated:

As I said to the House 16 days ago, we reject the easy solution of reckless spending which would impose debt burdens on our children and the generations beyond.

Let us look at where our debt burdens are. It is noted that 50c in every dollar that the Government takes this year will be needed to pay off our interest bill. That interest bill now totals \$657.2 million. It is factual that, since the Bannon Government came to power, it has borrowed almost \$2 billion to fund its budgets on top of the record tax increases.

Let us look at the reckless spending in which, the Premier says, the Government will not indulge and which will affect future generations. It was very interesting that the Auditor-General's Report, which was tabled today, contained about three pages dedicated to the Marineland investment. According to the Auditor-General, this investment is a carbon copy of the Government's investment in the New Zealand Timber Corporation. The Auditor-General states that the Government went into the Marineland investment without proper information—that is exactly what he has been saying about Satco for the past three or four years. Here we have Satco revisited. The Auditor-General states that the Department of State Development and Technology and the Department of Tourism misled the Industries Development Committee—a committee of this Parliament—into looking at this development.

The figures presented to the committee were coloured in favour of the project. It was an unmitigated disaster. More than \$5.1 million of taxpayers' funds has been absolutely wasted to this point. There is a further allocation of another \$900 000 before the Government can get out of this situation. That is some \$6 million straight down the gurgler because this Government did not have the financial expertise or the people with the ability to look at that project. The Government has plenty of people with the ability to write this sort of nonsense which purports the Government to be something else; however, it does not have the financial ability to make the decisions that should be expected of a Treasurer in Government in this State.

I refer now to the South Australian Timber Corporation. Once again, the Auditor-General has been critical of the South Australian Timber Corporation. It is interesting to note that, instead of the profit that was supposed to be generated by the South Australian Timber Corporation as enunciated by the Minister about three weeks ago, the Auditor-General's Report shows that that alleged profit was, in fact, a loss. Worse than that, if interest was charged against the 15.2 per cent of equity written off by the South Australian Timber Corporation and the equity given to SAFA for the financing of the corporation it would reduce the sum to a further loss of some \$4 million.

The SAFA report shows some very disturbing facts. It shows that the South Australian Timber Corporation, in its investment, had total debts of about \$44 million last year. Of that, \$26 million was put into equity with the Woods and Forests Department. That asset was then revalued and

reassessed and was written down \$17 million. It is noted that last year SAFA put into the South Australian Timber Corporation a further \$5 million in capital. The Leader very succinctly asked, 'What responsible Government, during the past 12 months, would lend a further \$5 million in capital to a failing corporation and then during that time, on the advice of consultants, write off \$17 million of that debt?'. The South Australian Timber Corporation is probably one of the biggest scandals of the past five years of this Government. It has accumulated losses of some \$15.4 million and the Auditor-General states quite categorically that there is virtually no hope of that corporation returning to profitability. The Auditor-General goes on to state:

Last year, I suggested that the most efficient and effective way to use the State's valuable timber resource might be best served by an amalgamation of the Woods and Forests Department and the corporation, . . . and the determination of an appropriate corporate structure, financial structure and management for the amalgamated body. I still remain of that view.

So, for five years the Auditor-General has been criticising the Government on its performance in terms of the South Australian Timber Corporation, and for five years the Government has done nothing about the situation. For two years the Auditor-General has been saying that the Government must amalgamate Woods and Forests Department with the South Australian Timber Corporation, because all it is doing at present is using it to keep the facts away from the public of South Australia. Nothing has been done—absolutely nothing!

I note that the ex-Minister of Forests is not in the Chamber to hear this. At least he sat there and admitted quite categorically that the South Australian Timber Corporation was not travelling too well. That is contrary to the statements made by the current Minister, who tells us what a rosy situation we have. The credibility of the current Minister of Forests has been blown out of the water many times in relation to financial issues, as has the credibility of the Treasurer. The reports that we receive from the Auditor-General are completely different from the Ministers' assertions.

Of course, that is not the only financial disaster in which this Government has been involved. Recently we have heard quite a bit about the *Island Seaway*. It is interesting to note that the *Island Seaway* was initially estimated to cost \$15 million. The estimate is now somewhere near \$27 million. It does not regularly sail from Outer Harbor and its appearances at Kangaroo Island are even less regular. As the Leader said, the *Falio* is much more reliable in transporting the produce requirements to keep the Island's economy functioning. However, again, the Government is duck-shovelling and running away from its commitment because, as is the case with the entertainment centre proposal, the *Island Seaway* was built on the 'fast track'. This method produces tremendous problems. One would have thought that the Government would have learned from the disaster of the *Island Seaway* that one cannot, economically and viably, build ships in that fashion.

From what the Opposition has worked out, the entertainment centre will supposedly cost about \$40 million. However, the people who have been asked to tender are saying that the cost will be closer to \$60 million in today's dollars because the 'fast track' method is being used. Surely this Government should have more financial expertise available to it. Of course, the trouble is that one must accept the advice offered. It is no good getting in a consultant—as occurred in relation to the South Australian Timber Corporation—if one is not prepared to accept the advice.

Probably the daddy of them all, and one of which I have been very critical for the past couple of years, has been the

Scrimber operation. It is very interesting to read what the Auditor-General has had to say about this operation. To date it has cost \$44 million with interest capitalised. In the budget, a further \$9 million has been allocated for that project. In anyone's language that represents about \$53 million, and next year's interest has to be capitalised. The estimated total production cost in 1985 was \$12 million up to the start of production. Four years later, when still we have no production, it is scheduled for September 1989, but I am told it is to be put forward at least three or four months—the cost is estimated to be about \$60 million. That will be the cost to the South Australian taxpayers before the first beam comes out.

Of course, the Auditor-General has criticised this operation and the Opposition has criticised it the whole way through. Why could not the Government listen to the Auditor-General when he stated from day one that, if we are to go into these speculative ventures, we first need good financial management (which obviously the Government does not have) and, secondly, we should not use borrowed funds? In other words, we should go into such a venture in equity. To get out of the mire the Government has tried valiantly to dress up the balance sheet for the Timber Corporation and the Woods and Forests Department, but the Auditor-General has said that those two bodies should be clubbed together. The Premier goes on to state in his fabrication:

All businesses will benefit from real reductions in charges and continued tax relief.

We should look at the real figures. We find that, first, the Premier goes on at length in his budget speech about reductions in land tax. He said that 'this will be of particular assistance to small business'. How does he reconcile that the actual receipts of land tax last year totalled \$63.7 million but the estimate for this year is \$70 million? How can there be, on the one hand, substantial benefits for business when, on the other hand, more will be received in land tax this year than was received last year? Our investigations show clearly that small business will pay more in dollars in land tax this year than last year. That is where this document is a complete and absolute sham.

I do not know how the Treasurer of this State can stand up and try to hoodwink the people of South Australia into believing that there will be land tax or payroll reductions for business in this State, because that is not fact. In fact, the only reduction budgeted for over the next 12 months involves stamp duty. Those who understand anything about stamp duty know that it is paid on the sale of property. This budget therefore estimates that there will be decreased activity in South Australia over the next 12 months—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That is what the *News* says tonight.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, at least someone is starting to wake up that things are tightening up in this country. All the hoo-hah in this document, which states that the foundations of the economy have been rebuilt and that we are going into a period of growth and growing optimism, is rubbish, because the figures do not indicate that. Small business in this State is being ground into the dirt by increased taxes and charges. That has been going on every year since the Premier has been the Treasurer of this State because no-one opposite understands or has had any experience whatsoever in small business.

If we look at the payment side (and the Premier claimed that he made an excess in receipts over payments last year), we note that the contingencies, or the allowance for increases in wages and salaries, is \$115 million this year whilst last year it was something like \$80 million. The \$40 million excess claimed by the Premier was merely \$40 million that was not spent on wages and salaries.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In this debate I wish to refer to the manner in which the budget is being discussed and has been presented to us. A document was presented by the Premier, which was nicely worded and sounded good to many people. It was supported by a number of other booklets giving greater detail. Another viewpoint tends to indicate that the budget as presented by the Government is clouded by words and is, therefore, not truly representative of the issue. If ever a need existed for a truly independent audit of the State's affairs, it exists now and it will exist on a regular basis, perhaps every five years.

If the Government was being factual (and I am not questioning the figures presented) in its presentation to the public, it would have nothing to fear from an independent audit and, in fact, it would have everything to gain, because an outside authority would be able to provide evidence that the Government is handling the State's affairs correctly and appropriately. If, on the other hand, that were not the case and if the Government was attempting to fudge or misrepresent the figures either deliberately, unobtrusively or innocently, that anomaly would be exposed and the public would have a fair idea of whether the State is being managed correctly in fiscal terms.

That suggestion is in no way derogatory. What I am basing my comments on is the experience of New South Wales, where the Government was saying one thing but the Opposition believed that the figures were not accurate and it was found, upon engaging independent auditors, that the figures were far more serious than at first thought. Of course, having the results of an independent audit, the Government of the day was able to make the appropriate cuts or sacrifices, whatever the case might be, in order that affairs could be put back in order. During the last sitting day and today we heard comments from both sides of the House, but one would ask whether we are in fact debating the same budget papers.

I wish to make one other comment on the Premier's speech, and that relates to his reference to money being borrowed from the capital account to pay for the day-to-day expenses of Government. On nearly every occasion on which that has occurred, irrespective of which Government is in power, I have referred to that practice. I believe that it is totally wrong, and that a Government should be obliged to live within its means. If it is spending more than it is earning, it should be made accountable for that and either cut back on expenditure or increase revenue. That raises another question: whether the policy direction adopted by the Government is correct. Of course, the present Government tends to be a high taxation Government in order to give greater service to the community in the area of community welfare type of services.

If the community is prepared to wear the taxation increases to provide those benefits, that is a political decision the Government makes on that occasion. It therefore has to wear the political decisions it makes and the political direction in which it is endeavouring to take the State. Whatever happens, irrespective of political philosophy, the Government should balance the books and not move into deficit budgeting where future generations are obliged to pick up the mistakes or the responsibilities of today's Governments.

That is something about which I have a great deal of concern, and if there is a point on which to commend the Government it is on its balancing the books in that way. Of course, we can raise all sorts of other arguments to say that the books do not give a true indication, because one does not know the amount of indebtedness of many of the statutory authorities. They are not taken into account in the recurrent expenditure proposed. If we weighed that in

the balance, perhaps a different picture could be obtained. However, I believe that the indebtedness of those statutory authorities has been reduced.

One of my greatest concerns, and one which I have voiced in this House on many occasions, is the effect on my electorate of activities in the rural scene. I refer particularly to the devastating drought we had last year, following four years of below average rainfall. Comment has been made about the drought and how it has broken, but it is fair to say that not one dollar has yet flowed into the economy since the drought has broken. Until such time as it does, there will be no improvement in the overall economy of Eyre Peninsula and, moreover, the bulk of the first good year's income will probably go to pay accumulated debts before a climate can be created to enable the farmers to start spending, to start replacing some of the equipment that is wearing out, to start making improvements of a capital nature—water, fences, sheds, etc.—thereby creating a cash flow within the small business community and the service industries on the peninsula and in other areas of the State.

Until that money starts to flow through those areas, no great benefit will come to this State, because the money will be absorbed within the financial institutions. Those financial institutions' demands must first be met before moneys can be spent with the small business community and ultimately within the overall community.

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

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 701.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In his speech the Premier said that the Government was somewhat concerned about the impact of interest rates on the overall economy. I cannot but help agree with him. I would like to read into *Hansard* a letter that I received from a constituent about two months ago. The letter epitomises the general feeling of many people on the West Coast, particularly those who have found themselves in some financial difficulties. The letter states:

Dear Peter, I woke up this morning to the radio saying Mortgage Week is on. So I feel I must protest on behalf of my family and our way of life in regard to farm mortgages. We hear plenty of comments on house mortgages, and rightly so; the wage earners would find it increasingly difficult, as do farmers and small business people to service their loans as interest rates continue to rise every week or two.

I know some critics will argue debt is self-inflicted but it is necessary sometimes to go into debt, in which to continue your farm enterprise and enable your children to pursue their chosen way of life. Why is it that Australians who try so hard to help themselves must always suffer? I have brought my family up for the last 20 years on my own, since the death of my husband, without an ounce of help from any Government pension, etc., and am very proud of the fact. But, with interest rates at present

standing at 20 per cent, State Bank loan and PIBA 21¼ per cent, I wonder sometimes for how much longer.

I thought the State Bank was initially set up to help farmers during the last depression. My main comment is to ask how is it possible for a person to sign a contract, as we did in 1985, to buy land at 16.5 per cent, and now in 1989 we face rates of 20 to 21¼ per cent.

It's no wonder people are in trouble. Contracts should be binding both ways. The way I see it, the banks can't lose, although the blame isn't theirs entirely; the Government calls the tune, to the detriment of the middle class person, our main working taxpayers. It's time for action, and I look to you to press our case. I'm not asking for sympathy, just a fair go.

I believe the letter expresses adequately the sentiments of the many people who have found themselves in financial difficulties as a result of interest rate increases. The problem has been compounded by the bad seasons experienced in the area. I would now like to refer to those drought areas because of a perception within the wider community that the drought has broken. Members have heard about how wonderful the crops look and about the future of farmers being satisfactory. Regrettably, this perception suggests to the general public that all the problems are over. However, I point out that not one dollar has flowed through to the community yet and it will be some time before money does arrive. When it does, it will pay off bank loans or interest debt, rather than going into the general infrastructure of the community.

It is necessary and desirable for the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture to visit Eyre Peninsula as soon as possible. Certainly, I invite them to Eyre Peninsula so that they can see for themselves how country which was wiped off by many people only a few months ago has been transformed into what looks as though it could be an all-time record season for grain growers.

All those instant experts who were around to tell us what to do when things were rough have gone. They are not around now. Where are they? We want the Government to see how this country can revive and transform itself into a highly productive area—an area which almost certainly will produce half the State's grain in the coming season.

However, it needs to go further than that. We need the Government and Government officers to see the good and the bad. They have seen the bad; let them see the good. More particularly, we want the Government to set in train a disaster plan of some kind, whether partly self-funded or partly Government-funded, which can be put in place when natural disasters occur (such as occurred last year), because they will recur. The community in general, with the Government's aid, must be able to look at long-term planning in order to buffer the results of natural disasters.

We would all like to think that the farming community should be able to carry its losses and share its wins. That ideal is great, but we all acknowledge that with Government restrictions, with the costs of production rising and reduced prices received—a general cost squeeze—it is almost impossible for the farming way of life as it was 20 years ago to continue. To that end, if the Premier and the Minister could visit Eyre Peninsula whilst it is a picture of health, hopefully some reporting of that can be noted and it will be seen that the Eyre Peninsula is not an area to be wiped off as was perceived by many.

The Premier, in his detailed explanation of the budget, talked about the years ahead, the budget objectives, the outlays and other statistical data and information were given. One issue that concerns me—and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will be able to respond at some time—is that, following a deputation to the then Minister of Agriculture and the Premier by people representing local government and the small business community, the Government responded by offering some concessional interest rates to

small businesses in the rural community on Eyre Peninsula if they could demonstrate that the bulk of their income was directly related to the rural area and was therefore affected by the drought. I note that there has been a small response from the business community.

I am somewhat baffled as to why there was not a flood of applications for this assistance. I do not know whether the criteria were unrealistic and therefore could not be accepted or whether other factors were brought into it. I note that in one of the press articles a commentator remarked that some of the smaller stores had asked their clientele to pay by bankcard or credit card. Therefore, small businesses are not carrying the debt. That may be one way of shifting the debt burden from the small business person to the financial institutions, but there may be other reasons for that. I would welcome the Minister's response as to how, where and why the service offered by the Government has not been accepted. I believe that perhaps the criteria were unrealistic and therefore could not be accepted as such.

Although it is not specifically mentioned in the Premier's speech, I am pleased that planning work has begun on the proposed \$8 million extension wing of the Port Lincoln Hospital and that construction is expected to commence next financial year. I hope that, this time, the project reaches fruition. I say that with some cynicism because in 1978 this project was approved by the Public Works Standing Committee and the Government of the day. However, with changing priorities and Governments the project was set aside, and we have only just seen it come to light again. I am pleased that that has occurred, but I hope that building this new wing in a large regional hospital will not in any way be to the detriment of the smaller regional hospitals that service the area so well.

I now turn my attention to the proposed sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln. I was pleased that last week the Leader of the Opposition visited my electorate and gave an undertaking that a sewage treatment works would be in the planning stage within 12 months of a Liberal Government being elected. That is the first time the Liberal Party has made such a commitment. However, I make the point that the Leader of the Opposition's undertaking mentioned only the planning stage. It is ironic that the newspaper that reported the Leader of the Opposition's promise to Port Lincoln also contains a reference to a speech made by Sir Thomas Playford 30 years ago where he talked about providing a sewage works for Port Lincoln. That comment made 30 years ago by Sir Thomas Playford appearing in the same newspaper as the promise of the Liberal Leader is irony worth noting.

What we need from both the Government and the Opposition is an undertaking that that sewage treatment works will be completed during the life of the next Government, and that is a challenge for both Parties. My statements supporting the sewage works are well known. I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee when the Finger Point proposal was considered, and I know the attitude of the two major Parties in relation to it. I am pleased that that project was considered. I was the only member of that committee to initially give it active support. However, things changed after that; there were elections, and promises and priorities were made.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member can say that, too.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I know very well that, if the gentleman to whom the honourable member refers was honest and checked with the Secretary of the Public Works Standing

Committee, he would find that I am right. I gave the Finger Point project so much support because it affected the lobster industry. The entire lobster industry of this State would have been in jeopardy if it was spread about overseas that South Australian lobster came from an area that could be polluted. That was the basis of that report, and when I said that I would put in a minority report the gentleman to whom the member for Mount Gambier refers changed his mind, as did other members. I know exactly how the system works and what happened in that instance.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): If we want a snapshot, as one might say, of this the seventh and last budget of the Bannon Government, there is no better place to look for it than on page 152 and onwards of the Financial Statement 1989-90. That budget outcome in the financial statement gives us a very clear picture of the way in which the Government could work to release the State's indebtedness, to relieve State taxation and to ease the financial situation of so many people, but it is not doing so. The evidence to support this assertion is found in the detail of receipts received by the Government in the past financial year. Page 153 of the Financial Statement 1989-90 states that, whilst actual recurrent receipts for 1988-89 were \$7.5 million lower than the budget estimates, considerable offsetting amounts gave the Government what could only be described as a very easy ride.

The improvements in taxation revenue (which was up by \$63.3 million) and in interest earnings (which were up by \$12.9 million) enabled the contribution to the budget from SAFA to be reduced from \$374.1 million to \$294.1 million. Through no effort, the Government increased general purpose funds from the Commonwealth which exceeded budget by about \$18 million. It is true that these gains were almost completely offset by lower than anticipated levels of specific purpose funds from the Commonwealth, which were down by \$16.5 million and for which there were corresponding reductions of \$13.7 million in budget outlays under various programs, but every State Government in the Federation would want to receive general purpose grants from the Commonwealth rather than specific purpose grants. Those general purpose grants confer enormous economic and political flexibility so, in itself, that summary indicates that, through no effort on its part, the Government was in a much improved position.

Table 11.2 on page 153 indicates that actual taxation receipts increased over estimates by \$63.3 million. That is a very substantial sum comprising stamp duty receipts, which were \$44.3 million higher than budget; gambling revenues, which were \$10.8 million above budget (and I will have a word to say about that in a moment); payroll tax receipts, which exceeded budget by \$9.3 million; and interest earnings on investments, which were \$12.9 million higher than expected.

In relation to the gambling revenues, when people are desperate, as so many are these days, they will take any risk in order to improve their situation. The gambling revenues, which increased by \$10.8 million, are a significant commentary on the growing desperation of the South Australian community and people's belief that they must take risks in order to survive. Those risks are having a very detrimental effect upon many families.

The other side of those unexpected benefits gained by the Government can be seen when one looks at the result of the Government's investment in financial and commercial

undertakings. In that area the outcome is almost universally gloomy and negative. Because there is such an important philosophical difference between the Government and the Opposition on this aspect, it is worth looking at the Government's approach to investments in financial and commercial undertakings by Government. In its overview, the capital budget gives a clear indication of the Government's ideological direction. It states:

The Capital Works Program for 1989-90 has been framed in the context of a number of factors . . .

The first of these—obviously one which the Opposition would certainly support and endorse—is:

. . . the need to provide and maintain essential community services through the construction and timely renewal of basic infrastructure, such as schools, hospitals, roads and water supply.

The second factor—and one to which the Government gives enormous prominence in terms of priority—is:

. . . the desirability of Government business agencies proceeding with commercially justified investments.

I believe that there can scarcely ever be justification for a Government's adopting a function which is primarily, indeed, essentially, the function of private enterprise. I will not say that that can never be the case: for example, in the case of the Commonwealth Bank and the State Bank, there is a justification, based on sound economic and political grounds, as a matter of public policy, to proceed with a commercial function, or what is normally considered to be a commercial function. However, the range of investments that this Government has got itself into goes far and beyond that which can be in any way politically, philosophically or commercially justified.

The essential role of State Government in this country is to provide human services and education, health, transport and police services, and to keep roads in good order and condition. To go beyond that, as this Government has done, and to start investing in a vast range of commercial enterprises, many of which have failed lamentably, is to go way beyond the proper role of government.

The Government has claimed that these investments and commitments are required in order to stimulate and encourage the overall development of the State's resources. Sometimes it claims that support with public funds is needed if a business with profit and growth potential cannot raise adequate capital or loans elsewhere. The Government has sometimes claimed that it has been forced to become entrepreneurial in order to sustain the required volume of public revenue. Whenever these claims are made, one has only to look at the budget to find that the claims simply cannot be sustained. It is clear from the Premier's answers to a multitude of questions over the past seven years that the Government, having made these decisions to invest, is not prepared to acknowledge that it must carry the full responsibility for the results and the state of affairs of the business undertakings which are now in State ownership and which show enormous deficits and losses.

The Premier and his Ministers seem to assume that if anything goes wrong with any of these State undertakings it is not their fault. They seem to believe that the blame attaches to the directors whom they have appointed, or to the managers who have been appointed by the directors. But such an assumption has no validity, and it must be clearly understood by the Parliament and the people, and by the Premier and his Ministers, that when their Government-owned business undertakings go bad the responsibility cannot be shifted to others.

The responsibility for the losses of the State Clothing Corporation cannot be shifted to its managers: it must rest with the Government. The Timber Corporation losses cannot be shifted to the managers: the responsibility must

reside with the Minister. The losses of Marineland cannot be shifted to the managers: they must reside with the Minister. And so the list goes on. It is the Government which decided to make the original investment and it is the Government which must account fully for its stewardship in respect of that investment.

Last year the loss for the State Clothing Corporation was \$456 000; the Timber Corporation's accumulated losses were \$16.8 million last year; the SAMIC loss was \$5 million last year; and for the previous year the SGIC loss was \$5.6 million. The accumulated losses over three years of Enterprise Investment were \$2.7 million and the accumulated losses over three years of South Australian Venturers was \$1.5 million. The budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report enumerate the additional losses which have occurred this year. The Auditor-General makes the point that the operating losses of companies such as the State Clothing Corporation will need to be addressed. In his audit comment on page 402, the Auditor-General states:

Last year, it was pointed out that an improvement in production efficiency in firm sales contracts would seem to be essential if the corporation is to become profitable.

He adds:

Since 1984, the Government has contributed \$1 million by way of grants to the operations of the corporation.

That sort of activity simply cannot be sustained. We cannot afford to go on pouring millions of dollars into these commercial adventures by the State Government. The taxation revenue simply cannot be drained in the way it has been by this Government.

At page iii, the Auditor-General states:

I regret that once again I must draw attention to the quality of information provided to support proposals for the investment of funds in public sector programs or projects; or to support proposals for financial guarantees which have the potential to place taxpayers' funds at risk.

He identifies the Marineland redevelopment (which others of my colleagues will comment on in some depth), on which the State has already lost \$6 million, and the State Services Department proposal to increase the processing capacity of the State Computing Business Unit—formerly the Government Computing Centre—as the projects in question. Despite that criticism by the Auditor-General, we find in the capital works program that State Services has had the enormous amount of \$16.640 million injected into it in the 1989-90 budget for expenditure on capital works by the various business units—and I stress 'business units'—of that department.

These services are not providing essential services to the people of this State but are units engaged in business operations in direct competition with the private sector. For example, State Computing will invest \$1.8 million net in acquiring computing equipment to support its recently won major contract with the WorkCover Corporation. Why was that contract not let to a private company which did not require any capital injection whatsoever by the taxpayers of South Australia and which did not require the employment of public servants and the costly superannuation, holiday pay and other benefits associated with public sector employees? It is simply not feasible to defend that kind of investment when the funds are so desperately needed in other areas identified as the first priority in the capital works program—the provision in maintenance of essential community services through the construction and timely renewal of basic infrastructure. That \$1.8 million that has gone to State Computing could well have gone into an essential service.

Similarly, State Print will take advantage, according to the budget, of technological changes in the printing industry

by purchasing a number of items which will improve productivity and reduce lead times to customers. The items include a desktop publishing system (\$120 000), microfilm application equipment (\$150 000) and a combination folder (\$126 000). The items I have mentioned do not involve huge sums of money, but huge sums have been invested in the South Australian Timber Corporation, the Scrimber operation and a whole range of other business ventures which simply cannot be justified. In his general comments, the Auditor-General states that these business undertakings need to be very carefully managed indeed.

The Auditor-General also makes the point (page i) that to ignore the effect of work practices and working conditions as factors contributing to morale and leave patterns is to embark on poor management practices. He also says that productivity and service delivery to the public is of primary importance. The Leader of the Opposition made these very points in his statement when he said that a Liberal Government would concentrate on an increase in productivity on a 3 per cent saving on the present levels of recurrent spending, so that resources can be reordered to areas of greatest need and on an undertaking to establish productivity targets and other procedures to encourage efficiency. It seems that, wherever the Auditor-General has made a criticism, the Opposition has well and truly—and prior to this report—established goals and policy undertakings which address and, indeed, reinforce these criticisms of the Government.

It is clear, when one looks at the budget outcomes and at the proposals for the forthcoming year, that the Government is not only running out of steam but simply has not learnt the lessons of its own failures over the past seven years. In his speech, the Leader quoted from Moody's latest assessment of SAFA and that reinforces what I have been saying about the undesirability of Government investment in business ventures. In previous years, the Premier has praised Moody's as one of the two major American ratings agencies. Moody's states that: in using taxpayers' funds, central borrowing agencies, such as SAFA, are becoming entrepreneurs or commercial risk takers in enterprises of inherently uncertain and sometimes dubious value. The distinction between a Government and business becomes blurred.

That is precisely what has happened under this Government. It is one of the principle issues that a Liberal Government will redress, because our notion of the function of Government is that essentially it is a provider of services, not a competitor on the business scene. When the Liberal Party is in Government it will carry out that policy, the drain on taxpayers' funds will immediately be eased and these commercial ventures will cease.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): For the fourth year in a row I will make some comments about the presentation of the budget. I find it amazing that we cannot get a Government to present the figures in a way that everyone can understand. This is done deliberately, and I know that the previous Minister of Transport is having a bit of a giggle in the background. I will address two major issues tonight: transport and housing and construction.

The number of gaps is quite amazing and I will highlight them as I go through. The State Government ought to be able to put together the same documentation that it requires of every company in this State when putting out their annual reports. We should be requiring, as with any private company, notes to be attached to any changes. That is not

an unreasonable request and should be part of the budget program. I will start with the Housing and Construction portfolio and refer briefly to the receipts of a recurrent and capital nature and about expenditure for this portfolio. As I go through I will highlight the inconsistencies that appear and, hopefully, some time during the Estimates Committees or before the election, we may get fair dinkum answers from the Government.

In the area of income and recurrent receipts under the Housing and Construction portfolio, it is interesting to note that in charges to other State agencies we have this year a significant reduction of \$3.2 million compared with last year's figure. That is a reduction of some 56 per cent. It is staggering that suddenly in one year we can see charges to other State agencies suddenly dropping by \$3 million, with no explanation being given therefor. If we work our way through the documents we still find no explanation. That sort of thing needs to be highlighted.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It is a matter not of not understanding it but of not being able to find it. There is a significant difference, namely, that it is deliberately hidden away in other areas and not properly explained. When I get down to the Housing Trust, I will highlight one instance where its General Manager, after five days, still cannot explain something.

In terms of Commonwealth special grants, it is interesting that, in essential services relating to Aboriginal advancement, there is no allocation this year, yet last year some \$700 000 was spent on these essential services. I assume that this Government, in all its social justice packages, wants to ensure that at least some sort of explanation is given to why the Commonwealth has suddenly not made money available in that area. It is also interesting to note that the figure for the administration of Aboriginal lands is significantly down—by some \$300 000.

I refer also to the Commonwealth special purpose grants relating to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. We find in this special purpose grant a reduction from \$40.6 million last year to \$29.7 million this year—a decrease of \$10 million or 26 per cent; again with no explanation. The Minister of Housing and Construction has said in this place several times, 'We are negotiating a new housing agreement and it will be a very good agreement.' Yet, here these figures show clearly a significant reduction in the amount of money made available by the Commonwealth through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Mr Groom: What is your housing policy?

Mr INGERSON: You wait and see. In the overall total receipts as they relate to the Housing and Construction Department we find a reduction of \$14 million or 27 per cent over actual receipts for last year. That is a staggering amount, with no explanation given. We see all the goodies and nice things, but in the housing area the receipts from the Commonwealth and generally in the receipts from and explanations of other departments we have a significant reduction with no explanation being given.

In the capital receipts area we see where all the goodies have come from. We find that the Government, which at the last election said, 'We will not be part of any sale for profits or of any privatisation, or implement any policy such as that,' has gone in for commercialisation at the best possible level. If we look at the capital receipts in this budget we see a huge sale in primary and secondary education buildings, in TAFE properties, Government employee housing and properties of other Government bodies, some \$17.9 million worth of real estate having been sold in 1988-89,

bringing asset sales over the two years to a total of some \$36 million.

I support that concept, if that is surplus land and buildings, but it is interesting that almost four years ago we heard this damning of privatisation—now called commercialisation—as a policy. Now we have a very significant sale of assets basically to help balance the budget. It is a tragedy of this whole exercise that we see this money go into recurrent areas instead of going to pay off debt. That should not occur, and we should be paying off our debt at a much faster rate than is happening.

In the capital receipts area in the same portfolio of Housing and Construction we find, again, from Commonwealth special purpose grants that there is an increase in the Aboriginal advancement area of some \$3 million. While last year there was an increase in expenditure of \$3.8 million, this year we have a reduction of \$1.8 million. Again, in this area of social justice, we have a significant reduction from the Commonwealth in relation to the treatment of the Aboriginal community.

As far as the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is concerned, there was an estimate of \$49 million to come in over and above the actual of last year, but the fascinating thing is that we now find that from this Commonwealth special purpose grant we have an increase from \$25 million to \$75 million—a \$50 million increase in capital receipts—but no explanation is given. As I said earlier, we have a Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which is up in the air. No-one seems to know what has been finalised, and we have these very significant figures and variations appearing in the budget with no explanation.

Let us look at the expenditure in the Housing and Construction portfolio. First, we have rent rebates to the South Australian Housing Trust or the concessions under program 1. Under this item there was expenditure last year of \$29.9 million, in essence, balanced from a Commonwealth subsidy, but in 1989-90 there is no allocation at all. All of a sudden \$29.9 million which was used last year in rent rebates is not in any line at all this year. I know from leaks from the Commonwealth that there have been some changes in the agreement and that it is still being negotiated, but there is no explanation here.

No-one can match up that line. From my discussions with the Housing Trust, it has not been able to match it up with any line in this budget. That sort of thing is unbelievable. Looking further at the area of housing, one finds that at page 204 of the Estimates of Payments, under 'Department of Housing and Construction, Office of Housing', the South Australian Housing Trust program vote in 1988-89 was \$167 million with an actual payment of \$148 million—and then there is a blank.

It has a little 'c' under it. If one adds up the columns, one finds that about \$191 million relates to the new line. There does not seem to be any correlation between that and any other lines in the budget. I told the General Manager of the Housing Trust that it looked very much that on these budget figures about \$19 million had not been paid to the trust. He said that that could not be true because he had all the money from the past year.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I spoke with Mr Edwards. The reality is that he could not explain why \$19 million is short on that line. It is interesting that the trust's General Manager, when asked simply to explain that line (and there must be an explanation)—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: You can ask that question in the Estimates Committee.

Mr INGERSON: The reality is that the budget papers should be studied before the Estimates Committee. The papers ought to be clear and precise, and one ought to be able to sit down and ask the normal questions that one expects to raise in the Estimates Committee. I know that one must be brilliant, a soothsayer and lots of other things to work through these papers.

Let me now turn to the transport budget, which is also a fascinating document. It seems that the programs have again been changed around; the Government has been munching things up. Having discussed these matters with departmental officers, I am still unable to answer some of the questions that have been asked. It is fascinating to note actual payments last year of \$217 million and a projected reduction to \$169 million in 1989-90. When I read through the budget papers I noted a significant sum transferred into capital. One cannot argue against that because that should have always been in the capital area. However, I would like to make some other interesting comments.

I refer to the area of road safety. The Government has proudly gone out to the community claiming that it is very interested in road safety. It has promoted some good changes in road safety. There are many matters on which I have congratulated the Government and will continue to do so whenever it acts in the right way. It is interesting in examining the papers to find that the road safety budget has been reduced from \$6.8 million last year to \$5.81 million this year—a reduction of \$1.25 million or 17 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Members claimed that I have it wrong, because in this instance there are no gaps. I can only assume that the budget papers have been printed accurately with respect to the road safety program.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The person in the gallery will not use a camera.

Mr INGERSON: The road safety program has been reduced by \$1.2 million, according to these papers. Turning the page I note the program 'Administration and Enforcement of State Taxation Legislation', which I assume relates to the Motor Vehicle Registration Department and its costs. That has now been transferred to the Highways Department, but it is an interesting change with the transfer of control to the Director of Transport. Actual expenditure of \$13.8 million relates to a new figure of \$19.468 million, and that is certainly an interesting transfer.

We find a transfer to save money resulting in a significant increase of \$6 million. There is no change in the line—merely a significant difference between the actual expenditure last year and what is recommended to be spent this year. I do not oppose that. I am just asking how it can happen, because there ought to be an explanation.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: When we receive a reply I might be more critical, but at this stage I am merely seeking an explanation about information that should be in the budget papers. Let us turn over a few more pages and look at the State Transport Authority. There are some very interesting comments by the Auditor-General. On page 426 of his report, he says:

The cost per passenger journey of providing services over the last five years has increased by 23 per cent in real terms. The major contributing components of that increase were:

- depreciation, amortisation and interest—up 82 per cent in real terms;
- administration and general expenses—up 21 per cent in real terms; and
- patronage—down 17 per cent.

It is amazing. Over five years patronage, or the number of passenger journeys, has decreased from 64.7 million per year to 53.9 million this year. In language that we all under-

stand, there have been 209 000 fewer passenger journeys per week in the five years of the Bannon Government than there were five years ago. The measure of any service is the number of people who come through the door or use the service. The Auditor-General has pointed out that there were 209 000 fewer journeys per week than five years ago. At the same time, the Government contribution has increased from \$70 million to \$120 million—a Government contribution of \$2.3 million per week—to keep the State Transport Authority running.

It is also interesting to note the incidence of sick leave within the State Transport Authority. The Auditor-General says that based on the analysis at one depot, significantly higher levels of sick leave were taken on days when no penalty rates applied; a disproportionate amount of sick leave was taken adjacent to non-rostered days. Sick leave appears to be a major problem. Comparing the variations from 1987-88 to 1988-89, the average incidence of sick leave has increased from 7.7 days in 1987-88 to 8.5 days in 1988-89. That is another area of State private sector type operations where there appears to be a significant increase in the incidence of sick leave.

It is also interesting to note that the Auditor-General's Report agrees with the comments of Fielding—the report on which we spent \$100 000, yet the majority of which has not been implemented. The Bannon Labor Government has basically implemented only the soft options.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): That was a very disappointing contribution by the member for Bragg, but he was honest enough to confess that he had difficulty understanding the budgetary process and what is in the budget. The honourable member for Coles had the temerity to suggest that the Government had had an easy ride, but a proper analysis shows that it has not been an easy ride for the Government. The result of the budget is a direct consequence of capable economic management in South Australia. I know that is painful for members opposite to face.

The fact is that the budget is a blueprint for South Australia's economic development, and South Australians can feel justly confident that they are in good hands and that a Labor Government will guide them into the 1990s and beyond. It is no good members opposite having the audacity to lecture this Government on economic management, because they are the same people who were here between 1979 and 1982.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to that a little later, if I have time. It was members opposite who mismanaged South Australia from 1979 to 1982 and brought South Australia to its knees. Yet again I hear tonight the audacity of members opposite lecturing members on this side of the House about how to manage South Australia's economic affairs. The fact of the matter is that the budget is better than a balanced result and, indeed, as the Premier said in his ministerial statement of 8 August, there is a recurrent account surplus of \$83 million this year, which is \$27 million over the forecast. Of course, that figure should be combined with an accumulated surplus of \$4 million from the previous financial year. That speaks for itself.

There is no question that South Australia is very well economically managed, and that is as a consequence of a number of budget strategies that were put into operation to clear the \$63 million deficit that the Tonkin Government left us—and that \$63 million deficit is set out in the Financial Statements, and I will come to it later.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Hartley take his seat. Other members have been heard in relative silence and the member for Hartley will receive the same consideration. The member for Hartley.

Mr GROOM: The fact of the matter is that as a consequence of very capable economic management we were able to reduce our planned financing requirement of \$226 million to \$199 million. SAFA's contribution was reduced to \$294 million compared with \$310 million in 1987-88—despite the fact that over past years this State has gone through very troubled economic times. The Leader of the Opposition again made a very disappointing contribution, but that is not surprising. I think that that will be his last budget speech as Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The Leader of the Opposition will not make a budget speech from this side of the Chamber, make no mistake about that. I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition will sit on the other side of the House; he certainly will not be on this side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition attacked State instrumentalities, but did not tell the full story—and one would expect that. One has only to turn to the recurrent receipts to see the success of some State Government instrumentalities and to see that the Leader did not tell the full story.

Electricity Trust receipts for last year were \$35 million, and next year they are expected to be \$36 million. The State Bank—a great success story in South Australia—paid \$19.5 million, in lieu of income tax, into recurrent revenue, and it is estimated that it will be \$25 million next year. The State Government Insurance Commission—which I will deal with in detail later because the Leader of the Opposition sidestepped it—contributed \$1.1 million and it is estimated that next year it will be \$1.3 million.

The fact of the matter is that these State Government instrumentalities alone, for 1988-89, contributed \$55.65 million to State Government recurrent revenue, yet members opposite want to pretend that State Government instrumentalities are a failure. The member for Coles said that she wants them to get rid of them and the Government to provide services only. I can imagine what would happen if the State Bank or SGIC was privatised—and I will turn my attention to SGIC in a moment. The fact is that in 1989-90 the contribution from these State Government instrumentalities alone will rise to \$62.72 million—not a bad contribution to the State's recurrent account.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr GROOM: It is a tremendous contribution, as the member for Mitchell says. However, let us look at the SGIC as detailed in the Auditor-General's Report. It had a trading profit of \$45 million compared with \$23 million last year. It recorded a net fund surplus of \$74 million, which is an improvement of \$98 million on the previous year.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: They've gone very quiet.

Mr GROOM: I know that they have gone very quiet. I will make the point in a moment—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg has had his turn.

Mr GROOM: When one looks at the consolidated profit and loss statement for the SGIC, one finds that the \$108 million accumulated loss that had been carried in the system has been wiped out. We now have a \$3.3 million surplus at SGIC. That is an enormous success story for South Australia. It is no wonder that the private insurance industry now wants to return to the third party field. This is a very successfully-run State Government venture, so the private

insurers want to be part of it. They did not want any part of it when it made a loss, but now that it is making a profit and now that a State Government instrumentality is highly successful in South Australia they are all applying to return to the field.

Mr Ingerson: What about the STA's loss?

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member wants to debate the State Transport Authority, I will deal with that on another occasion. However, on this occasion I want to deal with some positives of my own, because the Leader of the Opposition did not tell the full story. The fact is that the SGIC, which is a State Government instrumentality, is highly successful in a very troubled market. There is no question that this Government took certain action in the third party field, but nevertheless it just shows how successful it was.

I now turn to the South Australian Government Financing Authority. This year the criticisms were not as thick as they were in other years when they were more direct and blatant. The fact is that SAFA, which in previous budget debates has been hotly criticised by members opposite, had an operating surplus of \$287 million compared with \$279 million as at 30 June 1988. In addition, it has general reserves and retained surpluses of \$216 million. In itself, that is an improvement over the amount of \$209 million as at 30 June 1988.

The funds employed by the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which was an innovation of this Government, amount to about \$15 billion. The funds employed during last year amounted to \$11.7 billion, with a total income of \$1.5 billion. That demonstrates the remarkable success story of the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

Because the member for Bragg made some criticisms on this matter, I will deal with the Housing Trust. He suggested that the sale of assets was being used to balance the budget and to prop up recurrent revenue. That is not the case. If one looks at the budget estimates in relation to the Housing Trust, one finds this result.

Mr Ingerson: What page is this?

Mr GROOM: It is page 18 of the Estimates of Receipts. I know that the honourable member has some difficulty with the budgetary process. If he goes up four lines from the bottom he will see 'Department of Housing and Construction, sale of land and buildings'. The estimated receipts for 1988-89 were \$4.2 million and the actual receipts were \$22 million. The estimated receipts for next year will decrease to \$14 million, but there has been a very positive story for the financial year 1988-89. I refer to the honourable member's suggestion that it is somehow being used to prop up recurrent expenditure. If members turn to the Auditor-General's Report, they will see that a very different story is told about the South Australian Housing Trust.

Mr Ingerson: You're talking about apples and bananas.

Mr GROOM: I am not talking about apples and bananas. The fact is that the Auditor-General said that the proceeds from the sale of these Housing Trust properties were going into reinvestment to enable new houses to be built. I urge the honourable member to study the Auditor-General's Report in this regard.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that the honourable member has trouble with the budgetary process, because he said so himself. However, I cannot be more to the point than that.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg will contain himself, or the Chair will take appropriate action.

Mr GROOM: The following statement is made at page 348 of the Auditor-General's Report:

Although the results for 1988-89 show a surplus of \$14.3 million, this occurred only because of the significant increase in the surplus on sale of assets mainly from the sale of rental houses to tenants, the proceeds of which are reinvested in replacement housing.

It will not balance the budget. The proceeds go into replacement housing. This is the positive way in which this Government manages the housing market. I urge members to look at the situation in relation to the casino, for instance. We had a mammoth debate—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that the member for Coles opposed the casino. I know that, had she been Minister of Tourism the ASER project would not be there. It is part of a perception—a positive image. However, the contribution from the casino operations was estimated, in 1988-89, at \$12.4 million. It actually came in at \$14.2 million. In 1989-90 it is estimated to be \$15.6 million. I can assure members that although that is from gambling revenue, there is no question that people want to gamble. If they cannot gamble in South Australia they will gamble outside this State, and they will play the poker machines more in other States. That money is now going to stay in South Australia. The sort of management that we could expect from members opposite would have resulted in a loss of the casino to South Australia, the loss of a massive employer and a massive service provider.

Turning to the financial statement, one sees a nice summary there of the Consolidated Account results on an annual and accumulated balance for the years since 30 June 1978. There it is, for all to see. One sees that the Tonkin Government inherited a nice surplus from the outgoing Corcoran Government of \$1.4 million.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that this is painful for the member for Coles and that she does not like hearing it.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: She was one of the guilty ones.

Mr GROOM: She was in the Cabinet from 1979 to 1982. She presided over the knocking off of \$100 million from capital works. This Government abolished using capital works money. It is certainly true that we were forced to use about \$28 million in 1983-84—in our first year—but we stopped using capital works money, and that was because we got on and balanced our budget. We put in place a budget strategy in relation to governing South Australia. It did not relate to the sort of short-term mischief that members opposite got up to, and the Opposition still includes some of the people who governed South Australia between 1979 and 1982. The figures speak for themselves. In their first year, 1980-81—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that the member for Bragg might have a bit of trouble finding this table: he told us tonight that he has trouble finding these things, that it is quite complex, that he looks for explanations and cannot find them and that he has to ring up people. Well, if the honourable member comes to me, I will assist him in this process. I draw his attention to table 8 on page 207 of the 1989-90 Financial Statement. In 1980-81 the previous Government went down the tube to the tune of \$6.5 million.

At the same time members opposite were taking capital works money. At the time they were budgeting for \$40 million-odd in capital works money, they were going down and were not balancing their books. They pretended this was a low tax State but anyone can do that. However, if we take capital works money and do not raise taxation to meet our obligations, we will go bankrupt. If an individual in private enterprise did that, he would go bankrupt. There

would be a collapse and one would have to mortgage one's house. Members opposite were trying to govern South Australia like that and yet tonight they had the audacity and temerity to tell members on this side and the Premier how to manage and govern South Australia. What a joke! What about their next budget? Did they do any better in 1981-82? The result was worse—by another \$6 million. It resulted in a budget blow out in 1982-83 to \$63 million.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that this is painful for members opposite. That previous Government's budgetary situation blew out to \$100 million in capital works money gone. It is no wonder we had a recession in South Australia. However, that is not the way this Government manages South Australia's finances. This Government was honest enough to tell the people in 1983 that we had to raise revenue through FID. We had the courage to do it. We all know the benefits that FID brought to South Australia. It is not criticised any more: people accept it as an equitable tax, and that is because it draws from the business community and does not draw from the underprivileged.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: When the previous Government went to the polls in October 1982 it told the people that it had a balanced budget. Members opposite introduced it as a balanced budget, knowing that it was \$63 million down the tube and that they had taken another \$40 million in capital works money. This State Government had to grapple with a traumatic situation. This budget is the result of a long-term strategy that was put in place in very difficult economic times. Of course South Australians are bearing the fruit of a very positive budget. Not only are we bearing the fruit but when we turn to page 42 of the paper Economic Conditions and the Budget 1989-90 outlining the economic conditions—and I am sorry that the member for Bragg is not here, although I understand he is coming back—we see reference to the \$570 million Myer-Remm development.

I will highlight just a couple of projects. They include expenditure of \$130 million by News Limited for a facility at Mile End; a \$110 million plant expansion for Adelaide Brighton Cement; \$100 million for the Jane Eliza River Estate project at Renmark, of which the member for Chaffey will be very proud; another \$100 million for the Adelaide Cosmopolitan Centre; three large city office projects in the area bounded by Grenfell, Chesser and Wyatt Streets; \$82 million for the Pier Hotel redevelopment; \$50 million for the Eden Hotel, a four-star hotel in Hindley Street—and this is very good for the entertainment industry and it shows the confidence; \$50 million for the Flinders Ranges Wilpena Pound resort, the same resort that involves the member for Coles lying in front of a bulldozer—and I am waiting for that occasion. I will be there watching.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr GROOM: There is also another \$40 million for the entertainment centre at Hindmarsh.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am sure that the member for Coles hopes someone will come up on a white horse, rescue her and carry her off into the political wilderness. The fact of the matter is that South Australia is a low tax State. Not only is it a low tax State and not only have we been governed well in economic terms but the Premier was able to announce only a few weeks ago that \$55 million would be going back to the people. It is no good pretending that South Australia is a high tax State: it is not. I just emphasise the information paper prepared by Treasury last year and circulated to the Public Accounts Committee and to all members.

For the benefit of the member for Bragg, who again is not here, I refer to page 48, where Treasury stated:

South Australia has the second lowest gross State product ratio of the States.

Further:

According to Grants Commission analysis, the State has an ability to increase the overall tax burden by about 4 per cent before the tax burden would reach the weighted average level applicable across the six States.

In other words, we have a further 4 per cent to catch up on the other States by way of the weighted average. And the Premier, in a remarkable fashion, has not only been able to maintain South Australia as a low tax State through some very serious economic years brought about as a consequence of the management between 1979 and 1982 but been able to give back \$55 million to South Australians. What happened to members opposite? All they could offer was some incentivisation slogan. That was to be the buzz word in 1987 according to this newspaper clipping—incentivisation, get with it! They got incentivated, all right. But what happened to it? It died out. It did not take. It was to be on everyone's lips. That was all they could offer South Australia. They are yesterday's people. They are the same people who were here between 1979 and 1982. They could only offer that and incentivisation, which phased out, and they have the temerity to tell us how to manage South Australia's finances.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It is a pleasure to follow a wide-awake member for Hartley this evening.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is a change.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes. Was it Grimm's fairytales or Groom's fairytales? I think the latter. The document before us is a discredited document. It was a fraudulent document even before the ink was dry. That is quite clearly identified if one analyses several of the statements made by the Premier in the first two or three pages.

At page 4 it is stated:

This is a strong and flexible budget which recognises the need to balance spending and revenue measures throughout the community.

When one analyses the documents that accompany this budget, one finds just how flexible some of those figures are. They are more than flexible—they are very rubbery. They set a perception in one direction but they are not there; they are mythical; they have disappeared in another direction where the delivery is supposed to occur. It is further stated that, 'All business will benefit from real reduction in charges and continuing tax relief.'

Go out and tell that to the people who own hotels in Port Adelaide and who are dealing with increased valuations and the effect they have had on council rates. When they receive their land tax notifications in November, they will go through the roof, as will small businessmen and others right across the State.

It is very clear from the Estimates of Receipts (page 10) that recurrent receipts from land tax in 1989-90 are expected to be \$70 million. Last year the Government had an income of \$63 739 605. We have been told that there will be a marked return of funds to the public by way of land tax, payroll tax and stamp duty on first homes benefit. However, we are still seeing an increase of almost \$6.5 million. If one goes back to most of the taxation income of this Government in recent years, one will find that it has increased markedly in total above the expected figure. In fact, recently, the Leader identified the fact that in about three years \$182 million had been collected in excess of expectation by way of direct Government charges.

I make the point that, whether it be the hotel business, the emporium business, or the local delicatessen on the corner, when small businesses receive their land tax notifications in the coming year, particularly when they are tenants of someone with aggregated property, there will be an ever-greater increase in the number of bankruptcies and people going out of business in this State. I hate to be so negative in making such a prediction, but one has only to go through the malls in a number of business sectors of South Australia or read the figures from the Bankruptcy Court for South Australia in comparison with other States to recognise that those increasing charges are adversely affecting people in business.

The member for Hartley made light of the FID tax, saying that it did not really worry people, but \$49 million in revenue is expected this year from fiddle tax. The same people who were concerned when this tax came in in 1983 are still concerned about it. I remember one old lady saying to me that the rats had been at her bank account. I asked her what she meant, and she said, 'Every time I go to my bank account there is a little bit more gone.' She was referring to the fiddle tax and the Federal tax. It is affecting everyone in the community.

On page 4, the budget speech states:

This budget places high priority on maintaining and improving basic services for families and others in our community, particularly in health and education.

What was demonstrated here this afternoon in relation to the benefits which have been passed on to the education sector? The Leader referred to the very large reduction in teacher numbers—almost 800—and the failure of the Government to meet its commitment in respect of increased numbers of ancillary staff that have been promised.

The member for Hartley is concerned about the lack of knowledge on this side of the House about the privatisation or capitalisation of so many assets, claiming that they were not going into recurrent spending, but his own Minister of Education indicated that a number of benefits that have been able to flow on to staff—if one can believe that staff have benefited (and the teaching profession would question that)—has been as a direct result of selling a number of Education Department properties where the money is available to turn back into education through staffing. The member for Hartley needs to look at the facts. He made great play about capitalised assets not going back into keeping the recurrent budget going, but that is not the song his own Ministry is singing.

Again, on page 4, the Premier states, 'This budget places a high priority on confronting crime'. If we look at the statement made by the Premier and the Minister for Emergency Services on 22 August when they put out into the public arena a package in respect of police, we find the words 'prevention is everybody's business'. Prevention is everybody's business, but this Government is not practising it. It has taken away from the police the opportunity to provide services at the coal face. Every time it undertakes a new initiative it takes people away from the coal face.

One recent evening in Gawler no patrol was available. One officer phoned in sick, so the patrol did not go out. That is the same situation as has applied in the Christies Beach area on a number of occasions. Even though 10 additional policemen have now been sent to Christies they are still having difficulties, with the demand for service in that area, in providing the service required. Large numbers of people through letters to the Editor, to the Opposition and, I am sure, to the Ministry, refer to the inability of the police, because of lack of resources, to provide the basic requirements for the detection and prevention of crime.

In the self same document that the Premier delivered on 22 August we read, 'If we are to turn the tide against crime all South Australians must play their part'. The way in which the South Australian public has embraced Neighbourhood Watch and, more recently, Country Watch is a clear indication that the public want to assist. It has been of tremendous advantage. The position needs support, but there is decreasing support. The insurance company behind the practice has provided additional funds and I laud it for having done so, but it does not get away from the fact that a tremendous waiting list exists out there of cases not being supported by this Government. They will not be supported by this Government in the document it put forward on 22 August.

As has been demonstrated, there are no funds in the budget for us now to fulfil the commitment to put those additional people in the front line. There is a delay in calling in the staff to prepare the probationary constables who will take up the positions and, when they are called in, they will not be replaced at the coal face. We finish up with a reduced number of people on the beat. Down the track there will be more, but not in the way the Government has sought to project for the people of South Australia.

That is why that document of 22 August was fraudulent, as are many of the claims in these budget documents. It is further stated:

South Australia is a safe place in which to live. We want this security maintained, through a two pronged attack on crime, with additional police resources and a wide ranging crime prevention strategy.

Anyone who has been doorknocking recently will know that people do not believe that they are safe in their homes. One has only to consider the number of people with security doors; the number of people who have turned to Rottweilers, Alsations, Dobermann Pinschers, Blue Heelers and various other dogs to assist them. They are there because people do not feel safe in their homes. Many of us will be aware of the very grave concern which besets a number of residents of Housing Trust homes who are being harassed in their enjoyment of the premises they have occupied for 30 or 40 years when suddenly people are imported from some other part of the metropolitan area and placed alongside them. These people have no regard whatsoever for their neighbours. They are active all night with noise, doing wheelies, wolf cries, urinating on gardens and defecating in people's back yards.

The Minister at the bench at present, when reading the *News Review* for Salisbury, Elizabeth and Gawler, will fully appreciate that hardly a week goes by without people writing a letter to the Editor telling of harassment and problems experienced in their own homes. The Minister will also recognise the sorts of problems besetting Salisbury North and the marauding groups that have been responsible for bashings and creating problems in that area. I support the people who come to me, as I am sure the Minister supports the people who come to him, in the belief that some action is necessary to overcome these difficulties. If we are reducing the number of people at the coal face, as we are doing under the present arrangements, we are not assisting these people and they do not feel safe in their homes. At page 5 of the budget speech it is stated:

We continue to place high priority on protection of the environment. This Government recognises the need to preserve what we have and, where possible, restore some of what we have lost.

This Government has no mortgage on the environment. I do not know of any person in this Parliament who does not acknowledge the importance of the environment and of the maintenance of a lifestyle unhindered by ozone layer wipe-out, by the greenhouse effect, by pollution of the marine

environment, etc. In recent months the current Minister for Environment and Planning has made a tremendous number of announcements of what this Government will do, but when one comes to analyse what it has done, we find that it has been sitting on reports for three or four years.

We have the lead situation at Cromer, and now there is another at Seaford. A number of work places in and around Adelaide are discharging effluent and industrial fluids of various types into creeks or sewers. A number of people at Thebarton or West Richmond would tell you of the problem they have with a new business which started up. After it had started it was found that it was given the opportunity to put all of its industrial effluent into the sewer. But each time it ran a large dose of effluent into the sewer it banked up the whole system, so that everyone in close proximity was having difficulty with the sewerage system—and it is still going on. Even though four Ministers have looked at the problem, six months later it is still there. That problem has been offset to a degree, because now the material does not go into the sewer—but, very quietly, it goes into a creek and the creek takes it into the system and eventually into the gulf.

The Minister at the bench will know some of the problems with the drain that goes alongside the railway line past Parafield and Salisbury and eventually into the water system that goes out past the ICI salt works. The Minister will be aware that effluent flows in that system, and he will know of the froth and bubble that people can see from the train. Even though the material released from industrial areas has been reported to the authorities, still no action has been taken, yet the Government claims it will do something about it.

Let us get away from this business that the Government has a total commitment to the environment when in fact it is not totally honouring that commitment. If one analyses the budget documents, one finds yet again a number of areas in the environment line where there is an actual reduction in the 1989-90 estimates over what was actually paid out in 1988-89. Only two areas are subject to a real increase, and even one of those is fudged. Further, I have found that we have lost a line which last year involved an expenditure of almost \$6 million in respect of native vegetation. This year, that line has no allocation, but about two or three lines further down \$9 million is allocated for the purchase of native vegetation areas. Much of that sum relates to native vegetation purchase for heritage undertakings that have been in the pipeline for over four years. People have been waiting for the payment to be made.

I now refer to the Auditor-General's Report received this afternoon and, in respect of native vegetation, I refer specifically to the number of applications made, supported and denied. Some have been sitting since May 1983 and still have not been dealt with. Almost 50 per cent of the applications lodged as far back as 1983 in respect of native vegetation still have not been processed through the system. Therefore, we have a \$9 million line for native vegetation purchases this year which offsets the almost \$6 million line appearing in a different section last year and which will overcome some of the longer term commitment of heritage vegetation agreements acknowledged by both sides of the Parliament. If the community wants a facility, it ought to pay for it.

A similar situation exists in respect of heritage buildings. It is all very well to say to a person, 'You will not do this or that with a heritage building because the community does not want you to, but you—the owner—will pay all the additional cost of maintaining that building.' Where the community identifies that it wants a landscape or building

maintained then, as is the case with native vegetation, there is an urgent need for the community to contribute. Time will not permit me to analyse completely the environmental lines. Suffice to say there is a marked reduction in the amount of money which is to be directed effectively to the environment this financial year, and that is in direct contrast to the Government's argument that it is giving great moment to environmental matters.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the time allowed me this evening I would like to speak about the TAFE college at Port Adelaide. The TAFE report of 1987, which is the latest that I could find, refers to the educational programs and the subprograms as follows:

Within all these subprograms a variety of courses is offered to meet the training needs of commerce and industry, and assist the individual student to obtain the knowledge and skills necessary to obtain rewarding employment or progress within a chosen career.

I am reading these to make a point in a minute. The Premier, in his budget speech, said that South Australia has the best TAFE facilities in the country to meet the new industry training challenges of the 1990s. The financial statement says that the data illustrate the department's principal roles in providing education and training programs to meet industry's needs. The TAFE handbook, referring to the Port Adelaide college, says that it provides maritime studies courses in line with the requirements of the Department of Marine and Harbors and that these courses lead to various certificates of competency of crews of commercial vessels operating under South Australian law.

Having laid that basis, I should like to express my concern over aspects of the marine training provided by the TAFE college at Port Adelaide. I shall refer to the standards that are required and what is or is not being provided by the TAFE colleges. When the uniform shipping law was pronounced in 1981 by the Federal Government, the State regulations were changed. As a result, all crews on commercial vessels, both fishing and trading, had to be certificated. At that time personnel and equipment were allocated to the Port Adelaide TAFE to conduct deck courses. They are courses for deck officers in navigation, seamanship and that type of expertise. It was also allocated engineering equipment and personnel, but they went to Regency College in the first instance. However, due to the lack of progress, the unit was transferred to Croydon Park in 1982.

The deck courses have proved to be extremely successful. Competently trained and able people have come out of them and the shipping industry as such is very pleased with the results there. However, on the engineering side, the marine engine driver classification has become very poor. The fishing industry has become agitated about the lack of progress in the engineering courses. I spoke today to someone who said that they are even prepared to contribute financially to get these courses under way.

On the other side of the coin, as far as certification is concerned, approximately 18 vessels operate under temporary dispensation from the Department of Marine and Harbors. The department made it clear that it would not renew these temporary licences after the 1988 fishing season. It believes that it has allowed adequate time for the engineers to be trained and certified in order to maintain their positions. The problem is that the facilities are not available for this training to be provided.

Surveys were carried out in 1980 to evaluate the need for these marine studies courses. From the surveys it was clear that Coxswain and Master V courses, including the lower deck (because a component includes engineering), could be carried out at country ports. The marine engine driver grade

1 and 2 and marine engineer class 3 courses would have to be conducted at a central location, which currently is at Croydon Park. To do this (and this shows the need for the course), nearly \$200 000 has been spent on equipment which is lying idle.

In 1980 the Department of Marine and Harbors bought a GM diesel, a Caterpillar diesel and a Perkins diesel. In 1982 it bought a hydrothermal cooling tower and a range of small pumps and pumping systems. It also bought a Gardener diesel, a Rolls-Royce diesel and various valves and pumps. In 1987 it was donated, from a vessel called the Saxon Progress which was refitted at Port Adelaide, equipment which included the main engine through to generating diesels and pump diesels. Altogether there was about \$200 000 worth of equipment.

Out of all that equipment only one piece—a Perkins T6 354M diesel engine—has been converted for use, and that is a small rig that covers the engineering component of the coxswain and Master Class V courses. It has been set up on a test rig which is currently in use, but which is not appropriate to train people to the top levels. This equipment services an industry that in 1987-88 had a fish catch worth \$107 million from five defined fisheries.

This industry's return to the State has increased way beyond the inflation rate. In this State about 500 vessels of various sizes above 7.5 metres are registered to work in the commercial fisheries. About half the vessels are in the range of 10 to 15 metres and 10 to 25 tons, and have 300 to 400 horsepower engines, while approximately one-quarter of those vessels are of greater dimensions.

There are uniform requirements for the qualifications of crew, according to the national agreement and the USL code, and this State is not meeting those requirements. I am sure that the former Minister is clear about what is required under the USL code for the manning of these ships. I wonder why he did not fix it when he was Minister.

Prominent people in the fishing industry are greatly disappointed about the degree of training that is being provided. There is a growing need for adequate training in the industry, which is becoming short of qualified engineers. As I said, nearly 500 vessels in this State alone are registered to fish, and we are running out of engineers to adequately service them. We need to do something about this. I suggest a course of action which I know has been suggested to the Government and which I understand is presently being looked at—that is, redeveloping the TAFE college at Port Adelaide.

The TAFE college at Port Adelaide covers five different areas: the Croydon Park branch, covering marine engineering training; the Grange branch; the adult matriculation campus at Ethelton; and an outreach program at the Largs Bay Police Academy. It is a very diverse college, as can be seen.

The proposal that has been put forward is to consolidate all the campuses at Port Adelaide, and I suggest that the way to do that is to extend to number 5 shed at Port Adelaide. Obviously, the police academy cannot be included, but I understand that the adult matriculation branch at Ethelton must be relocated very shortly, as it is in temporary classrooms that used to belong to the Ethelton Primary School. The Port Adelaide College of TAFE is in urgent need of redevelopment, and different options have been looked at over the years.

At one stage the college considered using the old Customs House, but that was not successful; it looked at using number 2 shed; and it looked at using number 2 shed in conjunction with the local council to extend the library facilities at the Port. However, all those proposals were rejected for

one reason or another. The existing TAFE facility at Port Adelaide has its main campus on McLaren Road; that is a three-storey building which has been upgraded and contains classrooms and an administrative area. The Ethelton branch is a series of temporary classrooms. The Grange campus has portable timber and metal classrooms, together with some old brick buildings, and is on a small site adjacent to the Grange Primary School.

Projections have been made about the need to provide training in TAFE colleges. Within the next decade the four inner metropolitan specialist colleges—Adelaide, Regency Park, Croydon Park and Marleston—will not be able to meet the expanded demand. Another theory has been presented that, instead of a J curve, there is an industrial U curve which goes from Outer Harbor through Port Adelaide and back to the Salisbury area. It has been suggested that the TAFE colleges will have to cater for the needs of this area. There is an increasing demand for a great variety of training in these colleges.

New technology is required by the submarine and frigate projects, so the training needs in the electorate of Semaphore are growing all the time. The tradespersons and technicians required for these projects must be trained. A training program for the submarine project is being conducted at the Panorama College, but it is believed that all maritime and allied studies should be consolidated at Port Adelaide. Another program has been presented by an arm of TAFE in relation to Jenkin's slipway at Port Adelaide. If we can expand the engineering and shipbuilding arms at Port Adelaide, it would consolidate everything in one area.

The Hon. G.F. Kenedy interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: These people need the skill. I know that the honourable member is not very interested in this, but it is important that these people gain those skills which will be required. TAFE is examining the establishment of a program to teach shipbuilding skills at Birkenhead which will link into this college at the Port at No. 5 wharf shed where engineering workshops, classrooms, etc. can be established. The needs at metropolitan level make it necessary to provide such facilities in order to teach technical studies and to consolidate them in an area where the program can be controlled.

It has also been proposed that these studies be extended into the fishing area so that the entire maritime industries of the State can be brought into a common campus. It will involve the total redevelopment of the college as such. I have said before, and I will say again, that the fishing industry is very concerned about the removal of these temporary permits for marine engine drivers, who are necessary for the industry and whose skills are not simple automotive skills; rather, the skills involve aspects of ship safety, pumping tanks, the stability of ships, hydraulics and electrical power. It requires a high degree of skill which must be taught somewhere.

It is disgusting that this State has \$200 000 worth of equipment lying idle. Croydon Park has only one test rig to teach people at three levels of competency, but that single small rig is inadequate. I am sure that the industry will be concerned when it cannot obtain trained people. In the end it will not be able to operate its ships. That will mean that in this State \$750 million worth of fish will not be caught because these people cannot be trained. The ongoing problem here involves not only the ability of people to provide the service but also the economy of the State. We must look very seriously at training facilities for people who wish to provide skills to this State, to improve their own ability to provide for themselves and to be employed successfully.

We must look after the fishing and small boat industry in this State.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): When I first looked at the budget documents and at the allocation of funds, I thought, 'Gosh, South Australia is doing pretty well.' In looking at page 4 of the Auditor-General's Report, one could be forgiven for thinking that way. The Auditor-General analyses the public accounts and advises us that there was a surplus on the recurrent account of \$83.4 million. It is shown that, using the capital payments (the receipts and payments), capital expenditure was in deficit by \$282.3 million. We then, of course, borrowed some money from SAFA, and that helped to balance the books. It therefore seems to me that the whole thing is a fraud.

According to the Auditor-General, taxation receipts were up \$63.3 million, mainly as a result of stamp duty receipts—amounting to something like \$44.3 million. There was a saving of \$65.8 million on the budget allowance for salary and wage increases and other contingencies. There was also a provision of \$20 million for expected future payments in relation to superannuation special commutation schemes. Of course, that is where the State has a need to provide a huge sum of money—somewhere in the vicinity of \$2 billion.

In looking at the figures for the last financial year and the current financial year, we see that for the first time the budget will break the \$5 billion mark. Receipts are estimated at \$4 502 million; the capital receipts will be \$360 million-odd; and there is a proposal to borrow about \$154 million from SAFA. That makes a total of \$5 016 million on the receipts side. On the payments side there will be some \$4 407 million from the recurrent account, and with capital expenditure of about \$609 million that brings the figure out to \$5 016 million—and a balanced budget. It looks all very nice. This way of doing it and presenting those sorts of figures creates the perception that South Australia is going very well. However, we all know that if a line in the budget is created there is no guarantee that that budget has to be adhered to.

That is where the weakness is in our whole financial system. First of all, it is now 5 September and we are considering the State budget. In the next few weeks we will go through the budget estimates procedure and somewhere in late October or early November the budget will pass the Parliament and then the Public Service can go on its merry way in spending the money allocated. This is the first weakness. I believe that the State budget should be brought down in the first month of the calendar year so that it can be dealt with and examined by Parliament. There should be an opportunity provided then, as there is now through the budget estimates procedures, to scrutinise the public servants in relation to justifying the amounts of money sought.

The budget estimates system must be improved. The current system is not good enough. It is being abused in all directions by the Government. The Opposition and the taxpayers of South Australia are not being given a fair go in relation to analysing the budget properly or thoroughly. I think that in relation to every program the public servants should have to come along and present their case; that should then be considered by Parliament and the matter dealt with. We only have to take five or 10 minutes per program.

The current system that has been adopted is not good enough. There is far too much politics being played. More importantly, the budget should be passed through the Parliament before 30 June so that, come 1 July—the beginning

of the new financial year—everything is in place, with the Public Service, Ministers and Government departments knowing that, whatever program is involved, the various expenditures can be arranged and funds raised to meet those programs. This would avoid a mad rush halfway through the financial year to try to acquire what is sought or to try to put in place programs which have been urgently needed but which have been held up for so long.

So, it is an incompetent and expensive system, and it is high time that Governments and political Parties undertook a total review of the parliamentary budget process. We have a lot to learn from other countries which deal with larger budgets. We could use to full advantage the luxury of a small budget and make it far more efficient. I am not convinced that the system is efficient, and that is highlighted in the Auditor-General's comments on page iii, in relation to audit issues. It is fortunate that the Minister at the bench tonight is the Minister concerned. The Auditor-General states:

I regret that once again I must draw attention to the quality of information provided to support proposals for the investment of funds in public sector programs or projects; or to support proposals for financial guarantees which have the potential to place taxpayers' funds at risk. The projects are:

Marineland redevelopment—a proposal to guarantee a bank loan to the developers of a new Marineland complex was based on the financial projections of the developer; supported before the Parliamentary Industries Development Committee, by a submission from the Department of State Development and Technology which seemed to be directed more towards justifying the projections, rather than critically examining their validity.

These matters are covered in more detail further in the report. The Auditor-General continues:

Nevertheless, I again stress, as I did two years ago, that a complete and objective assessment of the financial implications of a program or a project (or a guarantee application) needs to be the base line to which other factors are applied and a final decision reached. That approach helps to ensure that maximum value is obtained from the investment of taxpayers' funds or that those funds are not placed unduly at risk.

Emphasis given to that principle recognises the fact that Governments are the custodians of significant taxpayers' funds and they are constantly making decisions on programs and projects which directly or indirectly (through guarantees) commit those funds. In the light of that responsibility, it is essential that:

- the decision is based on quality information;
- the decision makers (Cabinet, Ministers, chief executive officers and their managers) ensure that an independent and objective assessment of the financial factors relevant to a program or project and the financial implications flowing from that assessment are clearly stated and become the base line against which other factors (non-financial) are applied in the decision making process;
- parliamentary standing committees (such as the Industries Development Committee) responsible for recommending the commitment of taxpayers' funds directly (or indirectly through guarantee arrangements) ensure that they have access to similar independent objective assessments.

There is an urgent need to address this management responsibility if further risks to taxpayers' funds are to be avoided.

That is a terrible indictment not only on the Department of State Development and Technology, the Minister, the Cabinet and the Treasury of this State but also on the Industries Development Committee. One wonders what advice was given to that committee and how it attacked this project from the original application. There is no doubt in my mind that what has transpired with the Marineland redevelopment, the West Beach Trust, the Department of State Development and Technology and the Government is one huge conspiracy to defraud the people who were enticed to come to South Australia and to redevelop Marineland. Suddenly the whole thing was closed down around them.

The Government, through the Industries Development Committee, rightly or wrongly (irrespective of what the Auditor-General has to say in hindsight), encouraged the

developers, Tribond Development Pty Ltd, through the guarantee of \$9 million to redevelop Marineland. That company was induced by the West Beach Trust to undertake that development.

However, the unions and a few greenies decided 'no way'. They decided that they would stop this project, that they would sabotage it at all costs. That has cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$6 million so far and it will probably cost another \$500 000 or even \$1 million. Until we get answers to the questions on notice and until the Minister reveals the full details, no-one will know whether the liquidator (John Heard) will get one or two Mercedes-Benz out of it. But he is doing very well. He is better paid than any solicitor I know. The whole thing could have been avoided. There is always the possibility of negotiating with building unions. The members of those unions are reasonable, as long as they are well paid and have good working conditions. Had the situation been explained to them and had their objections been noted, I am quite sure there would have been a way out of this whole sad, sorry saga.

One of the six dolphins at Marineland is pregnant. Under any animal liberation requirements or standards of treatment of animals, there is no way that that dolphin can be moved. Further, under the regulations governing the treatment of animals, such as dolphins, in captivity, one does not leave an animal on its own: there must be three. Therefore, if the Government thinks it is going to move these dolphins from Marineland, it will experience considerable problems and additional expense.

The Government has taken too long to make the decisions, if any decisions were to be made other than the redevelopment of Marineland or, as is now proposed, the building of a sanctuary incorporating a huge State aquarium, a research facility and a hospital facility to rehabilitate stranded animals which can be immediately sent back to the sea rather than held. Without that facility what will happen to the stranded animals? It is all very well reserving millions of hectares of land so that we can watch the whales at play during their visits to our coastline, and it is all very well having beautiful marine parks but, periodically, these animals are stranded and may need a little bit of assistance. We need research and hospital facilities and we need to establish more than one base along our huge coastline. West Beach could be the starting point in that process, and we find that the budget document Capital Works Program 1989-90 (page 34) states:

	Estimated total cost	Proposed expenditure 1989-90
	\$'000	\$'000

West Beach marine laboratory—seawater intake. Commencement February 1990; completion due September 1990. In order to facilitate continuation of research into marine life at West Beach, it is planned to construct a new seawater intake including a pipe extending up to 1.5 kilometres offshore. In addition to these projects, the 1989-90 program also includes provision for work to proceed on planning for stage 2 of the marine laboratory at West Beach.

3 500	2 000
-------	-------

That will involve about \$5.5 million. Therefore, the Government will go ahead with the further upgrading and development of the fisheries research station at West Beach. There is no way that the developer of the (now-called) West Beach hotel and conference centre can object to having any research facility alongside his hotel. Apparently, that was one of the reasons for his opposition to the redevelopment of Marineland. That is absolute nonsense. It is alleged—and I have no reason to doubt—that the Department of State Development and Technology, fearing further diffi-

culties from Wild Watch—a handful of young people—and building unions induced, enticed, instructed or told Zhen Yun, the proposed developer of the hotel complex—and, one now reads, of all sorts of other complexes within the area—not to proceed with Marineland as we know it.

It has even been reported that they were not interested in Marineland. That is not true. An international standard or even three or four star hotel at West Beach alongside the Marineland development—one of the most unlikely spots in the metropolitan area—will have to stand on its own, as there is no way that people will go down there and stay. People will have to come from overseas, so some other tourist attraction—something completely unusual—is needed. We have the opportunity to build one of three in the world—a beautiful State aquarium and research facility, attached to our universities and used as part of the education facilities in veterinary and marine science and in the further study of Australian sea lions. We have only 3 000 left in South Australia—they are an endangered species.

Presently homes have not been found for the sea lions at West Beach, despite utterances made by various Government Ministers. We believe that one will go to the zoo and we doubt whether any others or very few will go interstate. Will the Government shoot them and, if so, who will do it—the RSPCA, the Department of Fisheries or the National Parks and Wildlife Service? I do not believe that anybody else would want to put down those animals. It will be an absolute tragedy, after all the work and effort that has gone into saving many of the stranded animals that have been kept at West Beach for so long, to turn around and shoot them because an overseas developer now wants to put up a hotel, having been induced by one of the most ill-informed departments in this Government. How anybody could ever contemplate any development in that general area, without first consulting the Federal Airports Corporation, the civil aviation authorities or the local council (even though it is on West Beach Trust land, a separate trust but still within the West Torrens council), I do not know.

Only as late as last week a soil test was conducted. Surprise, surprise—it did not go down very far before striking water. The land is not solid. How can the Government build a six-storey 300 bedroom hotel on a sand dune? Where is the Conservation Foundation? I rang the foundation and asked what it is doing about it and how it could allow an international standard hotel to be built on the back of the last sand dune in the metropolitan area? We have lost over 100 metres of sand dune, but the Government stands by and lets it disappear. How can the Government say that it is keen to protect the environment when it allows the last sand dune in the metropolitan area—the last chance for children to see it within walking distance—disappear into the sea. It will not build up again in our lifetime or in the lifetime of my grandchildren.

As the member for Morphett reminds me, we have a proposal from the Premier's Department to cut a canal through near the sewage treatment works so that we will have a boat marina right under the flight path of the main runway of the Adelaide Airport. It is ludicrous! It would be a great development, but we cannot put it there—it is physically impossible. The management of the West Beach Trust has made a mess of the development of the North Patawalonga golf course. The Minister of State Development and Technology tells us that it will cost \$700 000 and is on budget, yet every staff member of the West Beach Trust tells me that the figure is about \$1 million and is over budget because there were no specific plans.

This is an illustration of the sort of attitude displayed by the Government. No wonder we get an editorial such as

that in the *Advertiser* today, headed 'Government on the spot', which states:

The State Government will need more than hand-holding with dolphin-loving conservationists and unionist wreckers today when Parliament resumes. *The Advertiser* has uncovered disturbing questions about the Government's role in Marineland . . . We smell lies.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Tonight in this budget debate I wish to deal with three matters: first, the South Australian economy at large; secondly, the public works budget presented as part of this total budget package; and, thirdly, some of the specific areas of social expenditure, in particular the areas of expenditure on the aged and on crime prevention. Let me say at the outset that the principal word I have heard during the speeches of members of the Opposition was 'fraudulent'—all of the documents presented as part of the budget are fraudulent.

It is a word that every single contributor from the Opposition side has used to describe the budget papers. They have used other words as well, such as 'untruthful' and 'misleading' and, most interestingly, they have said that the budget papers are very hard to follow. I find that all of those descriptions used by the Opposition about the budget are nothing more than empty rhetoric.

Let me deal with the latter first. I find it rather extraordinary that a number of Opposition members have said that there is very little information, or that the information is difficult to find or badly presented. The budget papers presented by the Premier when he introduced the budget to this Parliament late in August included nine documents. There was the budget speech itself and three financial papers: the Financial Statement for 1989-90, the Estimates of Receipts for 1989-90 and the Estimates of Payments for 1989-90. They are quite specific, and detailed in the information they are designed to provide, setting out very clearly where the money is coming from, how it has been raised and how it will be spent.

In most other Parliaments of the Commonwealth that is about all you would get from the Government. Even that information would be limited indeed, but in respect of the South Australian budget there are five more financial papers: the Program Estimates, a paper dealing with the economic conditions and the general backdrop to the formulation of the budget in South Australia, showing how the South Australian economy has to fit in with the constraints operating at a national level; a comprehensive breakdown of the capital works program for the forthcoming year; a document dealing with the social justice strategy, stating how the social objectives of the Government are being effected by this financial document; and, finally, a paper outlining the way in which programs for women are presented and dealt with by the South Australian Government.

But that is not all—there were other documents. The Auditor-General's Report was tabled today, and there is the annual report of SAFA. That is an extraordinarily wide range of economic documents to be presented to any Parliament by way of backdrop and by way of explanation to the expenditure and revenue decisions being made by this Government, and the objectives it wishes to fulfil as part of its responsibility to the community for the forthcoming year. The objectives of the budget were quite clearly set out, both in the budget speech of the Premier and in the other documents presented here today.

The budget has five main objectives: first, to maintain and improve basic services in the areas of health, education and public transport; secondly, to provide additional resources in the high priority areas of economic development, employment and training, tourism, social justice, crime

prevention, the environment and housing; thirdly, to maintain capital spending for essential infrastructure; fourthly, to achieve real reductions in taxes and charges; and, fifthly, to maintain the State's overall sound financial position.

The most recent report of the State Bank for the June quarter in 1989 was based on information up to and including 3 August 1989. Reporting on economic activity, in that document the State Bank had this to say:

The South Australian economy continued to expand through the March and June quarters with increased housing construction and manufacturing activity. Retail turnover growth on a year to year basis continued to rise, as did new motor vehicle registrations. Non dwelling construction activity remains strong . . . employment growth slowed but sustained high vacancies and overtime suggest further gains through the September quarter.

That is the quarter that we are now in—continued strong, high growth. The report continues:

Strong competition in the local housing finance market has kept new home loan interest rates the lowest in Australia, supporting the local . . . industry.

That is an overall assessment made by the State Bank as to the relative strength of our economy. It is that relative strength which underpins this economy and which belies the statements made by a number of members opposite that there has been economic mismanagement, manipulation and fraud by this Government in the way that it has framed the budget, the objectives that it has set, the results it wishes to achieve for the forthcoming year and what it has been doing over the previous five or six budgets.

The material provided in the overview documents indicate that there has been a continuing strong rise in all of those areas over the past five years, and time does not permit me to go into each of those areas. Needless to say, the result has shown two principal things. First, a budget surplus for the second year in a row, which is a significant and substantial achievement for any Government. To say that that is the result of fraudulent mismanagement of the State's finances is an absolute nonsense. The second and most important thing about the State's economic condition is the continuing high levels of investment in the manufacturing and non-retail sectors of our economy. Those details are also set out in documents provided to the Parliament.

I will now deal with the public works document. The capital works program for 1989 takes a number of factors into account. The first is obviously the need to provide and maintain essential community services through the construction and renewal of basic infrastructure. There are a number of other considerations also in terms of ensuring that the contribution that the Government makes to the overall State economy will not either put too many projects on stream too early or create the effect of a slump by not ensuring that there is a continuing range of projects coming on line. In respect of the district of Adelaide, I am pleased to note that this year more than \$50 million will be spent in non-housing commercial activity in the City of Adelaide. This is only the contribution to be made this year.

The projects themselves will amount to more than \$150 million when completed. The biggest winners both in the inner city area and the State as a whole are the hospitals. The Royal Adelaide Hospital gets \$16 million and the Children's Hospital gets over \$2 million, although much more is allocated next year. That is in addition to the \$11.6 million already allocated to public hospitals by the Premier and the Minister of Health last month. Other big winners in the inner city area include the State Library, which gets \$1.5 million; the Police Communications Centre, which gets over \$4 million; the completion of the nurses school on Frome Road as part of the health development program, which project gets \$2.5 million; and the University of Adelaide, which gets \$3.5 million.

The courts get \$4.5 million, and the Festival Centre Plaza will be completed with an expenditure this year of \$4 million. The biggest single item of capital works in the city is the convention centre and exhibition hall, which this year will receive over \$8 million. Nearly all that expenditure is for essential community services and infrastructure. The Government has been conscious to limit its borrowing requirements as well as to ensure that the people of Adelaide benefit both socially and commercially from Government investments. The overall capital works program, as well as the capital works program in the electorate of Adelaide, is balanced and responsible.

I turn quickly to two areas of social expenditure which have been completely overlooked or, alternatively, described as fraudulent or con tricks by Opposition members who have contributed to the debate. I reject both those ways of approaching the budget.

The contribution specifically made in the area of the aged is dramatic, significant and necessary, and there is no doubt that it is welcomed by the people for whom it is designed. It is based on a research program undertaken by members on this side of the Parliament and by research units within the Government. It will provide much needed services for the elderly. It will provide extended transport concessions, housing opportunities and health and domiciliary care services for elderly people—the priorities that they have given the Government and said are essential to their well-being in this community. It is appalling that Opposition members should say it is a con trick and fraudulent for the Government to package this set of programs which are designed to help the elderly so that they can see at a glance what the Government is providing for them in this comprehensive program.

The other area on which I should like to comment, which has also been described by the Opposition as a con trick, is the crime prevention program. The Opposition has described the expenditure going to the police and the increase in the number of police as fraudulent. It is nothing of the sort. They are real increases in dollars, manpower and police personnel. They will translate into real increases in local community centres and local crime prevention programs, and they will extend the 24-hour service offered by more and more police stations. These programs will benefit local communities in their local areas. They were not there before; they are there now.

Those are the contributions that I wish to make to this budget. I believe that it is a comprehensive and socially responsible budget and I am proud to be associated with it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In the time available to me, I urge the Government to show more interest in and support for the Northern Territory Government's campaign to establish a rail link between Alice Springs and the port of Darwin. A project such as this will be of significant advantage to South Australia. The Northern Territory Government is attempting to achieve a totally integrated transport system utilising both public and private capital. It believes that by providing this total transport system the economic dynamism of the north will be triggered. Studies have shown

that local freight alone will not produce enough revenue to make the railway line viable as an isolated transport system. However, the transport plan for a total transport system is being shown as a very viable proposition with enormous potential for South Australia.

It should be borne in mind that much public discussion over recent years has shown that the line is non-viable. However, recent studies that have been developed through the Northern Territory Government have started to allay those fears. The transport entities needed to make up an effective total transport system are shipowners (to provide shipping services to all required trading ports), the Darwin Port Authority (to provide port facilities and operations), terminal operators and stevedores (to provide cargo handling facilities and operations at the port and elsewhere), Australian National (to provide connecting rail services), freight forwarders (to provide services to exporters and importers), and a communications bureau (to provide operating information to all operators).

Interfacing these operators with Australian National's successful rail link between Adelaide and Alice Springs will facilitate the development of a competitive commercial transport service between Australia and South-East Asia. By doing so we will be linking Australia, through the Port of Darwin, to Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Korea, Singapore and China and extending further afield to North America and the rest of the world. It will enable Adelaide or its regional centres such as Port Pirie—if we are serious about the concept of regionalisation—to become the distribution hub by tapping into a land bridge operation between the Port of Darwin involving the port authority, terminal operators, shipping operators, shipowners, exporters, importers, transport companies, mining companies and various Government bodies.

The economic stimulus to Australia's north is obvious. The opportunity of providing private enterprise to forge a commercial alliance will be challenging and should be endorsed by every member in this Chamber. The Premier of South Australia has a real opportunity on this occasion, particularly with his very special link with the Federal Government, as President of the ALP, to support the Northern Territory Government and all its authorities in getting this project off the ground. I understand that the negotiations have reached a fairly delicate stage but that they still require a commitment by the Federal Government to support the Northern Territory Government and the private sector and to say that the project is a goer.

In a few minutes I will refer to the Alice Springs to Darwin Railway Feasibility Study which gives well qualified support to the project and should allay the fears of those who, in the past, have been told that it is non-viable. That report demonstrates that it would only be non-viable if one is looking at it in terms of the intra-traffic that would go up and down the line; but it becomes a very viable project if one looks at the new concept of a new Port of Darwin linking into South-East Asia and into the central corridor down to Tennant Creek, Alice Springs and through to Adelaide.

What we are talking about is a complete shift in emphasis in transport infrastructure in the form of a rail link into the national system in Australia and an integrated port system that will be necessary to support the emerging economic value of the Far North. I do not think that we, in the south, should turn a blind eye to the potential for economic development in the north.

The shift of Australia's oil and gas industry from Bass Strait to the Timor Sea and the Bonaparte Gulf will shift Australia's infrastructure needs. Government support for an

integrated development would recognise a northern Australian gateway, a supply base for oil and gas development and a defence commitment recognising our defence in depth policy, and would provide closer economic relations opportunities, particularly with Indonesia and the ASEAN countries.

The challenge to Australia is to trigger development by bringing together a coordinated commitment from private sector industry and Government. This requires a commitment by the Federal Government, supported by the State Governments of South Australia and the Northern Territory, to provide the port with facilities, an oil and gas industry commitment to the Darwin supply base, a defence commitment, a shipping commitment to service Darwin, a rail commitment to service the port, and a freight forwarder commitment to test and develop the system. It is a challenge to the private sector as much as it is to Government.

The railway from Alice Springs to Darwin is the vital link to make this whole new transport system complete. It will be a new intermodal system for container and piggyback traffic based on the best railway practices which will reduce costs and improve transit times. The proposed system includes new wagons capable of double stacking containers and more effectively carrying trailers; weight efficient high speed 5-pack railcars; new container and trailer handling equipment, for example, straddle cranes and piggybackers; new intermodal yards; and new operating practices. These trains will run directly between Darwin, through to South Australia, and then will tranship out from South Australia to Western Australia and Victoria. The potential benefits from South Australia's being linked into that network are enormous.

The study to which I referred a few minutes ago, the Alice Springs to Darwin Railway Study dated September 1986 (and if members have not read this study, I am happy to loan it to them), at paragraph 1.26 on page 7, states:

The projections indicate that:

- the railway will cover its operating and equipment costs from commencement of operations; but these railway operating surpluses will not make much impression on recouping construction costs in the first 12 years of operation. However, the railway will be generating a significant and rapidly rising operating surplus by 2002, to the extent that by 2008 the project will turn cash-positive.

If I could briefly return to this whole concept of a land-bridge, which appears at page 60 of the study, it states:

A consultant's report has been prepared on the marketability of the rail link as a 'landbridge' between the Port of Darwin and the centres of population and industry in southern and eastern Australia.

The landbridge concept encompasses a fast, frequent, low-cost shipping service between Darwin and Singapore—and possibly other SE Asian Ports—and connection in Singapore with round-the-world container vessels operating at very low unit cost. Because of the very high cost of calling at Australia's principal ports . . . it was expected that the combined cost of line-haul shipping to Singapore, transshipment, feeding to Darwin, discharge, transfer onto rail and line-haul by rail to Adelaide/Melbourne/Sydney could prove cheaper . . . The consultant has concluded, however, that although about 10 million tonnes of containerised cargo flows in and out of Australia annually . . .

I wanted to highlight the fact that 10 million tonnes of containerised cargo flows into Australia annually. If some of that cargo could be brought into the Port of Darwin and transhipped down to Alice Springs and then down to Adelaide on the efficient system, it behoves us to look at the potential for a reasonable development in the Iron Triangle or in Adelaide.

I am advised that such a proposal requires the support of the Commonwealth Government. I would be pleased if this Government, particularly the Premier, on behalf of South Australia and in support of the Northern Territory

Government, took up the matter with the Prime Minister so that this project could be undertaken.

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

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): The University of the Third Age is a relatively new institution or organisation in our community. However, it is a very vibrant community organisation throughout the metropolitan area, and its success in the metropolitan area is now mirrored in a number of country centres where people interested in this University of the Third Age concept are starting to establish programs and offer courses on a wide variety of topics.

It is probable that very few people have heard of U3A—which is the shortened version of the name of this movement. I suppose it could best be described as a self-help adult education movement for people in retirement or approaching retirement—namely, the third age, which is where the terminology for U3A comes from. The third age follows, if you like, the first age of childhood and adolescence and the second age of adulthood and vocational employment. The third age, then, becomes the age of retirement, moving out of the paid employment arena and perhaps then having more opportunities or extended opportunities to explore areas of social, intellectual and historical interests which people may not have had the opportunity to do earlier.

There are no entry requirements for people wishing to enter the University of the Third Age, and no awards are given for participation in the learning groups. It is very much an organisation or a movement that is controlled by its members—controlled in relation to access, priorities and methods that the participants in a program choose when exploring a certain topic. Most of the leaders and tutors in U3A give their services free, and in most cases meeting rooms are provided free of charge. This involves a range of organisations.

For instance, one group which is learning French meets at the Box Factory Community Centre on Monday mornings. I am aware of this activity because I run an electoral consultancy there on the first Monday of every month at which time I have to share the space with those adults from the inner city area who are learning French as part of the U3A program. Similarly, most of the people who give organisational and administrative support to the program provide it free. Probably the only cost associated with the program is the annual subscription of \$20 in the Adelaide metropolitan area and \$15 for other branches.

The University of the Third Age started its programs in South Australia in 1986. The programs started in the Adelaide and inner suburban areas. It has since moved outwards and is now operating independently at Tea Tree Gully, Noarlunga and Port Adelaide and, also, programs have started recently on the south coast at Victor Harbor, Port Elliot and Goolwa. I understand that other programs have been established in the Gawler and Barossa areas.

The range of programs offered by U3A is quite extensive. Its 1989 program includes a variety of courses. There is a course dealing with the geology of the Sturt Gorge, Fleurieu Peninsula and Hallett Cove. That may well be one of the programs that my colleague the member for Bright has been involved in as a teacher at one stage. He lives in that area and has a scientific interest in it and a commitment to it.

There are a number of other programs, and I will give some brief examples of those. One deals with alternative medicine; another deals with the development of the orchestra; and another deals with contemporary literature with an emphasis on Britain. It is an extensive and wide-ranging

series of programs which can be undertaken in a variety of ways. There are excursions, music programs with a very heavy listening content, play readings, language lessons in respect of the French group at the Box Factory Community Centre and also creative writing groups.

The last conference of the U3A was held in October last year. A person who is currently undertaking a Master of Education degree at the University of Adelaide distributed a questionnaire to the hundred or so people present at that seminar. He did this as a preliminary to writing an essay examining the concept of the University of the Third Age and its participants. I wish to now summarise from that survey and provide some interesting information about the participants. In the total group, 63 people were aged between 60 and 80 years; 62 were women and 17 were men. A total of 46 had studied at a CAE or a university, and quite a large number of those had been either teachers or librarians. The most popular courses at that time were French language, creative writing and geology. The comments that the participants made about U3A were that they found the programs wide-ranging in their scope and the discussions they had on each of those topics were also wide-ranging; there was good quality leadership and an extensive range of reading material and other support facilities were provided.

The person who undertook the survey concluded his analysis of the participants at that seminar by making some observations about the whole of the group of people who tend to be involved in these organisations. He stated:

Through the questionnaire a representative cross-section of U3A participants have expressed the view that retirement, or the Third Age, can be a new phase of life, a period of growth. Research studies show that ageing has its effects on the body and the mind to varying degrees. It does not necessarily mean that the elderly become incapable of learning. The stereotype image of older people as being passive and stagnant needs to be demolished so that the myth that older people are no longer capable of learning can be refuted. Intellectual fitness can be increased or held constant by factors such as educational experiences, professional involvement, general interest and other social or physical variables. The University of the Third Age provides its participants with insights into their own mental capacities.

There are now over 700 members of U3A in seven branches in South Australia, established in the metropolitan area and increasingly now in the country. It is a concept that I believe deserves support. The biggest issue facing U3A is to try to find an identifiable focus, a place that can become easily recognisable as the home for U3A where people as they become increasingly aware of its activities can go to learn more of the programs that are offered. I have had great pleasure in my dealings with the people involved in the U3A program and I wish it the best for the future.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate the opportunity to speak in this debate because I wish to raise two matters which affect my electorate and, indirectly, all South Australians. The economic welfare of South Australia is essential to our standard of living and to the employment of those people who currently hold jobs and to those who are looking for employment. I have been particularly concerned recently that little regard has been given to the need to encourage people to invest, to prospect, to develop and to create wealth so that we can raise the living standard of the less well off and maintain the living standard of the rest of the community. Future employment opportunities in my electorate have been affected by these actions: first, the Government's decision to proceed with the pastoral legislation, a decision which will impose unfair, unrealistic rents upon those people engaged in the pastoral industry; and, secondly, the lack of action by the Government to address the difficulties

facing the opal mining industry at Mintabie, which involves in excess of 1 000 people.

Mintabie is a recognised opal field and everyone knows that it is quite simple to extend the opal fields to incorporate sufficient opal resources to maintain that industry. The people involved use a lot of machinery and equipment and provide employment indirectly to people who service that equipment and supply fuel. The State Government has recognised the need to provide facilities, and it has just completed an excellent school at Mintabie that was opened only a couple of weeks ago.

Unfortunately, those people who are based in Alice Springs and who are currently in charge of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara people appear either not to understand or, most likely, do not want to understand that there is an urgent need to allow for a reasonable extension of the opal fields and that there is no reason whatsoever why the Outback Areas Community Development Trust should not be allowed to instal electricity. That is nothing extraordinary or unusual; it is a quite reasonable request; the money is available and the need is there, but there is absolute bloody-mindedness on the part of those who are currently preventing this initiative. They are also frustrating the Uniting Church in its endeavours to build a medical facility for the citizens of Mintabie. That is another outrageous decision. The time has come when commonsense must apply.

The Mintabie review has been stalled by nonsense, by bureaucracy and by red tape. One of the reports produced was an insult to the intelligence of anyone who read it. I say to the Minister of Lands and to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs that it is time for action, otherwise they will be acting contrary to the best interests of South Australia.

Many of the people employed at Mintabie will leave and will become non-productive South Australians. I do not know whether the Government wants to see the Mintabie field run down and become a minor operation but, if it continues with its policy of inaction and procrastination, allowing the affairs of South Australia to be administered at the whim of one European female lawyer based in Alice Springs and whose conduct so far leaves a great deal to be desired, that will occur. I am very concerned about the current arrangements, because my proposition will benefit the local Aboriginal community who utilise the Mintabie opal fields as a source of income, as evidenced by the many Aborigines who are successfully noodling and making a reasonable income.

From time to time, we are told that these communities require economic independence. I entirely agree with that. One way to achieve that independence is to allow the continuation of opal mining in the Mintabie field. The Department of Mines and Energy knows where the opal is around the old Wallatinna mining area—it is shown on the map. The department has the surveys and its officers know the facts. The nonsense has continued for too long. I believe that a survey of the local Aborigines would indicate an overwhelming majority in favour of the extension.

However, those people currently administering the Pitjantjatjara legislation have, contrary to the spirit and intent of the Act, based themselves at Alice Springs where they are living in a cosy little atmosphere. My concern is for the welfare of the communities. On one occasion when the Pitjantjatjara committee went to Alice Springs to meet

the people on the lands, 11 of the 12 people were European. That in itself explains what has taken place. Control should be put back into the hands of the local Aboriginal communities on the lands themselves. The Aboriginal police aids scheme has been an outstanding success because the local Aborigines chose the people. They are doing an excellent job and have the support of their communities. The only people that I know who have complained about them have been one or two Europeans from Alice Springs.

The hangers-on, the Europeans, attach themselves to the coat-tails of the Aboriginal community and take the salaries that should go to those in the Aboriginal community. The time has come for this Government and the Minister of Lands, who has the authority, to make departmental officers complete the review and make the right recommendations. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs can assist. It is no good saying that it cannot be done. It can be simply done and commonsense dictates that action take place. To all those who race around up there and say what a terrible person I am, I say that I do not care less what they say about me. I want to see commonsense applying. To stop the building of the hospital or to stop electricity being supplied to residents is a nonsense. These droves of hangers-on who are based in Alice Springs in a sweet, cosy arrangement are stopping residents of South Australia driving through the lands. It is a nonsense—they are law-abiding citizens. These hangers-on are acting contrary to the intent of the Act. The time has come to amend the Act.

I now refer to problems caused by the pastoral Act. One of the unfortunate things is that well meaning-people make foolish decisions. The Government, to the best of its ability, believes it has done the right thing. I have been inundated with representations from people in the pastoral industry residing in my electorate who are concerned about arbitrary decisions. It is well known that if you overtax, over control, over-regulate or reduce in size any agricultural enterprise you will cause not only havoc and difficulties but also over-farming, which causes environmental damage. This will stop proper development. People will not have the cash to extend their pipelines, build tanks or to fence their paddocks into smaller areas as they will always be looking over their shoulder.

The Minister and those advising her should take heed of the advice coming to them. One of the main opponents of this Act has been placed on the Pastoral Board, yet he knows nothing about the pastoral industry. Obviously an incoming Liberal Government will rectify some of that nonsense early in its term. It has to amend the Act or make administrative decisions to rectify the situation, otherwise another industry will face difficulties it should never have had to face. Commonsense dictates that people should be encouraged to invest. In agriculture one must be able to reinvest a considerable amount of money back into the industry, otherwise it has no long-term stable future. That is a fact and commonsense dictates that suitable amendments should be made instead of trying to kowtow to the environmental vote.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 6 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 September 1989

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MOBILONG PRISON

10. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Was there an incident in the kitchen of Mobilong Prison in early June involving a fight between two prison officers (a prison industries officer and a general duties officer) and was it necessary to call three other prison officers to restrain the two officers involved and, if so—

- (a) what action has been taken following the incident;
- (b) were prisoners present instructed to lock away all knives in the kitchen; and
- (c) what action has been taken to prevent repetition of such an incident?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There was an altercation between two officers at Mobilong Prison on 1 June 1989. The altercation was not in the prison kitchen but on the loading bay adjacent to the rear of the kitchen. It was not necessary to call any officers to restrain the two officers.

- (a) The Manager, Mobilong Prison, investigated the incident that had resulted from a disagreement occurring between the two officers. The Executive Director, Department of Correctional Services, instructed the department's Senior Investigations Officer to undertake a full and comprehensive investigation into the incident.
- (b) No kitchen prisoners were outside the kitchen and on the loading bay, and no instructions were given to lock away all knives in the kitchen.
- (c) The Manager, Mobilong Prison, has counselled the officer responsible for unprofessional behaviour towards the other officer.

An apology has also been made by the officer displaying this behaviour.

SELICKS BEACH MARINA

18. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What were the reasons for the refusal of a proposal for a marina development at Sellicks Beach?

The Hon. S. M. LENEHAN: In accordance with section 51 (3) of the Planning Act 1982, His Excellency the Governor declined to give his consent to the proposed marina-residential development at Sellicks Beach having regard to the environmental impact statement.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

20. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Has 'C S Gas' been used on Tyrone Fisher whilst an inmate of G Division at Yatala Labour Prison, particularly immediately prior to his attempt to commit suicide and, if so, what quantity and why?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At 1650 hours on 5 July 1989, 'C S Gas' was used on Tyrone Fisher as a result of his having refused to peacefully leave his cell. Mr Fisher made threats of violence against staff, destroyed furniture and fittings in his cell and armed himself with parts of a metal bin that he had also destroyed. Mr Fisher attempted

to block the trap opening to stop the 'C S Gas' and several squirts of the aerosol were required. At 1830 hours officers whilst carrying out observation duties notice that Mr Fisher had attempted to hang himself. The officers cut him loose and medical assistance was called. At 1950 hours Mr Fisher was transferred to James Nash House on the direction of the Prison Medical Officer.

FOUNDATION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

22. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Which sporting clubs and other organisations have received grants from Foundation South Australia since the inception of the fund and how much has been allocated to each organisation?

2. How many applications have been received to date and how much financial assistance was sought in each case?

3. Have all funds available for the year 1988-89 been expended and, if not, why not?

4. Are the criteria for grants under review and, if so, why?

5. Will capital grants for sporting bodies be considered and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. Foundation South Australia has advised that applications to the foundation for support and sponsorship are made in complete confidence and any negotiations that occur subsequently in regard to such applications are also confidential. Public announcements are made by the foundation when all involved parties have agreed.

3. The annual report, including audited financial statements, will be tabled in Parliament, following submission to the Minister by 31 October, as required by the Act.

4. and 5. The Chairman and General Manager of the foundation have indicated that they are available to meet the honourable member to discuss matters he may care to raise, and any specific suggestions will be given consideration.

GAP INSURANCE

23. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Why is it necessary for owners of motor vehicles weighing two tonnes or more to arrange for 'gap insurance' to cover third party bodily injury in the event of their vehicle being involved in an accident whilst stationary?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Recent amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act define the meaning of the words caused by or arising out of the 'use of a motor vehicle'.

Amendments to the Act were made because of the community's concern at the escalating costs of compulsory third party insurance premiums. The amendments were based on recommendations arising from a six-month investigation into compulsory third party insurance schemes operating in this State and elsewhere. The amendments apply to motor vehicle accidents occurring on or after 8 February 1987 only.

Section 99 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act defines the extent of cover:

For the purposes of this part and the fourth schedule, death or bodily injury shall not be regarded as being caused by or as arising out of the use of a motor vehicle if it is not a consequence of:

- (a) the driving of a vehicle;
- (b) a collision, or action taken to avoid a collision, with the vehicle when stationary; or
- (c) the vehicle running out of control.

The issue of 'gap insurance' to which you refer is the same for all vehicles, including passenger vehicles. The MVA does not determine a weight limit of vehicles to be covered by the compulsory third party bodily insurance scheme.

Inquiries have revealed that insurance companies have differing approaches to the issue of gap insurance and apply different criteria to their policies. For example, SGIC offers gap insurance as an inclusion with comprehensive motor vehicle type policies and it is understood that some other insurance companies have adopted similar approaches.

NORTHFIELD WOMEN'S COMPLEX

25. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many offenders from the Northfield Women's Complex sought leave to visit outpatient clinics at Government or private hospitals for medical treatment in the past five years?

2. What was the cost of escorts and medical treatment in each instance?

3. What were the types of treatment necessary and how many visits were for tattoo removal?

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

1. The number of women prisoners attending hospital outpatient clinics between 1984-85 and 1988-89 were as follows:

Clinic	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
Obst and Gynac.	40	39	25	38	37
Surgery (gen. and ortho.)	6	31	7	17	11
Other specialities	45	53	15	26	18
Casualty (A and E)	11	15	5	7	14
Total	102	138	52	88	80

All the above visits were to public hospitals. It is the policy of the Prison Medical Service that only public hospitals are utilised. No offenders from the Northfield Women's Complex sought leave to attend private hospitals for medical treatment.

2. It is not possible to provide an exact cost of escorts and medical treatment in each instance without obtaining detailed information from the Prison Medical Service, for example, name of each patient, date of treatment.

However, the Department of Correctional Services recently undertook an extensive survey of these activities and an indication of the costs incurred are:

1985-86—71 patients received medical treatment at a cost of \$2 705.50.

1986-87—22 patients received medical treatment at a cost of \$1 645.

1987-88—42 patients received medical treatment at a cost of \$3 450.

1988-89—21 patients received medical treatment at a cost of \$1 955—to the end of April 1989.

It has not been possible to provide any figures for the 1984-85 financial year.

Escort costs have not been included for the reasons given earlier. Also it is difficult to determine whether escorts are provided by rostered staff or by staff who incur an additional expense of overtime or callback.

3. There were no visits for tattoo removal.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING

30. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen), on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Who are the current members of the Advisory Committee on Planning and when was each appointed?

2. What is the area of interest or responsibility which makes each member eligible to be a member of this committee?

3. How often does the committee meet?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Member	Appointment Date
Presiding Officer: Mr Stephen Hains	2.6.88
Members: Ms Judith Worrall	10.9.87
Mr David Plumridge	10.9.87
Mr David Moyle	10.9.87
Mr Tom Muecke	10.9.87
Mr Don Pfitzner	10.9.87
Mr Brian Martin	10.9.87
Mr Rod Payze	25.8.88

2. The following members appointed by the Governor:

- (a) a person who:
 - (i) is a corporate member of the Royal Australian Planning Institute Incorporated;
 - (ii) has qualifications and experience in urban and regional planning, environmental management or a related discipline.

Current Member—Stephen Hains

(b) two persons with wide experience of local government.

Current members:

- Judith Worrall—Alderman, C.T. St Peters
- David Plumridge—Alderman C.C. Salisbury
Vice President, L.G.A.

(c) a person with wide experience in environmental matters.

Current member:
David Moyle—Former President, Nature Conservation Society

(d) a person with wide experience of commerce and industry.

Current member:
Tom Muecke—Customs Agent previously nominated by Chamber of Commerce and Industry

(e) a person with wide experience in rural affairs.

Current member:
Don Pfitzner—President, United Farmers and Stock-owners Association of S.A.

(f) a person with wide experience of housing or urban development.

Current member:
Brian Martin—Managing Director, Delfin Property

(g) a person with wide experience of the utilities and services that form the infrastructure of urban development.

Current member:
Rod Payze—Commissioner of Highways

3. The committee holds ordinary meetings on a monthly basis as well as carrying out inspections of planning areas and holding public hearings for Ministerial Supplementary Development Plans.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

31. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen), on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: When did Mr Bruce, retired Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service, give notice that he would be leaving that post, when did he vacate it, what measures have been taken to fill the position and when is it anticipated that an appointment will be made?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr A. Bruce, retired Chief Officer of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, provided advice of his proposed retirement on 23 January 1989.

2. Mr Bruce retired as Chief Officer on 5 July 1989.

3. Applications have been received for the position of Chief Officer following the advertising of the position throughout Australia and New Zealand.

4. It is anticipated that an appointment will be made following interviews of applicants.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS

33. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What is the role of each of the following in the preparation of a supplementary development plan; a council, the Planning Division of the Department of Environment and Planning and the Advisory Committee on Planning?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reply is as follows:
Council

Under section 41 of the Planning Act, a council has powers to initiate the preparation of a supplementary development plan for its own area, or part of its own area. After obtaining public exhibition approval from the Minister for Environment and Planning, the council exhibits the plan and conducts a public hearing in respect of any submissions which are received. The council then submits an authorisation draft to the Minister for Environment and Planning for final approval.

Department of Environment and Planning

The Planning Division of the Department of Environment and Planning provides advice to a council on supplementary development plans, prepares supplementary plans on behalf of the Minister, and reports to the Advisory Committee on Planning at the exhibition and authorisation stages on the suitability of supplementary development plans.
Advisory Committee on Planning

Under section 41 of the Planning Act, the Advisory Committee reports to the Minister for Environment and Planning on the suitability of council supplementary development plans, at the exhibition stage and (if requested by the Minister) at the authorisation stage. The committee conducts a public hearing and reports to the Minister for Environment and Planning at the authorisation stage, on those supplementary development plans prepared by the Minister.

ASBESTOS

42. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Is there any blue asbestos in buildings at the Julia Farr Centre and, if so, in what locations and when will it be removed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is no blue asbestos in buildings at the Julia Farr Centre. The Fisher Building has amosite (grey) asbestos insulation and, because of this, was closed in 1984 and has not been used since. There are currently no plans to remove the asbestos.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING AUTHORITY

45. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many houses were sold by the Office of the Government Employee Housing Authority in 1987-88 and 1988-89, what were the proceeds of each house sold, where were they located, and what was the reason for selling them?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In 1987-88, 59 assets were sold by the Office of Government Employee Housing. The

location, the proceeds of sale and the reason for selling each are as follows:

REASON FOR SALE

PA = Uneconomic to retain/surplus to requirements.

I = Sale under home purchase scheme to tenants.

G = Sale to the Education Department.

SAHT = Sale to the South Australian Housing Trust.

1 = Although the sales were conducted by the Office of Government Employee Housing, the proceeds of these sales were credited to the Teacher Housing Authority fund prior to its wind-up as they were commenced and negotiated by the authority prior to ceasing operations.

Location	Proceeds \$	Reason for Sale
Berri, 7 Coombe Street	32 458.30	PA
Berri, 50 Derrick Street	75 800.00	I
Bordertown, 13 Patterson Street	39 921.38	PA
Burra, 10 Smelts Road	19 918.10	PA 1
Christies Beach, 12 Colbert Street	44 843.86	PA
Christies Beach, 23 Sismey Road	46 824.24	PA
Christies Beach, 13 Sismey Road	44 683.61	PA
Elizabeth, 30 Broughton Road	40 179.64	PA
Elizabeth, 19 Judd Road	41 144.42	PA
Elizabeth Park, 6 Kirk Street	40 215.08	PA
Elizabeth East, 10 Talbot Street	39 062.61	PA
Eudunda, 6 Eyre Street	28 666.58	PA 1
Greenock, Main Road	56 650.22	I
Jamestown, 18 Forbes Street	34 001.08	PA
Jamestown, 44 Muirkirk Street	23 762.17	PA
Kapunda, 42 High Street	48 817.58	I 1
Kybybolite, Research Centre (Houses 1, 2, 3, 4, 9)	33 745.00	PA
Leigh Creek, Caravan	1 000.00	PA 1
Mount Gambier, 219 Commercial Street	47 000.00	SAHT
Mount Gambier, 6 Link Street	45 871.66	I 1
Mount Gambier, 22 Pannell Street	75 809.88	I
Mount Gambier, 1 Sim Street	40 709.35	PA
Mount Gambier, 20 Newsham Avenue	37 901.37	PA 1
Murray Bridge, 28 Gail Crescent	39 629.41	PA
Murray Bridge, 18 Leslie Street	67 745.22	I
Murray Bridge, 12 Mulgundawah Road	36 993.02	PA
Murray Bridge, 29 Weigall Avenue	37 710.57	PA 1
Myponga, 45 Main Street	37 941.43	PA
Naracoorte, 132 Jenkins Terrace	57 363.88	I
Naracoorte, 13 Lochiel Avenue	35 532.46	PA
Palmer, School House	47 863.45	P 1
Penola, 1 Kidman Place	32 107.09	PA
Peterborough, 71 Hill Street	15 211.22	PA
Peterborough, 70 South Terrace	31 947.05	I 1
Peterborough, 22 Queen Street	29 646.47	I 1
Pinnaroo, 19 Symonds Street	29 300.43	PA
Pipalyatjara, Mobile Home	7 000.00	PA 1
Port Augusta, 81 Elizabeth Street	46 721.08	I
Port Augusta, 135 Tassie Street	63 782.56	PA
Port Lincoln, 5 Kent Street	80 902.01	I
Port Lincoln, 55 Wavell Road	61 855.25	I
Port Lincoln, 5 Anne Place	47 237.64	G 1
Port Neill, 2 Peake Terrace	40 847.44	I 1
Port Pirie, 40 Hannan Street	26 969.43	PA
Port Pirie, 19 Meadow Crescent	25 137.27	PA
Port Pirie, 134 Balmoral Road	53 698.56	I 1
Renmark, 54 Sixteenth Street	32 735.53	PA 1

Location	Proceeds \$	Reason for Sale	Location	Proceeds \$	Reason for Sale
Strathalbyn, 12 Brecknock Road	43 818.53	PA I	Murray Bridge, 91 Gail Crescent	49 459.85	PA
Tintinara, 2 Bell Avenue	40 787.00	I	Murray Bridge, 74 Adelaide Road	64 251.38	I
Tintinara, 52 Wendt Terrace	38 326.00	I	Murray Bridge, 31 Elm Avenue	52 168.43	I
Victor Harbor, 104 Victoria Parade	49 854.00	I	Murray Bridge, 1 Ridgeway Terrace	33 058.71	PA
Victor Harbor, 106 Victoria Street	49 872.31	I I	Murray Bridge, 4 Ridgeway Terrace	40 734.68	PA
Whyalla, 39 Clutterbuck Street	28 384.12	PA	Murray Bridge, 142 Swanport Road	47 804.43	PA
Whyalla, 67 Viscount Slim Avenue	25 263.65	PA	Murray Bridge, 95 Gail Crescent	32 540.75	PA
Yorke town, 16 Victoria Street	52 583.37	I	Murray Bridge, 56 Verdun Street	59 971.38	I
	\$2 253 753.58		Mypolonga, 42 Williams Street	37 800.34	I
In 1988-89, 109 assets were sold. Again, the location, proceeds of sale and reason for selling are as follows:			Napperby, School House	26 000.00	PA
REASON FOR SALE			Naracoorte, 69 Memorial Drive	42 269.90	PA
I = Sold under the home purchase scheme to tenant.			Naracoorte, 21 Corriedale Street	36 748.81	I
PA = Uneconomic to retain/surplus to requirements.			Naracoorte, 20 Aitcheson Avenue	35 946.71	PA
Location	Proceeds \$	Reason for sale	Naracoorte, 18 Aitcheson Avenue	35 498.69	PA
Athelstone, 16 Bradbrooke Road	81 736.10	I	Naracoorte, 28 Sixth Street	33 126.93	PA
Berri, 10 Crawford Terrace	14 823.43	I	Oakbank, 162 Main Street	54 800.00	I
Berri, 2 McGregor Street	61 636.41	I	Oakbank, Part Section 4022	22 552.14	PA
Berri, 17 Kay Avenue	52 757.40	I	Penola, 10 Cameron Street	73 831.76	I
Berri, 7 Minnocks Street	36 743.67	PA	Penola, 115 Church Street	33 222.67	I
Booborowie, School House	14 995.00	PA	Poochera, Barnes Street	13 163.36	PA
Bordertown, 10 Virgo Street	39 822.29	PA	Port Augusta, 12 Symonds Street	26 310.00	PA
Bordertown, 4 Haynes Street	62 289.19	I	Port Augusta, 33 Hurcombe Crescent	46 770.38	I
Brinkworth, Section 220 Koolunga Road	491.77	PA	Port Augusta, 103 Tassie Street	52 424.95	PA
Burra, 4 Butterworth Street	30 133.00	PA	Port Augusta, 3 Gosden Street	31 983.54	PA
Ceduna, 4 Adey Crescent	29 800.32	PA	Port Augusta, 142 Carlton Parade	33 194.13	PA
Ceduna, 4 Park Terrace	33 665.47	PA	Port Augusta, 4 Victoria Parade	35 128.82	PA
Ceduna, 3 Marchant Street	37 262.72	PA	Port Augusta, 18 Hannagan Street	44 000.00	PA
Christies Beach, 20 Colbert Street	46 953.17	PA	Port Augusta, 20 Hannagan Street	34 710.98	PA
Cleve, 46 Fourth Street	22 872.14	PA	Port Augusta, 8 Sharam Street	35 273.79	PA
Coober Pedy, Lot 1003	29 543.00	I	Port Kenny, Lot 5 Old Police Station	29 227.10	PA
Coober Pedy, Lot 338	29 848.14	I	Port Lincoln, 14 Feltus Street	38 849.41	PA
Crystal Brook, 4 William Street	25 911.76	PA	Port Lincoln, 3 Brockworth Road	75 487.53	I
Elizabeth Vale, 40 Guerin Road	45 526.00	PA	Port Lincoln, 17 Stroud Terrace	72 674.39	I
Eudunda, 3 Hambour Avenue	35 028.00	PA	Port Lincoln, 43 Coronation Place	36 972.57	PA
Gawler, 4 Richards Avenue	44 495.00	PA	Port Pirie, 7 Evans Street	24 476.19	PA
Gawler West, 1 Ashford Street	48 718.61	PA	Port Pirie, 157 Balmoral Road	34 317.58	PA
Gladstone, 26 Parke Terrace	25 782.98	PA	Price, Lot 87 Third Street	30 243.80	PA
Jamestown, 21 Clifton Road	23 608.64	PA	Renmark, 24 Kurrajong Street	42 243.58	PA
Jamestown, 11 Cambridge Street	31 750.00	I	Sherlock, School House	23 750.00	PA
Jamestown, King Edward Terrace	6 474.25	PA	Snowtown, 5 Ninth Street	14 406.60	PA
Jamestown, 10 Glyde Street	26 810.79	PA	Strathalbyn, 11 East Terrace	67 807.23	I
Jamestown, 42 Cockburn Road	25 894.77	I	Streaky Bay, 62 Wells Street	54 082.76	I
Jamestown, 2 Forbes Avenue	20 465.83	PA	Truro, School House	28 067.14	PA
Jamestown, 15 Oxford Street	23 896.00	PA	Tumby Bay, Lot 233 Darling Avenue	35 116.00	PA
Kadina, 61 Francis Street	32 030.77	PA	Victor Harbor, 40 Harbourview Terrace	74 716.35	I
Kadina, 31 Digby Street	39 075.12	PA	Wanilla, School House	17 964.04	PA
Kimba, 27 Railway Terrace	16 920.90	PA	Watervale, Commercial Street	7 179.89	PA
Kimba, 19 West Terrace	17 520.90	PA	Whyalla, 42 Gowrie Avenue	31 346.96	PA
Kimba, 9 West Terrace	17 391.48	PA	Whyalla, 53 Havelberg Street	22 654.74	PA
Kingston, Marine Parade, Cottage 2	38 726.06	I	Whyalla, 10 Arthur Street	34 539.85	I
Kingston, 5 James Street	33 190.17	PA	Whyalla, 29 Aikman Crescent	32 153.46	PA
Kingston, Marine Parade, Cottage 1	38 879.71	I	Whyalla, 2 Jackson Avenue	33 720.84	PA
Kingston, 3 Marine Parade	38 601.13	I	Whyalla, 22 Williams Street	24 579.18	PA
Kulpara, Lot 6 North Terrace	35 865.90	PA	Whyalla, 16 Ralph Street	30 309.70	PA
Lenswood	48 712.00	PA	Whyalla Norrie, 56 Harvey Street	43 727.52	I
Lochiel, Ellis Street	25 803.80	PA	Whyalla Norrie, 71 Jenkins Avenue	26 985.71	I
Loxton, 3 Thiele Avenue	42 011.04	I	Wudinna, 61 Ballantyne Street	37 557.86	PA
Lyndoch, 6 William Street	39 505.93	I	Yorke town, 6 Weaners Street	20 259.42	PA
Millicent, 2 Playford Street	32 260.57	I			
Minlaton, 10 Eighth Street	33 401.14	PA			
Minnipa, 109 Travers Street	10 783.62	PA			
Morgan, 1 Tenth Street	28 718.47	PA			
Mount Gambier, 43 Lake Terrace East	47 175.18	I			
Mount Gambier, 7 Holloway Crescent	47 330.70	PA			
Mundulla, Lot 97 Wirrega Road	51 818.20	I			
				\$3 935 623.55	

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

66. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many motor vehicles are attached to the Department of Transport and authorities/agencies under the Minister's control and which classification level of officer may take such vehicles home each day/night and why?

2. How much fringe benefits tax was paid by the department and/or authorities/agencies of the department, respectively?

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

1. Of a total of 598 light motor vehicles held by the Highways Department as at August 1989, current approvals allow for 163 to be taken home on four or more nights per week. The authority for employees to take vehicles home is not related to classification but dependent on the necessary carrying out of that person's duties, in an efficient manner. The circumstances of authorisation were:

- employees on emergency callout.
- employees who are required to visit work sites at the beginning and/or end of a working day.
- employees engaged in policing heavy vehicle loads.
- when no secure garaging facility existed at the work site.

The State Transport Authority has a light vehicle fleet made up of 165 vehicles. Twenty-nine vehicles are taken home each night by managers and supervisors who may be required for out-of-hours duties or emergencies. Thirty-four vehicles are attached to the Department of Transport, of which five are also used for home to office travel. All officers allowed home-to-office privilege are in the EO classification range or, in the case of the Vehicle Engineering Branch's Chief Officer, at the EN-5 Government Engineering classification. Considerable after hours work is expected of officers within the senior ranks.

2. Fringe benefit tax for the FBT year ended 31 March 1989 was as follows:

Department of Transport	—\$ 5 630.00
State Transport Authority	—\$18 215.00
Highways Department	—\$15 134.31

MILITARY ROAD

97. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What discussions has the Highways Department had with Henley and Grange council, West Torrens council and Glenelg council regarding the future of Military Road and Patawalonga frontage and what proposals are being considered?

2. When will action be taken to reduce speeding traffic along Military Road and Patawalonga frontage?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Highways Department has had little involvement in this matter as this southern section of Military Road and the Patawalonga frontage are both council roads. Accordingly, any direct action to reduce speeding on them is a matter for the council.

However, discussions have been held between officers of the Henley and Grange council, West Torrens council and Glenelg council and officers of the Road Safety Division regarding the problem on Military Road and Patawalonga frontage. Three measures could improve the Patawalonga Frontage situation:

- (1) Reconstruct and widen Tapleys Hill Road and construct a connection into Brighton Road considered to provide the greatest improvement.
- (2) Modify the Military Road-Africaine Road junction so that Military Road South (which leads directly to the Patawalonga frontage) forms the stem of the

tee. This junction is in the West Torrens council area. If this modification was undertaken, signalisation of the junction between Africaine Road and Tapleys Hill Road may be required.

- (3) Install traffic control devices along the Patawalonga frontage.

This general consensus was that the measure that would provide the greatest benefit would be the reconstruction of the southern end of Tapleys Hill Road and its connection to Brighton Road.

This measure should divert traffic away from Military Road-Patawalonga frontage to the Tapleys Hill-Brighton Road arterial. Construction of these works is programmed by the Highways Department to proceed during the 1991-92 financial year subject to the availability of resources.

In 1987, Glenelg council undertook a safety bar and delineation treatment of the Patawalonga frontage and this has led to improvement in traffic behaviour and safety. It is my understanding that council will not pursue the modification of the Africaine Road-Military Road junction until the Tapleys Hill Road-Brighton Road work has been completed.

MARINELAND

99. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Why is it necessary to maintain a bus stop-terminus adjacent to the Marineland premises, when bus stops 30 and 31 are in front of and service Marineland Village and Patawalonga Golf Course and bus stops 26 and 27 are in front of West Beach Caravan Park and are served by bus routes 258, 259, 269, 272, 273 and 277?

2. What will happen to the bus terminus when Marineland is demolished?

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

1. Buses on route 269 operate from Glenelg North along Military Road, serving the Patawalonga Golf Course and the Marineland Village before terminating at Marineland. They then return to the City via Glenelg North as route 258 or 259. Bus route 277 operates from the City via Burbridge Road and Military Road, serving West Beach Caravan Park before terminating at Marineland and returning via Burbridge Road as routes 272 or 273. Buses continue to use a bus stop-terminus at Marineland premises as it is a convenient place to turn around. If this bus turning facility was not available it would be necessary to discontinue the provision of public transport services to the Marineland Village, the Patawalonga Golf Course and the West Beach Caravan Park, or develop a new turn-round elsewhere.

2. The State Transport Authority has had discussions with architects preparing plans for the redevelopment of the Marineland complex and has requested that provision for a bus turn-round be made in those plans.

FOUNDATION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

110. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Why is Foundation South Australia a major sponsor of the National Trust of South Australia's 'Spring Into Heritage Festival' from 10-17 September 1989 and what is the value of the foundation's sponsorship?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member would be aware, sponsorship arrangements are negotiated between Foundation South Australia and applicants. The Chairman and General Manager of the foundation have indicated that they are available to meet with the honourable member to discuss any matters he may care to raise.