

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 September 1989

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

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER GAOL

A petition signed by 292 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to relocate the Mount Gambier Gaol to the Mil Lel and Mingbool area was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table an interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for the replacement of linear accelerator No. 2 at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

COMPUTING SYSTEMS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier say why the Government has ignored a recommendation from the Auditor-General to initiate an independent management review of computing systems in the public sector? Will the Premier now immediately initiate such a review and, pending its recommendations, place a moratorium on the purchase of any further new systems? The Auditor-General first recommended this review last year after expressing major concerns about cost blow-outs for three major systems—the JIS; the courts; and the on-line system of the Motor Registration Division. His latest report reveals that his advice has not been acted upon, and he has repeated the recommendation. Other comments in his report demonstrate the urgency of such a review.

The Auditor-General has analysed systems which in total will cost about \$90 million to establish in a number of departments and agencies, and he has generally questioned whether they will be effectively managed to contain costs and to ensure that the benefits of these systems are delivered. Witness the blow-out of some \$30 million in the JIS. For example, the Government plans to spend \$23 million on StateLink to implement a Government-wide communications strategy.

However, the Auditor-General has reported that the management organisation structure for this project is 'loosely defined', and that there is 'insufficient specialist resource availability directed to policy and planning issues' within Government agencies and departments. Given the track record of cost blow-outs amounting to tens of millions of dollars, will the Premier immediately initiate a review and halt any further purchases?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that a decision to halt further purchases is warranted, although it is true that we have to be very circumspect and careful in ongoing programs. Let me answer the question quite directly. The Government has not ignored the Auditor-General's comments. On the contrary, we have taken his comments very seriously. In fact, I take this opportunity to record my

thanks to the Auditor-General for the number of areas that he canvassed in his report. It is important that we have that independent assessment so that I and my ministerial colleagues can go to the various departments armed with his recommendations and get something done.

Mr Olsen: But this has not been done.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition interjects 'But this hasn't been done.' It has in fact been done. An enormous amount of work has been done on the computing systems. The Auditor-General has suggested an overall review, and I will come to that in a minute. First, let me just say that we saw the first and major priority in this area as being to put many resources into the Justice Information System, to try to get that right. That involved Ministers, the Government Management Board, and Treasury—all the elements that are involved in that technology in Government. Major progress has been made already, and the Auditor-General acknowledges that. I suggest that the Leader read that section in his report.

About the communications policy and the Statelink referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, that information from the Auditor-General was referred to the Chairman of the Government Management Board in July 1989, not so long ago, seeking a response by mid-August. The communications policy committee has been considering a response; that response is prepared, and we hope that soon it can be in the hands of the Auditor-General.

I think the important thing is that at present the Government Management Board needs to remain in charge of the progress in investigating and reviewing these various systems. After all, that is why it was established. In doing that, it can call in independent assessment. In relation to the costs of the Government Computing Centre, the Government Management Board raised this issue. Touche Ross has been engaged by the Department of State Services and Supply to advise it on more appropriate cost pricing systems in a number of the elements involved. In addition, for technology information, that formal response will indeed be provided.

As the Leader of the Opposition would understand, substantial work is being undertaken, and the issues that are raised by the Auditor-General will certainly be pursued. The Government Management Board has a specific brief to do that. I am told that recently 70 per cent of the GMB's time has been devoted to pursuing matters of computing and communications, and so on. There is no question that the matter is being ignored. The problems that we have in Government in this area are not unique to the public sector of South Australia. On the contrary, they are shared by every Government in Australia, by most of the public sector enterprises. The stories are abounding. I will not name names, but private sector enterprises, like—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader is quite right; he says \$30 million—but they lose not \$30 million but hundreds of millions of dollars. One of the financial papers the other day reported that one company was rumoured to have lost \$175 million in a failed computer system.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition now changes his interjection. A minute ago \$30 million was an enormous amount of money, and now suddenly—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to conduct himself in a way more appropriate to his stature as a member of Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think I have covered all the matters involved. I simply repeat the point: these are major problems. In fact, we are recognised in this State as tackling the problems more directly and with more success than many other jurisdictions, and at less cost. Most importantly, we are prepared to use independent assessments and to read and understand and act on the Auditor-General's recommendations within the framework of our overall government support services.

The problems are being resolved as a matter of priority. However, it is a problem that is very common indeed across all systems, as we attempt to adjust to this new technology. Yes, some mistakes will be made, but in the end the system we produce I believe will be very good. We even had an award for our management systems at the national level. We do not have a bad record. I read in the newspapers of major initiatives taking place in New South Wales. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is very keen to follow examples in New South Wales. That is his model for this State—although heaven help the State if he ever had a chance to implement it. This major initiative referred to structural rearrangements and administrative changes that had been accomplished in South Australia some four years before. We are at the cutting edge of this area, and we intend to remain there.

JET SKIS

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Marine say what action has been or will be taken to ensure operators of jet skis abide by the appropriate boating laws along Adelaide's beaches this summer, and will local government officers be involved in this task? Last year I wrote to the Minister on behalf of seaside residents of Brighton and Seacliff seeking relief from the noise and fumes generated by jet skis. Residents and other beach users also complained of the danger posed by jet ski pilots who sped in the vicinity of swimmers and other beach users. Subsequently I understand that the seaside councils wrote to the Minister suggesting that council officers should be deputed in some way to police the regulations. What progress has been made?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question, because he raises a very important matter of public safety, particularly relating to people who are relaxing at the seaside and to young children. The antics of a few irresponsible people who hire jet skis and create a nuisance has been of considerable concern to people who use our metropolitan beaches. Last year I took up a matter raised with me by the member for Bright, and the department wrote to the metropolitan seaside councils and the West Beach Trust. Later, councils and the trust took up the offer to have a number of their council inspectors trained and to be authorised by the department to enforce the Boating Act in relation to jet ski operation. Jet skis will be treated no differently from any other motor boat under the Boating Act.

They must be registered, the operator must be licensed, and they must obey all the rules like any other person operating a power boat. That means they can travel no greater than 8 km/h within 30 metres of a swimmer. At present, breaches of that regulation can bring a maximum fine of \$200, and these council officers will be issued later this month with photographs and cards identifying them and stating their authority.

They have all been through a half day training course conducted by the Department of Marine and Harbors, and I am delighted that the councils have been so keen to

become involved, and they deserve credit for their involvement. The Boating Act is about safety for the operators, other boat users, and particularly for swimmers using our beaches during the summer months. I am confident that these officers will have an important educative role as well as helping to bring about a greater degree of safety awareness amongst our jet ski users and safer use of our beaches this summer by the young people of our State.

HOMESTART LOAN PROGRAM

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction ensure that advertising of the Government's HomeStart Loan Program includes information about total amounts borrowers will pay over the whole period of the loan? This information is missing from the promotional material the Government is using for this program. However, it is important that borrowers should be made aware of the total commitment they are taking on.

A Government leaflet now in wide distribution refers to a HomeStart loan of \$61 500 and for five year periods of the loan, list monthly repayments. What this leaflet does not say is that the actual amount home buyers will pay over the length of this loan is \$443 154. This will be almost \$200 000 more than the cost of the same loan at a fixed interest of 15 per cent, and almost \$160 000 more than the total cost of a 17 per cent building society loan. In making these calculations, the same assumptions have been used as has the Government about inflation. My figures show that by year 10 of the HomeStart loan, the outstanding balance of the loan will be \$106 416, while the outstanding balance on a fixed interest loan of 15 per cent would be \$57 744. By year 10, the monthly repayment of the HomeStart loan would be almost \$100 more than the fixed interest loan, and the difference would then continue to escalate until in the last year of the HomeStart loan, the monthly repayment is \$3 002, compared with \$784 for the fixed loan. To prevent misleading advertising of this program, this information should be immediately included.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Bragg for his question because, again, he has highlighted that three members of the Liberal Party—the member for Bragg, the Leader of the Opposition and, I understand, the economic spokesperson, the member for Coles—do not understand this scheme. As I said yesterday, the Liberal Party had 72 hours prior notice of this scheme and yet it still got it wrong. Members of the Opposition got it wrong last night and they are still getting it wrong. The South Australian public understands the scheme because as of 1 p.m. today we have had over 600 people jamming the hotline wanting to know more about it. Every major building organisation—including the Real Estate Institute and, now, the biggest builder in the State—has endorsed the scheme. The *Advertiser* has endorsed the scheme as has the *News*, but the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg have not endorsed it.

An honourable member: Answer the question.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will answer the question in a minute. In the coming months I will let the people of South Australia know that the Leader of the Opposition does not like the scheme.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee has a point of order.

Mr LEWIS: My point of order is that, in view of the Minister's admission that he will 'answer the question in a minute', would you please draw to his attention that he

should address himself only to the question and he should do it now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair was under the impression that there was a heavy political content to the question and that the Minister was responding accordingly.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As I have said, one can fairly say that the whole of the South Australian community, with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg, has endorsed the scheme. I will be pamphletting the electorates of Liberal members who do not support this scheme, but if any member opposite approaches me privately and says 'It is a good deal, Terry' I guarantee that I will not move into his or her electorate and put down the hard word.

The member for Bragg is a little unfair, because the figures he uses—on which he wanted me to elaborate—are the figures the Government put out in its leaflet. They are the figures put out by HomeStart Finance. What the member for Bragg and the Leader of the Opposition failed to mention and failed to understand is that the Government has made it perfectly clear, and the Premier made it perfectly clear at the launch of the HomeStart program, that this scheme is for people trapped in private rental and who cannot get out of it through conventional loan schemes. If one wants to use the conventional lending system to make a quick buck out of capital gains—buying and selling houses—we have no objection, but this scheme is for people trapped in the private rental market. The Government is offering them increased borrowing power. More importantly, the Government is offering a fixed 25 per cent of household income in repayment. That is the basic difference and that is what members opposite do not understand.

I understand that on radio this morning the Leader of the Opposition tried to sound very knowledgeable and quoted figures from the HomeStart program. He referred to this \$61 000 loan over 18 years—the example the Government put forward—and he tried to shock and horrify listeners by saying that after 18 years the outstanding balance will be \$132 821. What he did not tell the listeners is that after 18 years the property value on a \$70 000 home would be \$303 972. A person borrowing money from the HomeStart program would have equity in that home of \$171 151. I repeat that, just in case members opposite did not hear over the hubbub: the equity on this \$70 000 home would be \$171 151.

That is what the Opposition does not understand. We are offering, with the endorsement of every major organisation in this State, a means for those people who are trapped in private rental the chance to get into home ownership. This might be upsetting the member for Bragg, because we are saying that the money these people put into HomeStart is equity and it does not go into the pockets of private landlords. That might well be what is upsetting the member for Bragg. He has plenty of friends who are private landlords and who most likely see this as a great threat to their livelihood.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Housing and Construction is rather softly spoken and the Chair had difficulty hearing him because of the amount of audible conversation in the Chamber. The honourable member for Newland.

IRISH COMMERCIALS

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Has the Minister of Ethnic Affairs seen the Lotteries Commission television advertise-

ment about the luck of the Irish and does he consider that such an advertisement, which ridicules a particular ethnic group, is appropriate? In the lead-up to the visit of the Irish jockeys for a recent Adelaide race meeting and to promote its Irish sweep lottery, the Lotteries Commission ran an advertisement on Adelaide's three commercial television stations. I have been approached by the Irish Heritage Society Secretary who is concerned indeed about the advertisement. The Secretary stated:

The result of the visit of the Irish jockeys to Australia was a sustained and scurrilous attack on a state-wide basis on the Irish character by a Government body.

Other members of the Irish community in South Australia have also complained about the advertisement as being in extremely bad taste.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the question from the member for Newland. I, too, have received complaints from the Irish community about the advertisement. Apparently we have a degree of hilarity from members opposite who want to treat very cheaply the sensitivities of some people in our community. That is for members opposite to wear. I do understand the sensitivity of people who have complained about this matter.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham says, 'This is unbelievable.' There are occasions when people feel that the way in which they are portrayed in commercials is derogatory. It is not something that is meant to de-build on positive aspects of cultural features. Such features can be built upon, but this advertisement was not one of them. If one reads the text, sees it on television or hears it on radio, one will see that it quite deliberately tries to pick out certain aspects of the Irish accent and caricature it. The general character portrayed on the television advertisement is a caricature of the most insensitive kind. From time to time advertisements like this quite rightly cause members of the community to express their opinion, and it is quite proper for that opinion to be heard by those who produce the advertisements. Ultimately, it must be decided whether or not the advertisements can proceed.

I also had complaints about some of the advertising features being used by a department store at the moment with respect to a promotion and what could be referred to in the old jargon as a blackamoor carrying flowers. That reference to a black slave has offended some people in the community. From time to time we receive complaints about such matters. My obligation as Minister of Ethnic Affairs is to communicate those concerns to the relevant bodies promoting such advertisements, and I undertake to do that. In this case I advise the House that the advertisement has been withdrawn in any event apparently because the Lotteries Commission directly received complaints from the Irish community.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Can the Premier say whether the 1989 Grand Prix is facing a major downturn in spectator and corporate support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles has the call and not the member for Albert Park.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:—and whether sales for the event are being made even more difficult by the pilots strike? Figures in the Auditor-General's report show that Grand Prix sales for the 1989 event have been much slower than for 1988. The report shows that to 30 June this year—two months before the pilots strike began—the board's

income amounted to \$4.2 million, compared with \$7.5 million for the same period before the 1988 event. Of this, ticket and corporate package sales had brought in \$2.8 million this year—just under half the \$5.7 million in sales achieved to 30 June 1988. In the end, income from sales of seating and general admission tickets for last year's events was down by more than \$1.2 million—the first time since the event came to Adelaide that these sales had fallen off. Sales so far this year, and the pilots strike possibly affecting the number of overseas visitors planning to come to the event, suggest that this trend will continue this year.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member by saying, 'No, the Grand Prix is not facing a major downturn in support.' I know that she would dearly like that to happen and I am sorry that she is continuing this ongoing campaign about an event which is very important to South Australian tourism, to our international image abroad and which is supported by the vast majority of the population.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It would surprise everyone listening to the statements and comments made by the honourable member about this event.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know the honourable member would be delighted if I had to clutch my brow and say that this year's Grand Prix will be a dismal failure. The smile would broaden on her face and she would be clapped on her back by all her colleagues sitting along that bench who have a vested interest in these things failing. Let me repeat that that is not the case. There has certainly been a pattern over the past few years that locally purchased tickets are being bought closer and closer to the event. That was predicted in all the marketing outlooks.

Of course, in the first year everyone gets in early, unsure of what the event will be like or whether they will be able to secure their place or seat. Eventually, we get to the stage where the locals understand what sort of timing is required and, as a result, the rush of tickets increases as the event builds up. The graph moves sharply upwards later than it did in the early events. That is a standard marketing pattern. Matching that, however, has been a much greater uptake of corporate boxes and corporate presence at the Grand Prix. It is an amazing selling event and selling point for this State. It is extraordinary how many other investment prospects and opportunities have opened up because those holding corporate boxes and their guests have done their business in Adelaide around Grand Prix time. That will continue.

In fact, the take up of reserved seats and interstate and overseas visitation dates have increased greatly. I understand that hotel bookings for this year's events are 42 per cent up on last year. Again, I know that that is disappointing news to the honourable member. True, concern could be caused by reason of the pilots' dispute—great concern. Contingency plans are being drawn up in the unlikely—and I hope that it is unlikely—event that that dispute continues until around Grand Prix time. I can do no better than refer the honourable member to today's edition of the *News* and a statement reported by Dr Hemmerling, Grand Prix Director, headed 'Prix on target despite air row', as follows:

Grand Prix tickets are selling strongly despite apprehension caused by the airlines pilots dispute. Grand Prix executive director . . . denied sales had been slow since the shutdown of domestic air services . . . 'We are still running to our projected \$4 million budget, and sales in WA are equal to, if not higher than at this time last year.'

That is the situation at the moment. Contingency plans are in place if it goes on. I am sorry to disappoint the honour-

able member, but I think that this year's Grand Prix will be a great success.

RETIREMENT VILLAGE RESIDENTS ADVOCATE

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister for the Aged consult with his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately the Chair is unable to hear the question from the honourable member for Mitchell because of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier exchanging pleasantries and, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition again interrupts the Chair when the Chair is trying to restore order, he will be named.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Me?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Chair has erred in attributing something to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that was not his fault, the Chair will apologise. The honourable member for Mitchell.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Will the Minister for the Aged consult with his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs with a view to appointing a special advocate for residents in retirement villages, this advocate to work from the Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing? Earlier this year a committee of review on retirement villages, which had a fairly widespread membership under the auspices of Sacota, met and produced a report. The recommendations in the report (which all members would have received) to the Sacota board included two matters that I will mention to indicate to the Minister my line of thinking on this matter. The first recommendation I cite is 'advocating for justice on behalf of retirement village residents'; and the second recommendation is 'to promote better communication between residents and administrators'.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to do so. I understand that Commissioner Greycar has had some discussions with Sacota about this suggestion, and it is certainly worth further consideration.

PURSUIT PERFORMANCE PTY LTD

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Was the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is also out of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Was the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware that Mr Michael Nunan was signing cheques to pay himself for goods he sold through his company, Pursuit Performance, to the Sports Institute, of which he is a director? How long had this practice been in operation?

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: We are asking whether the Minister knew. Further when were instructions given that it should cease? In the report tabled today by the Minister, Mr Belchev, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Recreation and Sport, is referred to as having said that the South Australian Sports Institute had purchased telemetry equipment from Pursuit Performance. It also stated that Mr Nunan had been one of the signatories to the cheques for the purchase of the equipment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The answer to the first question is 'No', and the report tabled in the House obviously answers the second question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I wonder what the Opposition is embarking on here, because Crown Law has investigated the matter, as has the Chief Executive Officer, on two occasions.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, the member for Coles says that it is for me to investigate. Obviously she does not understand the Government Management and Employment Act. She is obviously endeavouring to impugn me and officers of the Public Service, and I believe it is showing signs of becoming a witch-hunt by the Opposition. It has a certain smell about it.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am very worried that the member for Mitcham is after me! Clearly, the Chief Executive Officer has undertaken a thorough investigation with Crown Law inspectors, and the report has been tabled in the House. I think that that surprised the member for Coles, who was running around out there last week asking, 'Will the Minister table this report?' I have tabled it today, and I think it answers all the questions raised by the Opposition. I wonder whether the community should start asking what the Opposition is about and why it is hounding these people from a position of privilege. What are they hoping to achieve?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will take the final question on notice and bring back a further report regarding the date of the issue of the instruction. But there is a clear indication that the Chief Executive Officer has followed the provisions of the Government Management Employment Act appropriately. He has followed all the procedures, he has consulted with the Crown Law Department, had investigators go in, and has done everything properly. Yet still the Opposition goes on.

I note that the media is starting to question why certain members opposite are, under privilege, raising these matters and constantly hounding these people. However, I will bring back a further report for the member for Mitcham, to ensure that everything is placed before the Parliament. I am happy to do so, and I will continue to do so. I simply draw to the attention of the public the nature of the activities of these members—the member for Coles and the member for Mitcham, who are well known for getting into the gutter, for not bothering about people's rights in this place, and for continuing to hound and focus on people and these activities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to restrain himself.

POLIOMYELITIS

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Will the Minister of Health indicate whether parts of the South Australian population are at risk from poliomyelitis? Further, what programs are in place to minimise the risk? What should individuals do to take advantage of these programs? Last Thursday the Minister and I participated in the Marion City Council's immunisation campaign, and there was an encouraging response from the public to the campaign. The Minister may also care to say whether his arm is still sore.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Segments of the population could be at risk. Because one was immunised against polio at the age of 22, it is not good enough to imagine that at the age of 51, or whatever, one still has proper protection. It is important that people follow up with boosters from time to time—and this relates not only to poliomyelitis but to various other forms of immunisation. The program in which the honourable member and I participated is one which is replicated throughout the metropolitan and country areas. People should make contact through their local boards of health so that they can take advantage of these campaigns as they arise. There is also an opportunity to seek immunisation through general practitioners. The poliomyelitis vaccine is administered orally these days. It does not taste all that good, but for those who are a little squeamish there is always a boiled sweet to follow it up. The reference to my arm relates to the fact that I also had my tetanus immunisation updated—and it didn't hurt a bit!

RADIO STATION 5AA

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What assurances can the Minister of Recreation and Sport give that Radio Station 5AA will meet specified performance targets set by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal, following its further major loss last financial year? The Auditor-General's Report shows that the Government-owned radio station incurred a further trading loss of \$347 000 last financial year, bringing its accumulated loss to \$4.3 million. Last year's loss would have exceeded \$1 million had the TAB not increased by \$750 000 the race broadcasting fee that it pays to the station. These losses have continued despite previous assurance by the Minister that they would be turned around.

On 23 September 1986, the Minister told the House that he hoped that there would be 'a major redress in the next financial year' in the station's financial performance, while on 19 February 1987 he said:

The TAB is fairly confident that it can turn the situation around in relation to the operation of the station.

Concerns about the station's performance are shared by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal, which announced last month that it might consider commencing a further inquiry into the renewal of the station's licence if specified ratings and revenue targets were not met by January 1991. While the Government sees 5AA as a racing broadcasting station, the tribunal has also rejected this approach, stating that the station's programming needs to be developed free of racing considerations and those of the TAB.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to answer this question. I must say at the outset that the obvious link between the Minister of Recreation and Sport and radio station 5AA is at arm's length. That has been traditional, and the Opposition has insisted on that because it has raised questions in this House with regard to any so-called political interference. Am I meant to understand that the Deputy Leader wishes me now to adopt a different approach and interfere politically? I will not be doing that. I assure the House that—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted that the member for Murray-Mallee has embarked on this attitude. I am sure that the racing industry as a whole will be delighted with what he has to say. 'Sell it,' he says. That is a wonderful reaction. I can assure him that the racing industry supports 5AA's providing the service it does to the community of this State. I am sure those responsible will be very disappointed to hear the words of the honourable member.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Alexandra knows that this radio station has provided a very valuable and informative service, particularly to country listeners, through other related stations throughout the State. For the member for Murray-Mallee to suggest that it be sold is not something I will convey back to the TAB. It is not my role to do that, because it is a matter for the TAB board to make decisions with regard to radio station 5AA and its board members. I am certain that 5AA is providing a very important service to the racing community of this State and I hope it will continue to do so in one form or another.

I understand the ABT's recommendations. Obviously the boards of both the TAB and 5AA will be addressing those issues. The quality of service and the financial situation of 5AA is constantly under review, and it has had some significant improvement in its performance. There is still room for improvement, but if one looks at the service provided and the cost it would incur to provide it through a commercial radio station, it would be quite enormous. If one takes that into account, the service provided by 5AA is quite exceptional for the racing community. I hope the Chairman of the TAB will study the Deputy Leader's comments, and I hope that he will convey them to the boards of the TAB and 5AA. I am sure they have already considered the comments from the broadcasting tribunal.

PORT RIVER EFFLUENT

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of the statement in the September 1989 newsletter produced by the Port Adelaide Residents Environment Protection Group Inc. that:

Each day the sewer works of West Lakes puts into the Port River: one and a half tonnes of nitrogen; half a tonne of phosphorus; and one tonne of organic material.

Can she say whether this is true and what effect does this discharge have on the river environment? That there is a discharge is acknowledged in a report entitled, 'The South Australian Land Based Marine Pollution Report' prepared for the Department of Environment and Planning in March 1987. The upper reaches of the Port River are often the area where algal blooms occur, and with further residential and recreational development planned along the river, such discharge surely is unacceptable.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I am aware of the newsletter to which the honourable member refers. I acknowledge the honourable member's interest in and concern about the environment. The figures he has quoted are similar to the average amount per day which has been measured between 1986 and 1989 except that the phosphorus load is .2 tonnes per day and not .5 tonnes as referred to in the newsletter. I point out that the effluent is disinfected to remove harmful micro-organisms before discharge to the upper reaches of the Port River. The major cause for concern is that that effluent contributes to the growth of phytoplankton blooms. However, stormwater discharges also contribute to the growth of these blooms. Therefore, it is difficult to distinguish exactly what is the percentage of blame to be laid on each of these sources.

As the honourable member is aware, I will be introducing legislation in this session to address marine pollution. This legislation involves controlling discharges from several sources, including sewerage treatment works. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is assessing possible means of reducing nutrient loads from the effluent referred to by the honourable member, to meet the improved standards that will be required under this new legislation.

The options under investigation include tertiary treatment and the transfer of effluent to the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. At this stage, I can share with the House that, while tertiary treatment is still an extremely expensive option, it would appear to be a more cost effective option than the transfer of effluent from Port Adelaide to Bolivar. The Government is committed to reducing pollution of our marine environment, as will be demonstrated by the legislation that I have indicated I will bring before Parliament. State Government authorities will set standards for industries that now discharge material into the sea, and members opposite will be pleased to know that those standards will also apply to all Government agencies.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): In view of the Auditor-General's report on the project and the loss to taxpayers, which is already almost \$6 million and may go higher, will the Premier initiate an immediate independent inquiry into the Marineland redevelopment to determine, in particular, whether the Tribond company was misled by the Government when it agreed to become involved in the project? In response to the Auditor-General's Report, the Minister of State Development and Technology on the 7.30 Report last night, implied that the Tribond company was mainly responsible for the failure of this project and the loss of one of the State's prime tourist attractions. It is alleged that the Minister has consistently made untrue statements about this important point.

On 3 August this year, in answer to a number of questions he released to the media, the Minister said that it had been Mr Rod Abel of the Tribond company who had first approached the West Beach Trust to initiate the project. However, the submission by the Minister's own department to the Industries Development Committee, in July 1987, shows that the West Beach Trust had approached Tribond. I quote from the departmental submission:

Following an evaluation of the options, the late Mr Porter (the former General Manager of the West Beach Trust) made approaches to Mr Abel, a developer of oceanaria facilities, with a view to becoming involved in a major redevelopment of Marineland.

Agreement between the trust and Tribond was reached early in 1987. As part of that agreement, Tribond intended to continue operating some of the attractions at Marineland to maintain a cash flow while the redevelopment proceeded. I understand that, after taking over the project, Tribond found that it had been misled by the West Beach Trust about the deterioration and disrepair of the Marineland buildings which the trust had allowed to occur. After moving into the facilities, Tribond found that a major asbestos removal program would be necessary before any demolition work. And, ultimately, the company found that it would have to demolish all existing structures at Marineland, when the original plan was to retain some of them. The Auditor-General alludes to the deterioration of the Marineland facilities when he states, and I quote:

It is surprising that the submission did not suggest an independent engineering assessment be made of those facilities.

I understand that there is clear evidence that the West Beach Trust was well aware that its failure to maintain the Marineland facilities would pose very serious obstacles to any redevelopment. I have in my possession a comprehensive report written in 1984 by the former General Manager of the trust, the late Mr Porter. He reported to the Chairman of the trust, Mr Virgo, that, and I quote:

The Marineland building itself has many structural problems.

He also said:

There is a need for a total structural appraisal of the building and an assessment of repair and renovation costs.

The Auditor-General has now reported that this was not done before the West Beach Trust, on behalf of the Government, enticed Tribond into committing to the development, nor was the Industries Assistance Committee of the Parliament properly advised about the real state of deterioration and disrepair at Marineland. As a result, \$6 million of taxpayers' money is already down the drain.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hanson yet again seeks to destabilise any attempt at redevelopment on the Marineland site. He has been hell bent for the past nine months on ensuring that everything possible is done to make this project not succeed. Finally, he has to bear the blame for any decisions made that do not give success to this project. A number of comments are made in the Auditor-General's Report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: Mr Speaker, I am having a great deal of difficulty, irrespective of the microphones, in hearing the Minister's reply.

The SPEAKER: I accept the complaint of the honourable member that it is very difficult to hear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction to order. It is difficult to hear Ministers' replies to questions when they are subjected to constant harassment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hanson's question raises a number of matters referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. It is quite appropriate for me to respond to those issues raised in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member's explanation to his question was quite long and he deserves a fulsome reply to the matters he raised. When the Auditor-General's office contacted the Department of State Development and Technology, the department responded to the concerns; and a number of departmental responses are referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. They deserve fuller explanation on a couple of points. I refer to the engineering matter, which the department did acknowledge (and this is paid credence to in the Auditor-General's Report) in the following comment:

The comment in your covering minute is perhaps a reasonable one—

this is with respect to the engineering assessment—with the benefit of hindsight. However, at the time the existing facilities were only required for a relatively short time prior to demolition to make way for the new development. Marineland had been operating for some time and with the temporary improvements proposed it was considered Tribond had a reasonable prospect of trading at break even during the redevelopment stage. You should also note that Tribond itself made the decision to close the facility to the public essentially on commercial grounds.

A number of other points are worth identifying in the Auditor-General's Report. There is a comment about the independent assessment of the viability of the project, and there is reference to tourism figures. I note that the report indicates that advice was obtained from Tourism South Australia by the Department of State Development and Technology to provide to the Industries Development Committee of Parliament. The report also indicates that that advice was that a high quality and well-managed facility with patronage of around \$250 000 could be considered achievable. Reference was then made to a break-even level of \$292 000.

An honourable member: 250 000 people.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, 250 000 people. That is a big victory for members opposite—they picked up a minor error! If they are satisfied with that victory, so be it.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. First, apart from the fact that he was being drowned out at the time, I could not hear the Minister's last remarks because he was not addressing the Chair. Secondly, I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order for repeated interjection. There is no mistake this time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My apologies, Sir, for not addressing my remarks to you. The conclusion might be drawn, from the way that it appears in the report, that the figure that Tourism South Australia said would be achieved was below the viability figure. It is important to note what was in the report given to the Department of State Development and Technology by Tourism South Australia. It states:

The break-even attendance is estimated to be between 242 000 and 292 400 patrons.

Not the figure indicated in the report as being an only figure—there was a spectrum of possibilities. As a result, the report goes on to state:

A figure of around 250 000 is considered to be achievable.

Tourism South Australia concludes by saying:

... the department therefore supports the concept.

Any suggestion that people might have drawn that the Department of State Development and Technology was not giving full advice to the IDC is quite incorrect. First, the advice was tabled before the committee anyway and, secondly, Tourism South Australia did not indicate quite the proposition outlined in the report.

I mentioned the engineering forecast. As the independent view of the Tribond forecasts, there is a suggestion that the independent assessment indicated that the projections were over-optimistic. The reality is that the Price Waterhouse assessment was done on a reduced scale project—a scale of some \$7 million, not \$9 million—yet that same reduced scale project did have attached to it patron projection figures higher than the original proposal put before the IDC. It was upon that revamped proposal that the Price Waterhouse assessment indicated that it was far too optimistic.

So, the Department of State Development and Technology did not give false advice to the IDC in respect of this matter. In fact, the Department of State Development and Technology obtained advice, as I indicated, from Tourism South Australia. It also sought information on equivalent activities in other parts of Australia—other related tourist developments—and other tourist developments in South Australia. Clearly, the other developments in South Australia were not of a Marineland type, because we do not have any other Marineland-type facilities. The submission made to the bipartisan parliamentary committee by the Department of State Development and Technology was about 31 pages consisting of 10 or 11 appendices. The committee then had full opportunity to cross-examine the department, which it did, and also it had the opportunity to call such other evidence as it wished. Indeed, we know, from the information provided in this place by members opposite, some of the other information that it did seek.

I do not believe that there is any justification for a separate investigation into the matter although, as I indicated yesterday, when the Auditor-General made inquiries we provided to him all the information that he sought, so that a complete financial audit of this entire matter can be undertaken. We have nothing to hide in the matter; the department has nothing to hide in the matter, either.

I need to make one or two other points about a question raised yesterday. In a subsequent answer I mentioned the facts that have gone from State Development and Technology in South Australia to Zhen Yun in Hong Kong. That is correct. Another point I need to make is about the letter dated 6 February, I think the Leader said, from Zhen Yun to some lawyer. It is a letter that I do not have in my possession. I might say that the department is not aware of such a letter, but the department does know that, in the sale agreement between Zhen Yun and Tribond, Zhen Yun included a condition making the agreement subject to State Development and Technology's giving its permission for the development to proceed, but this was done without the knowledge of the department at the time. Also, and more pertinently, it is an irrelevant condition, because the department was not and is not in a position to give that permission or to deny it. It had no authority in that matter. That is a matter apparently not understood in the commercial discussions that Zhen Yun was involved in at the time. In fact, permission was never sought and, therefore, quite apart from being incapable of being approved or denied, was certainly not denied.

AGE DISCRIMINATION

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): In the light of the Government's commitment to end discrimination based on age, will the Minister of Labour consider amendments to the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act to ensure that injured workers who are over the normal retirement age are given full benefits under the Act or, alternatively, that their wages are exempted from the levy?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Did you want to ask a question, too?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will determine who has the call for questions, not the Minister of Labour. I ask the honourable member for Coles, I believe it was, to cease harassing the Minister in his reply. The Minister should not be subjected to harassment of that nature or of any other kind. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Mitcham for his question.

Honourable members: Elizabeth.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: He is a lot smarter than the member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to refrain from harassing the Minister, and I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning to cease her verbal counterattacks on members opposite.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Elizabeth has asked a question about the aged, and there are some age limitations in respect to the WorkCover Act. I will respond to that part of the question first. It is reasonable to say that the number of compensable injuries among people over 65 years would be very small, and by and large most injuries at work occur to younger employees. Indeed, overseas studies indicate that in their first six months employees are the most accident prone and figure highly in accident statistics.

Medical expenses for an injury to aged workers are paid under WorkCover as lump sums for any permanent disability. If an aged person is unfortunate enough to die because of a work injury, a spouse would receive \$75 100 this year, as well as a weekly payment if dependent on the worker's

income. The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act provides that weekly payments are not paid to injured workers over the age of 70 years. Before 70 years weekly payments are made up to the later of the following dates; first, the date on which a worker reaches the age at which he/she would be eligible to receive the age pension subject to satisfying qualifying requirements; or, secondly, the date on which the worker attains the normal retiring age for workers in the same kind of employment where the injury occurred. I stress that the limitation is for weekly payments only.

By limiting the age at which weekly payments cease, the legislation recognises that other community services are available to take over income maintenance at a stage in a worker's life where most would not be part of the workforce. The WorkCover levies paid by employers are a contribution to a common fund from which all compensation expenses are paid. The levies are calculated independently from the compensation payments structure. The levies are based on the total wages bill, including any amounts to or on behalf of an aged worker. It can be seen that weekly payments are just one element of an injured worker's expenses—and an employer's contribution to the common fund covers more than weekly payments to an injured worker. In respect of the legislation that was recently introduced into Parliament, when it has been passed and proclaimed the ramifications it will have on the Workers Compensation Act will be studied. The honourable member can be assured that the Government will act appropriately.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1—After line 11 insert new clause 1a, as follows:

'Commencement

1a. This Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.'

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The Legislative Council thought it desirable to move this amendment to ensure that there was some lead time prior to this provision coming into operation to enable an education program to be undertaken. I think the Legislative Council was correct in its view, and I urge the Committee to support the amendment.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. However, I think it is not a bad idea to invite members of the Legislative Council to question Ministers during the Estimates Committees. It is a fact that we have Ministers in the Upper House in this State, and rightly so. It is also a fact that Opposition mem-

bers in the Upper House have particular responsibilities. I guess that when the Labor Party is in Opposition and has shadow Ministers in the other place it would be interested in coming to this House to question Liberal Ministers. I put forward this suggestion—and do not intend to move a motion—for the consideration of the House. It is a fact that members in the Upper House would like to have the same access to the public servants who come to these Estimates Committees that is available to Lower House members. I support the motion and throw that proposition into the ring for consideration in future.

Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister Assisting the Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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 purpose of this Bill is to firmly establish the South Australian Superannuation Fund as a fund protected from the Commonwealth Government's new laws which tax superannuation funds. The Bill in principle clarifies the legal status of the fund as an entity holding assets and dealing in assets of the Crown. The Bill has no bearing on existing benefits paid under the scheme.

The Government took appropriate action earlier in the year to also protect the State from paying taxes, on the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. Further legislative action may be required to deal with some of the other superannuation funds in the public sector.

The South Australian Superannuation Fund provides considerable assistance to the Government by meeting part of the cost of the benefits payable under the Superannuation Act. Without the fund being protected from the Commonwealth taxes, there would be a considerable increase in the cost of maintaining the schemes. These costs would have to be met by the taxpayers of this State. Without protection from these taxes, there would be a flow of State taxpayers' money to Canberra.

Before the recent tax laws were passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, this State, together with the other States and the Northern Territory, argued very strongly with the Commonwealth that the main State schemes should continue to be excluded from the ambit of the tax legislation. The State took this position because:

- In terms of the Commonwealth Constitution, State Governments do not pay tax on State property;
- The benefit structures of the State schemes are, for historical reasons, far more complex than those in the private sector and do not lend themselves to simple and equitable solutions in offsetting the cost of the taxes;
- The main State scheme in this State has been the subject of substantial review and adjustment over the past three years, and therefore the Government believes it is unacceptable to start another review of the schemes culminating in possible reductions in gross benefits;
- The funding arrangements by Governments are vastly different from those of private sector employers, and the

new tax collection system could not easily and equitably be applied within the Government arena;

- For the State to comply with the Commonwealth legislation would require an increase in State taxation.

The Bill clarifies the status of the fund, and the investment trust. Under the proposed amendment to the Act, the fund will hold assets of the Crown, and the investment trust will be an instrumentality of the Crown.

Government employees will in future pay their contributions initially to the Treasurer instead of paying their contributions initially to the Superannuation Board. The contributions will continue to be passed on to the trust for investment. All benefits under the schemes will continue to be guaranteed, but will now be paid by the Treasurer. The fund will exist as a Crown entity responsible for supporting the Treasurer in meeting the benefits to be paid under the Act.

The Government stresses that the effect of the main amendments mean that Government employees will continue to pay the full tax due on their superannuation benefits. There will be no avoidance of tax on benefits by public servants. However, the tax will continue to be paid at the time benefits are received, with no tax being paid before then, as the Commonwealth would prefer.

Essentially the proposed amendments, maintain the *status quo*. The level of net benefits payable to members of the scheme will be maintained, just as the net benefits of members in private sector schemes will be maintained. The Bill also contains many consequential technical amendments related to protecting the fund from tax. A minor amendment is also proposed to section 5 of the Act so that the Superannuation Board can enter into an arrangement with the Leader of the Opposition, for the purpose of providing superannuation eligibility for the Leader's staff, and matters of funding for the accruing liability.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act for the reason just stated.

Clause 3 makes it clear that the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust is an instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 4 amends section 12 to make it clear that the functions of the trust include the management and investment of funds related to public sector superannuation other than funds held in the South Australian Superannuation Fund. An example is contributions made by employers pursuant to arrangements under section 11 of the repealed Superannuation Act and under section 5 of the current Act.

Clause 5 replaces section 17 of the principal Act. New subsection (2) states that the fund belongs to the Crown. The importance of this is that property of the Crown in right of a State is not subject to Commonwealth taxation (section 114 of the Australian Constitution). The amendment to section 23 (1) made by the schedule to the Bill provides that contributions must be made to the Treasurer and not the fund. Subsection (4) of new section 17 requires the Treasurer to make payments to the fund reflecting these contributions.

Clause 6 repeals section 18 of the principal Act. The substance of this section is incorporated in the other provisions inserted by the Bill.

Clause 7 inserts new Division IIIA and IIIB of Part II. Division IIIA deals with contributor's accounts and Division IIIB deals with the payment of benefits. Benefits are paid from Consolidated Account (section 20b (1)) but to the extent that a payment is to be charged against a contributor's account the Treasurer can recoup the payment from the Fund. (section 20b (2)).

Clause 8 inserts new section 43a. This provision is equivalent to existing section 18 (3) (b) (i).

Clause 9 repeals section 60 which will be replaced by the appropriation provision in new section 20b (1).

Clause 10 inserts a schedule of consequential amendments.

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

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It incorporates several amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. The amendments concern the following matters:

1. Payment of Penalty Interest

The amendment to section 31 enables the payment of penalty interest where legal practitioners place trust moneys in non-trust accounts.

The amendment was requested by the Law Society. Concern was expressed that from time to time legal practitioners pay trust money into a non-trust account. In many instances the practitioners gain an interest benefit during the period that the money remains in the non-trust account. The amendment ensures a practitioner will be liable to pay penalty interest on the amount paid into the non-trust account. The penalty interest received or recovered by the society must be paid into the statutory interest account. Provision is made for the penalty to be remitted or reduced in proper circumstances. The amendment ensures that a legal practitioner will not benefit from the placing of trust moneys in a non-trust account.

2. Right of Appearance

The amendment to section 51 gives a right of audience before the courts to solicitors employed by community legal centres.

The South Australian Council of Community Legal Services Inc. (SACCLS) has made a number of ongoing representations to the Attorney-General to the effect that the Legal Practitioners Act ought to be amended to enable legal practitioners, who are employed by a community legal centre, to appear before the courts.

By virtue of section 51 of the Act, such legal practitioners are excluded from the right of appearance.

In consequence of this, community legal centres are effectively required to retain solicitors who practise on their own account and the additional costs associated with this have become excessive and will continue to do so.

This matter was raised with the Law Society and in November 1988 the Law Society Council resolved it did not object to section 51 being amended to allow a right of appearance for legal practitioners employed by community legal centres.

The amendments will grant legal practitioners employed by community legal centres a right of audience before courts and tribunals.

3. Payments from the Guarantee Fund

The Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund is established by section 57 of the Act. The fund is applied for a variety of purposes and no payment can be made from the fund except upon the authorisation of the Attorney-General.

One problem which is often encountered in authorising payments out of the fund relates to the gaining of information and details as to why the payment is required. If the matter is one being dealt with by the Complaints Committee, the provisions relating to non-disclosure of information (section 73) apply.

Provision is made by these amendments for the Attorney-General to be included in the class of persons to whom information can be divulged in section 73 (2). In addition, section 57 is amended to make clear that the Attorney-General can request information and explanations authorising payments from the fund.

4. Amendment to section 77 of the Legal Practitioners Act

The Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee has been involved for some time in a lengthy investigation. The conduct of the investigation and attendant court proceedings have highlighted some deficiencies in provisions of the Legal Practitioners Act relating to the conduct and reporting of committee proceedings.

The committee is prohibited from divulging any information relating to its affairs except as permitted by the Act. Section 77 of the Act provides that the committee must report to the Attorney-General if satisfied that evidence of unprofessional conduct exists. The section has been amended to provide that the committee must also report to the Attorney-General, where it is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to suspect a legal practitioner has committed an offence. The Attorney-General may request additional information and, if criminal proceedings are indicated, is empowered to take any action that may be appropriate for that purpose. This may include passing the information on to State or Federal prosecuting authorities. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement of the measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act to insert the definition of 'community legal centre' which is currently in section 57a (6). Clause 4 amends section 31 of the principal Act to provide that a legal practitioner who fails to deposit trust moneys in a trust account as required by the section is liable to pay the society interest on the amount of those moneys at the prescribed rate. When received or recovered such interest must be paid into the statutory interest account. The society may remit interest for any proper reason.

Clause 5 amends section 51 of the principal Act to give a legal practitioner employed by a community legal centre and acting in the course of that employment a right of audience before the courts and tribunals of this State. Clause 6 amends section 57 of the principal Act to give the Attorney-General power to require the society, the Legal Practitioners' Disciplinary Tribunal, the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee or any person engaged in the administration of the Act to provide such information and explanations as to the reason for a proposed payment out of the guarantee fund as the Attorney-General may reasonably require before authorising the payment. Clause 7 amends section 57a of the principal Act to remove the definition of 'community legal centre', consequential on the transfer of

the definition to section 5 of the principal Act. Clause 8 amends section 73 of the principal Act to authorise a member of the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee or a person employed or engaged on work related to the affairs of the committee to divulge information that comes to his or her knowledge by virtue of his or her position to the Attorney-General.

Clause 9 amends section 77 of the principal Act. New subsection (4) provides that if, in the course or in consequence of investigation of a complaint the committee is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a legal practitioner has committed an offence, the committee must immediately report the matter to the Attorney-General.

New subsection (5) requires the committee to furnish the Attorney-General (at his or her request) with any material in the committee's possession that is relevant to the investigation or prosecution of the suspected offence. New subsection (6) provides if it appears to the Attorney-General from a report or material so furnished that criminal proceedings should be taken against any person, the Attorney-General may take any action that may be appropriate for that purpose.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 September. Page 715.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Yesterday we heard the Leader of the Opposition give a finely detailed and comprehensive address, in which he provided a broad brush portrait of a Labor Government guilty of mismanagement, tired, and in decline. I think that those members of the House who were here in 1979 would recall that the Liberal Government which assumed office at that time gave to the people of South Australia a 10-year plan for the State's well-being. That plan included initiatives such as the O-Bahn rapid transport system, which was opened recently, with great pride, by the Premier—who had previously decried the scheme. The plan included the Stony Point petrochemical and pipeline project, a project which, incidentally, involved the fast track training through the Department of Technical and Further Education (and with the help of Commonwealth Industrial Gases) of some 400 people, both young and old, in the welding of mild steel so that the pipeline was completely constructed by South Australians without having to import people from overseas.

Recently, the Government announced a fast track program, pretending that it was a brand new initiative. In fact, it is 10 years old. The plan also included the Adelaide branch of the Department of Technical and Further Education, a project for which I obtained a commitment of some \$23 million from Liberal Federal Senators Carrick and Fife when they were Ministers of Education in the Federal Government. That was back in 1981-82.

The Roxby Downs project was also well advanced, with the indenture having been completed under the Liberal Government. I might comment here on the spurious claims made by a former Labor Minister (Hon. John Cornwall) who said that the Hon. Norm Foster was set up to support the Liberal Party in having the indenture Bill put through. I simply remind members of the House that the Bill was in fact defeated by the ALP and that there was no indication in that defeat that the Hon. Norm Foster was going to vote

for the Bill. In fact, he voted against it, but it was after the Bill had been recommitted by the Liberal Party that Mr Foster ultimately decided to support it, and see the legislation go through, in what is regarded by the Liberal Party as being a very wise move. The Hon. Norm Foster has, of course, rejected Mr Cornwall's claims as being absolute rubbish.

Also included in the Liberal Party 10-year plan were the establishment of Technology Park (which was commenced), the establishment of the South Australian Financing Authority (which went ahead in 1982-83), the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank, the establishment of Port Adelaide as a very viable container port and the completion of the Finger Point sewerage scheme (which works are soon to be opened, on 21 September). These initiatives, and many more besides, were part of that Liberal Government's 10-year plan for South Australia. I think it would be plainly obvious to members of this House and to the general public that over the past seven or eight years the Labor Government has ridden on the back of that plan, has been proud to announce many of the initiatives as its own, and indeed has initiated very little of its own accord.

Oddly enough, in 1985 the Labor Government was desperate to oppose privatisation—in fact, privatisation which even the Liberal Party had not proposed to undertake. But since then it has of its own accord privatised a great deal of South Australia by liquidating many of the State's assets, including schools, Government properties, STA Roadliner, and much of the north-south corridor, which would have been invaluable for establishing a rapid transport scheme from the north to the south of the city of Adelaide. In privatising or selling off these assets it has realised tens of millions of dollars in the process.

I refer to the member for Hartley's contribution last evening, when again he tried to claim that the Labor Government had inherited a deficit of \$63 million in 1982. In fact, that \$63 million deficit was the result of the 1982-83 budget, the spending of which lay well and truly in the hands of the Labor Party. Indeed, between the 1982 election and the end of June 1982 the Labor Government reallocated substantial funding, to the extent that, for example, the Minister of Education cancelled the Kingston Area School project, which we had approved at a cost of about \$6 million, and instead reallocated funds across the board to projects of its own priority.

To suggest, therefore, that the \$63 million deficit can be laid at the doorstep of the Liberal Government, which lost office in 1982, is absolutely specious. However, even more important than that is the picture that one can ascertain from a quick examination of the borrowings of the State. I mentioned during the Address in Reply that the Tonkin Government had borrowed only \$104 million in 1979-82, over a three-year period. Those very small borrowings of \$104 million make that claimed \$63 million deficit look very small indeed, when one compares the absolutely massive borrowings, the record-breaking borrowings, which were entered into by the Bannon Labor Government from 1982 to 1985. Those borrowings totalled almost \$1 billion.

In three years the Labor Government borrowed 10 times more than was the case during the three years of the Tonkin Government from 1979 to 1982. This really places the whole of the Tonkin Government's regime in a much clearer light and absolutely makes arrant nonsense of the claims of the member for Hartley (Mr Groom) that the Liberal Government from 1979 to 1982 mismanaged the State's affairs. In fact, we were the most prudent managers of South Australia's finances of any Government over the previous 20 or 30 years—including the so-called halcyon days of the

Playford Government, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford's Government being in office for some 26 years.

It is perfectly obvious, too, that the Government itself has realised the abject folly of the excessive borrowings made from 1982 to 1985, because in the last two or three years it has of its own accord reined in its borrowings to the extent that, instead of doubling up from \$1 billion to \$2 billion in the next three years, it has restrained borrowings to increase only to \$1.3 billion, from 1982 to 1989. However, \$1.3 billion is still a massive sum. When one looks at the borrowings statistics, one can easily see that in 1982 the State's commitment to principal and interest payments on borrowings was just a little over \$200 million per annum. The commitments to principal and interest repayments, according to the Auditor-General's Report handed down yesterday, are now \$430 million per annum. In other words, the repayments have doubled in the past seven years. It had taken all of South Australia's history to get up to \$200 million: it took only another seven years to get up to \$400 million for repayment of principal and interest.

There is another important point which members who have spoken on the other side have completely ignored. This is the fact that, as to the \$4 billion debt currently owing by South Australia, \$3 billion of that debt is due to be repaid. What will happen, of course, is that in all probability it will be rolled over. It could be rolled over at a substantially increased interest rate. I suggest that that is far more likely than not. Therefore, one might be looking at substantially more than the \$400 million per annum repayments in principal and interest from 1992-93 onwards. In other words, the millstones around the necks of South Australia's children are well and truly there, and they have been placed there by this Labor Government.

Additionally, South Australia can hardly claim to have been under taxed in the past seven or eight years. The budget reached \$2 billion by 1982. In the following seven years, it increased from \$2 billion to \$5 billion income, again a massive increase associated with that massive increase in the State's debt. The mathematics are incontrovertible. They are in the Auditor-General's Report year by year for anyone to check, and it just highlights that South Australia has been a very high borrowing and high taxing State from 1982 to 1989, a situation which has thrown it vastly out of kilter with that which existed in 1982 when we were among the lowest taxed and the most favoured States for industrial development, because our charges were favourable for people coming into South Australia.

The Auditor-General's Report bears close scrutiny, and I refer members of the House and members of the public to pages i to xxv where the Auditor-General repeatedly, in nine or 10 instances, points to areas of concern, areas of mismanagement, areas which he has highlighted in previous years but on which his recommendations appear to have been largely ignored by the Government. If I have time—and I notice it is flying past rather quickly—I will expand on the Auditor-General's comments, but meanwhile I point out that he regards the present Government as one which is too ready to take risks.

Along with the South Australian Financing Authority, it has become increasingly entrepreneurial. Anyone who realises what the stockmarket is like and what gaming and betting at the casino or on horse racing are like will simply realise that entrepreneurial activities involving State finances are using taxpayers' money to satisfy the Government's gambling instinct to some extent. That is simply not on. The Government should be in the game of providing essential services and not competing in entrepreneurial activities with private enterprise.

Another fact to which I draw the attention of the House is one that attracted questions today and which, in some way, is worthy of applause. The Government is trying by its HomeStart scheme to encourage families to buy their first home. This scheme completely ignores the vast majority of South Australians who are already buying a house on a substantial mortgage and paying interest rates of 17 per cent or thereabouts. It does nothing at all to help them.

However, the Minister was ready to ridicule the member for Bragg when he drew attention to the fact that someone on a \$60 000 mortgage would be up for about \$440 000 in interest at the end of the Government's proposed 27 year term. My own mathematics have been somewhat simpler and I have only extrapolated figures for the first four years. This is what happens on the maximum proposed loan of \$109 200 which a family borrows at 15 per cent over 27 years and makes repayments at \$813 per month. The interest on that \$109 200 at 15 per cent amounts to \$16 380 in the first year. This is added to the principal sum. My figures err on the side of generosity, because the banks assess their payments on a monthly basis at the very best. Very few do it on a fortnightly, weekly or daily basis, whereas I have been generous in calculating this on an annual basis. Therefore, my figures are on the low side.

In the first year, the mortgagee would pay \$9 756 on the Government's set figure which, when deducted from the interest that has fallen due, would leave a deficit of \$6 624 to be added to the \$109 200. At the end of the first year that leaves an increased sum of \$115 824. At the end of the second year, again by paying the same amount of principal and interest (although it is largely interest because the principal is never arrived at), the increment to the base sum is \$7 547, leaving a net amount of \$123 371. At the end of the third year, the mortgagee owes \$132 120 and at the end of the fourth year, \$142 182. At some stage, of course, the Government proposes to increase the annual repayments.

I simply ask the Minister, who was so glib this afternoon and who tried to ridicule the member for Bragg, what the inflation rate would be on a \$39 000 salary, which is the figure that this is worked out on, if that wage earner were to earn an extra \$6 624 in the first year, an extra \$7 547 in the second year, an extra \$8 749 in the third year, and an extra \$10 062 in the fourth year, simply to maintain the interest rate on that original debt of \$109 200. The Minister and those in the real estate industry and the banking industry who have come out today in the daily press applauding this scheme must obviously have one thing only in mind, and that is to build more houses so that they will benefit from people borrowing to buy them. They have absolutely no thought at all in mind for the mortgagee who, after the first four years on a \$109 000 loan at a set repayment of \$9 756, is faced with more than \$33 000 additional on the original debt.

I ask members of the House to check those simple mathematics. As I said, they err on the side of generosity, because they are annual increments instead of monthly compounding figures which the banks and building societies work on. They are also generous because, if more is repaid, the repayments are reduced on a monthly basis. In order to pay more, one would have to earn thousands of dollars extra per year. The simple question at the end of that is: if the Minister believes that that can be done, that the value of the house will increase annually so that the people are still sitting on a capital gain, what sort of inflation rate does the Minister predict for South Australia and for Australia in promulgating with such tremendous enthusiasm his HomeStart scheme? I ask members of the House to reflect on that.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I also would like to address the direction of the budget and the recent announcement by the Premier of the HomeStart scheme. I question the morality of the scheme that is predicated on the basis that people's overall debt profile will increase over time. That is quite counter to the way in which the housing market has operated in the past. The Minister gaily told the House that property values will increase and, therefore, the proportion of equity in a house will increase as a result. I can assure the House that he is using some highly optimistic figures in taking that stance because, as we all know, there have been major losses in property values on the fringes of Adelaide. Those are the areas where many first home buyers settle and they are also the areas that do not have a very large escalation figure in terms of values. For example, last year property values fell in both real and absolute terms.

If we looked at the present situation, we would find that the equity in property would decrease over time. The Minister has not revealed the basis for his calculations. In the first place, it is immoral to say that we will assume that the debt profile will decrease and, as a consequence, we will not give people the opportunity to get in front. Secondly, in making these calculations, it is immoral to assume that houses purchased by such people for less than \$125 000 will increase at an average rate. Everyone knows the areas of Adelaide subject to the greatest escalation in values are those closest to the city where property values have increased enormously in recent years. If one takes a good hard look at the scheme one would question whether one should be involved.

My major criticism of the budget relates to the fact that it is a Father Christmas budget. I brought my Father Christmas tie with me in order to lend it to the Premier so that he can look the part when he delivers his election campaign speech. Fortunately, no-one really believes in Father Christmas. The fact is that this budget has been put together on the basis that there will be some real problems in 1990-91, but we will get over the situation now.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is right, we will have an early Christmas and pay for this later. The member for Bright raises a very good point. I must congratulate him. It is a bit like people shopping in the main stores at Christmas, putting all their purchases on credit and, in March and April, finding they have to pay the bills. Of course, that creates a great deal of pressure for families. It is a very good analogy because that is exactly what is happening with this budget.

The question of how one finances a budget is very important, because it means that if one uses all revenue sources in any one year, and the prospect of those revenue bases being maintained is somehow diminished, there will be problems in future years. In simple terms, the Government has called up its revenue options for this year, and has set aside cynically \$60 million from last year's SAFA operations for an election year. It added to that sum a projected profit in 1989-90 of about \$325 million.

Members should well recall that, while SAFA is a very profitable organisation, its ability to make that \$325 million must be questionable given that, in the past two years, the figures have been \$279 million and \$287 million, respectively, and that is against a background of record interest rates. However, even if SAFA does come in on target, and makes \$325 million, the question remains: what has been put away in reserves this year? Nothing has been put away. How can the Government sustain the extra \$60 million that has been placed in the budget from the previous years' operations, that is, up to \$385 million? How does one

replace the loss of Federal Government grants, which will occur next year, given that the Premier was given a one-off benefit of \$52 million this year? We are now up to \$437 million. That is in absolute terms. Of course, in real terms, that is well in excess of \$450 million. It just does not equate. How does the Premier intend to find \$450 million from one of these external sources—as I call SAFA—which provides finance?

We on this side of the House would be the first to congratulate the South Australian Government Financing Authority for the way it has brought together the resources—the hollow logs and assets—of the Government and utilised them to the benefit of South Australians. However, to my mind, it is quite impossible for the Government to earn the return that will be necessary to sustain the 1989-90 budget. It is absolutely impossible. The Premier has set out cynically on a path of wooing the voter—buying votes. He is keeping the revenue collections reasonable or neutral and will continue his expenditure programs but, in 1990-91, we will face some huge problems with the revenue budget.

I refer members to page 13 of the Auditor-General's Report, which contains a very revealing graph. It shows the debt profile of the State Government. Of course, it is no accident that a peaking of the debt maturity occurs during the year after an election. If it came during an election year, we would then see in vivid colour the extent to which the Government would then have to use other resources to ensure the maintenance of the funding flow. At page 13 an excellent chart shows that in 1990 an excess of \$750 million in debt will come due. That debt must be rolled over.

The Opposition does not have sufficient information at this stage to establish the profile of that debt and that will have to be questioned at a later date. However, I suggest that the cost of rolling that debt over will be quite considerably more than the level at which it was incurred, despite the fact that the Loan Council does allow for rolling over of debt—so that we do not have the constraints of global limits—and despite the fact that the financial market provides opportunities for alternative arrangements. That lumping will cause serious problems for the State Government in 1990-91.

We will see a further lumping as we enter 1992 and through to 1997. On average, over \$500 million must be found each year to roll over the debt. As my colleagues have pointed out, and as has been pointed out more recently by the member for Mount Gambier, debt is a serious problem. We have created a millstone for our children. This is a dishonest budget; it is a budget that has been cynically devised to get over an election. It shows no thought of the future, and shows no direction whatsoever. It is important for people to look at the weight of documents we have before us. The Financial Statement is a very comprehensive document which comprises some 207 pages. We have 'The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy' comprising 33 pages, but the one that rather intrigued me, and it comprises 158 pages, is 'The Budget and its Impact on Women'.

Mr Hamilton: What's wrong with that?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Albert Park says, 'What's wrong with that?' I question the intentions of any Government which puts out 158 pages on the impact of the budget on women but does not put out 158 pages on the direction of this State. There is nothing in the budget to give South Australians any hope that things will improve under a Labor Government. We find not one solid statement, not one direction and nothing to look forward to under Labor. We know that there will be a Christmas present in 1989-90; we know that we will have to pay the bills in 1990-91; but there is nothing in this document to say

that Premier Bannon has a vision for this State and that it is being implemented in this budget.

I ask people to look at the construction of the budget. I refer to the areas of State development and industrial relations, which are important components in respect of what the Government could be doing to assist this State. Anyone who has looked through the expenditure statements in both those areas would not get the impression that the Government is interested in improving the quality of life or economic opportunities in this State.

I do not necessarily say that we need to spend big dollars to achieve a lot. In fact, a Liberal Government could cut costs and achieve far more. Importantly, when we talk about improving the quality of life through economic development and look at the strategies being pursued by the Government, we have to refer to the economic documents. In respect of 'strategic planning' we are told that in 1989-90 \$1.3 million will be spent on strategic planning, and for 1989 it was \$1.25 million. So the Government is saying that we are doing all right in that area, that it should not spend any more money and does not need any more strategic planning.

The same picture emerges in respect of the 'encouragement of investment', program. The only area that gets a lift is 'State marketing and promotion.' We are not too sure how effective is that program. It is really the only area of the State Development and Technology portfolio that gets a boost under this Government. It is interesting to note that last year the 'Encouragement of regional development' program received \$6.25 million and this year it is down to \$6.175 million.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: The Auditor-General does not hand out too many bouquets.

Mr S.J. BAKER: No, the Auditor-General does not hand out too many bouquets. We do not need to spend money to achieve. If we look at quality in the context of the budget and its lines and ask, 'Where are we going?', we find that the approach is a 'steady as you go', 'don't make too many waves', 'try to keep everybody happy'. It does not show any leadership or direction. This budget is leaderless, directionless and has nothing for South Australians to look forward to. There are no statements in this budget about reforms to industrial relations. There are no statements about assisting ailing industries or setting in place means by which they can be changed. Budget time is the moment when Government has the opportunity to stand on its feet and tell the population of South Australia exactly what it intends for this State. I am sure that the budget papers contain no reference to future directions, because the Government has none.

So, when I ask why the Government puts out a statement comprising 158 pages on the budget and its impact on women, I also ask everyone in this House, 'Where is our sense of priorities?' Surely, if the Government wants to make a statement on women as a separate entity, it could also take the time and effort to talk about the economic future of this State in more detail than just picking up occasional statistics which show that South Australia is doing moderately well against most of the statistics which show that it is doing abysmally. Why do we not have this in the budget statement and why are not the major areas of economic activity addressed in a very strong, forceful and futuristic fashion, because that is what the people of South Australia are looking for? They are not interested in the 158 pages of 'The Budget and its Impact on Women'.

Ms Gayler: Speak for yourself!

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am sure that there are some elements in it. The member for Newland says 'Speak for yourself', but I question—

The Hon. H. Allison: The member for Tea Tree Gully!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the member for Tea Tree Gully. She forgets where she is. She has an identity and location crisis. The major statement is 'Economic Conditions and the Budget', which is financial information paper No. 2. It comprises 42 pages against 158 pages for 'The budget and its impact on women'. I ask you! We all know that the most important thing for Government is to provide conditions whereby we can all improve our lot in life. That must be through a strong and robust economy, yet we are told what is the status quo in 'Economic Conditions and the Budget'. It takes up 42 pages without giving any idea of where we are going. I am disappointed.

I am disappointed in the way the budget has been put together. I am disappointed for South Australians that the Premier has again been dishonest with the population of this State. The Premier hopes that South Australians will not realise that next year taxes and charges will have to rise significantly to pay the bills. There are no golden eggs or a golden goose to suddenly supply the extra funds necessary to sustain this budget. The Government has one of two choices: it can viciously cut into the services that it wishes to maintain or, alternatively, it can go out and further tax the population of South Australia. If the track record of the Labor Government is any guide, it will be the taxpayers of South Australia who will be paying the bills.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The budget with which we have been presented this year is disappointing: there is no other way of describing it. Members of the public who have heard the budget speech and read the reports in the newspaper the following day would have looked for respite from the high water rates, bus fares, escalating council rates, petrol prices and any other charges connected with the cost of living. However, they would not have found it. There is no respite in the budget and, despite the way the Premier and his staff have tried to sell it as a responsible budget for the future of South Australia—a budget to take this State into the 1990s—there is no future in it for those people. There is no hope in the budget and it is not a budget about which we can become excited or say that the Bannon Government has achieved something for South Australia. It is steady as she goes, hold the line, hold back on any semblance of price rise or increase until we get past the election due some time in the next few weeks. That is what the budget is written for.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member for Albert Park calls me cynical, but he knows that I am not cynical. He was involved in the writing of the budget and the deliberations that went on behind the scenes. He knows what the electorate out there is saying. He knows how cynical the electorate has become towards the Labor Party. That is why he knows that the Labor Party is in extreme trouble.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: There is no problem with the Liberal Party. We have put out a very positive alternative, and the polls are showing it. But the cynicism that is out there is reflected in the budget. Therefore, I would like to use the opportunity of the budget reply to refer to a newspaper which, no doubt, members opposite have read. I know that the member for Briggs is pretty pleased about it, because his photograph appears in it. I indicate for readers of *Hansard* that the newspaper, with the Premier on the front page, was produced by the Labor Party. It is headed 'The 1990s:

Answering the Challenge'. One can go through the newspaper which doubtless is being distributed to all the marginal seats—

Mr Robertson: How did you get a copy?

Mr OSWALD: I got it from the electorate of Walsh, but I have no doubt that the ALP will distribute it in the electorate of Morphett and the various western suburbs in an attempt to sell a budget that is not sustainable. If members read this newspaper, which is put out in a form similar to the Messenger Press, they will see that it is a deceptive and dishonest document which just does not stand up. I would now like to take up a few minutes in the debate to go through the newspaper and point out a few areas where it does not stand up.

We have a Premier who has run the State over the past four or five years and who plays the game of deception politics. He plays politics by press release, making press releases when he has a problem and putting out documents to try to cover or muddy the water whenever he is in trouble. This newspaper is no different. The opening letter from Premier Bannon states:

The priorities we set ourselves in the budget were to keep down the level of Government spending so we don't have to increase taxes and charges . . .

Let me take up that point. What did the Labor Government do? I refer to the deception of raising charges before the budget was announced so that the Government could come out on budget day and say, 'Ladies and gentlemen of South Australia, we are not increasing any charges.' If that is not deception taken to the nth degree, I do not know what is. The member for Hartley is about to interject, but I am not sure what he is going to say. I am ready for it, but there is nothing that he can say.

The fact is that the charges were increased beforehand, allowing the Premier to play his game of deception politics. In this way, the increased charges were all out of the way before the budget was handed down. The Premier talks in terms of keeping down the level of Government spending. All members know that the level of Government spending in this State has never been higher. The budget with which we were presented last week shows that there is not any respite. Before we even leave the front page of this ALP newspaper we can see that it is a document of sheer deception and dishonesty, a document to try to snare those who read this type of publication. The Labor Party hopes it will be read by people who believe such documents. I now refer to page 2, although my eyes keep creeping to page 3 and the picture of Mike Rann, who is described as the Deputy Chairperson of the Aged Care Task Force.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: He is a handsome bloke. Why is the Government hiding the Chairperson and promoting only the Deputy Chairperson? Has the Government chosen for political or other reasons to promote only the Deputy Chairperson? As this involves a colleague of mine in the western suburbs, I would surely have expected his photo to have appeared in the newspaper instead of that of the ex member for Briggs. Perhaps it is part of the move to get publicity for the honourable member in order to get him into the Ministry. There has to be some reason, because the Labor Party never does anything without a reason. I guess it is to promote the honourable member in an attempt to get him onto the front bench. I now refer to the following statement that appears on page 1 of the newspaper:

For jobs in the 1990s the right sort of economic development will provide us and our children with secure jobs. Tourism and exports are two areas that we have to concentrate on seriously if we want to increase the number of jobs available.

If that is not a fairy floss statement, I do not know what is. South Australia's unemployment rate is the highest on the mainland. Does anyone dispute that? Our July rate is 1.5 per cent higher than the national average and almost 3 per cent above the rate in Victoria. What sort of fairy floss stuff is this that the Premier is putting out to try to muddy the waters and confuse the issue out there, when we know what the facts are? The statements in this newspaper just do not stand up. The unemployment rate amongst our young people (15 years to 19 years) is disastrous.

What is particularly worrying about that is that 1 500 additional South Australians became unemployed in July and almost half of those are aged between 15 and 19 years. Yet the Premier puts out these documents to make it look as if the unemployment graph will spear downwards immediately after this budget is accepted and put into action. Our unemployment rate among this vital 15 years to 19 years age group is the highest on the mainland. This budget will do nothing to bring down that rate. If we are looking at the question of future job creations, the area of investment trends is the most reliable guide to our future employment prospects. Let us summarise what is happening in South Australia. First, new private capital expenditure in the first nine months of 1988-89 is down 10 per cent (in 1989 dollars) compared with the same period last year; secondly, spending on equipment, plant and machinery is down 13 per cent; and thirdly, construction is down 1.2 per cent. Our share of the international domestic tourism market has declined according to the budget papers with which we have been presented.

These are not my words—they are contained in the budget papers. The outlook for the next 12 months points to further slowing of the economy. The reason given in the budget papers is reduced consumer confidence. If we have a situation as the budget papers declare of reduced consumer confidence, how can the Government come out with these fairy floss documents and claim that job creation is assured for 1990 because of the Bannon budget which has just been brought down? The budget's only purpose—let me be frank about it—is to get the Government over the hurdle of the forthcoming election.

An honourable member: It won't work.

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says, it just will not work. The overriding factor in South Australia is the lack of investor confidence. If investor confidence comes back into this State, we will see job creation start to take off again. So much for the Bannon Government's claim of good job prospects for the 1990s.

I now go a little further into the document and look at education. Headed 'Education for Life in the 21st Century', it states:

This year's education budget is the biggest ever, emphasising our determination to give our children a proper start in life.

Every Government should aim to give its young people a proper start in life. The reality is that the Bannon Government has downgraded the importance of education. In case members react to this claim, let me put some facts on the record. I recall clearly back in 1985 the Labor election promise when the Premier said, 'I give South Australian parents a guarantee that there will be no funding cuts to schools.' In 1985-86, which was the time of the last election, recurrent spending on education was 22.2 per cent of the total budget. It has declined a further 3.6 per cent since then. Premier Bannon's fraudulent figures can also be applied to teacher numbers. We all remember in 1985 when the Premier announced his policy, which went as follows:

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

The Hon. H. Allison: Famous last words.

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Mount Gambier said, famous last words. The budget papers show a decline of 700 teachers over the past four years. Since 1982 when the Labor Party incited strikes through the Institute of Teachers to try to bring down the Tonkin Government teacher numbers have declined by 850. That is on the record; anyone who takes the time to look it up will see that that is correct.

Let us look at the matter of ancillary staff. During the last election campaign in 1985 the Premier committed his Government to providing 100 new ancillary staff teachers each year for schools. This budget promised to increase ancillary staff with the provision of 100 extra staff for a total increase of 400 ancillary staff numbers. Yet, when one closely examines the white documents that were presented with the budget they prove that the total increase of ancillary staff in relation to full-time equivalents has only been 64.8 positions since 1985. So much for the honesty of this newsletter that is doing the rounds of my electorate and other western suburbs electorates. It is a newsletter that is deceptive and dishonest and which the Government is using to get it past the next election. The next heading is entitled 'A quality public health system'. The newsletter states:

In 1989-90, more than \$1.06 billion will be spent on the health system in South Australia—that's \$750 for each South Australian. It talks about providing money for coping with the increasing demands on our hospital system and cutting down waiting lists. The newsletter points out what the Premier's market surveys tell him are the areas of public concern. He is playing perception politics. He knows what the people want to hear.

But, let us look at the real facts. The Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Health in the *Advertiser* of 28 August said that health had a record \$1.06 billion allocation. This compares with an allocation of \$1.02 billion last financial year. If one does one's sums this equates to a real cut in the health budget of 3 per cent—not a real increase. The feedback from the public hospitals does not support any of the claims that are made in this scurrilous newsletter that is being put around by the Government to shore up its support in marginal seats.

Another issue that the surveys told the Government it had to identify was crime prevention. What does the newsletter state? Under the heading 'A safe, secure community'—and no-one disagrees with that—the newsletter states:

We all want to live in a safe, secure community. Therefore, the budget concentrates on providing money to make sure the police have resources to do their job and also to involve the community in crime prevention. This budget being a \$10 million crime prevention program which will provide an extra 122 police officers by the end of next year . . .

I turn my attention to the extra 122 police officers that will be provided by the end of next year. The Government has tried to paint the picture that it wants to do something about the desire of the public that the police come to grips with this rapid increase in crime that we now have. The Government hopes that by saying that it will provide 122 police officers by the end of the year everyone will be happy. Law and order has become the centre of the Government's whole strategy—this extra 122 police by 31 December 1990. However, when one examines the budget papers one finds that they reveal that only 55 of those officers, at the most, will be employed by June 1990 on police general duties. As my Leader pointed out in his budget speech yesterday, that is on general duties. We want to see more police on the beat. That is the crux of the matter. An amount of \$215 000 this financial year will be provided for those extra police, so obviously the additional officers will not be recruited until well into 1990; and, when they are, that number will

only cover the number of police officers who will leave the force this financial year.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: That is incorrect.

Mr OSWALD: It comes straight out of the budget papers. The Minister can reply to it later, but the budget papers reveal a reduction of 48.3 per cent over the past 12 months in average Police Department employment. If the Minister is saying that this will be discussed in the Estimates Committees, that will be the appropriate place to sort it out. The public is concerned about the massive increase in crime, and I will place on record some of its concerns. For every 100 000 South Australians, violent crimes increased by 92 from 1981-82 when the Tonkin Government came to office to 186 on the last available figure, a massive increase of 102 per cent. The rate of property crime increased by 43 per cent; break-ins rose by 117 per cent; robberies increased by 75 per cent; rapes and attempted rapes rose by 182 per cent and drug offences rose by 152 per cent.

It is little wonder with this rapidly rising crime rate and declining resources that police morale is at an all time low. I take the Minister's offer to sort out once and for all during the Estimates Committees the issue of police numbers. I hope that they have not dropped; it would be a disaster if they did. I am a great supporter of the police and, if I had my way, I would substantially increase the police budget and put far more policemen on the beat. I have some very firm views that I will put into operation as soon as we come to Government.

The last matter I have time to mention is the section of the newsletter entitled 'Security, respect and care for the aged'. I have now had an opportunity to read the Government's aged document which is a very good document because it was pirated from a document prepared by the Liberal Party. I was one of its authors. I spent many months with the Hon. Miss Laidlaw and a couple of other colleagues writing that document. It would be flattering to say that when I read the Labor Government's document I could see it 'me-too-ed' us right through the whole document. If that is flattery I suppose we can accept it. If it did nothing else when we produced that document but make the Government pick up the initiatives we put forward for the betterment of the aged, then it achieved something even at this early stage. There is no doubt that as we went through that document page by page and line by line it contained no initiative that the Labor Party did not grab hold of, cost out, and run with as if it was its own.

This particular newsletter contains all the Liberal Party's initiatives. It is a Liberal Party document revisited. The Liberal Party costed it and put it out in numbers. It is interesting to see that when we announced that we would have a Minister for the Aged, the Labor Party created a Minister for the Aged; that as soon as we announced that we would have concessions for the aged, the Labor Party brought those concessions in; and when we announced senior citizens cards and so on the Labor Party announced it to.

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

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The important thing in this debate is to look at what the Government is really trying to achieve. I see that the member for Briggs is still with us—at least he was a second ago. He is not with us now. I wish to draw attention to the kind of activity in which he is most skilful. I do not detract from his ability to use words—not at all. To that extent he is clever in the way in which he handles subjects in this Chamber and elsewhere.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Who are you talking about?

Mr LEWIS: I am talking about the member for Briggs. He is clever—but that does not mean he is honest, accurate, fair and informative. I have only said that he is clever.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You are being quite unusually complimentary to that member. I have never heard such praise being poured upon him before.

Mr LEWIS: I would not necessarily agree with the member for Alexandra on that point. In fact, cleverness is not necessarily a commendable quality unless it is put to the use and well-being of society at large. I know that the member for Briggs could well take my words and use them as though they were intended to mean that—but indeed anything but that is the case. The member for Briggs, in fact, does no service to the community at all when he applies that considerable capacity he has for articulating ideas in the way that he does. Without being the least bit facetious, I have to acknowledge that he often fabricates a point of view and a statement on a matter of public importance to suit the stance that he has recommended to his Party colleagues, obviously including the Premier.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler): Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat for a moment. I remind the member that this is not a grievance debate, that we are debating the budget and that his comments must be related to that.

Mr LEWIS: This brings me to the very point: it is the skill of the member for Briggs in fabricating things that the Government relies on to put together a statement, such as that which accompanies the facts and figures of the budget, to make it sound as though it is in the interests of South Australia and all the people who live here.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Even though it may not necessarily be truthful?

Mr LEWIS: It does not necessarily have to bear any resemblance to accuracy whatever, in terms of the way it is interpreted, the form of words that are used. That is what the member for Briggs did professionally for the Premier before he became a member of this place—as the member for Alexandra and other members present would recognise. The member for Briggs is indeed a fabricator *par excellence*. The way in which the budget has been framed, in terms of wording, is clearly the kind of thing that the member for Briggs does very well at. I am not sure that he did not write the Premier's speech or the comments explaining the budget and the sorts of programs that it is said to initiate.

The kind of perception which the member for Briggs and, indeed, the Premier then seek to project through the remarks made about the proposed expenditure is that it is in the best interests of all South Australians, that it will enhance their common welfare and that it will improve the overall capacity of the State to support the people who live here now or who will live here in future, either by an accident of fate in that they are born here or by choice in moving here. Of course, fewer people are moving here than are moving away. We have figures which clearly demonstrate that South Australia is the worst off of all the States when it comes to establishing the position in relation to net migration gain or loss.

As was pointed out by the member for Mount Gambier in the course of his remarks, it is a fact that up until 1982 the State had a budget which did not exceed \$2 billion—in our terms that means \$2 000 million. The size of Government receipts and expenditure had been lower than that prior to 1982. Yet, since that time, in a mere seven years, during which the Labor Party has been in office, the size of the take and the expenditure has grown from that figure to over \$5 billion this year. Yet, the Premier claims that

this is a State which is attractive to enterprise, to people who wish to invest, providing not only themselves with an income but also jobs for others. If spending more money in the public sector is the way to prosperity and industrial strength and well-being, I am a monkey's uncle.

We are quite mistaken if we think that the way to encourage enterprise of any kind is to increase taxation, direct or indirect, on a population. When we raise revenue we are taxing the efforts of the population at large. In all enterprises in which that tax is paid by people or businesses that do not export from this country, they must pass the cost of that taxation along to their customers, whoever they might be.

Therefore, ultimately, two things happen. The first is that there is less money: that is, less of the effort of the general public is left to them in terms of money to spend in a way that they would choose. The Government has decided that it has the wisdom to spend the money that they have earned—to expend, as it were, the value of their efforts in their name and on their behalf. The Government has decided that they as individuals do not have the wit or wisdom to decide for themselves how best to expend that additional proportion of the productive output of their efforts which the Government has taken from them. That is the first point.

The second point is that the incidence of those costs, the costs of taxation, are passed on and end up being met in a loss of income to exporters, in cash terms. That therefore impairs the viability of all the enterprises in this State which could contribute to the State and to the nation's prosperity by earning income from outside our national economy. Every time taxation is increased we marginally destroy the viability of enterprises that are dependent upon world prices for their product or services. A price taker on world markets, as all exporters are, cannot simply increase the price and expect the rest of the world to pay that increased price just because it was a price considered necessary to sustain the same level of profitability or reduce the level of loss. We are competing on world markets with other people—the local producers of the same goods and services within the countries to which we are exporting—or indeed, with the competitive exporter nations providing goods to those importer markets.

So, to that extent, expanding the size of the public sector, expanding the size of the tax take and the expenditure made with that tax revenue so obtained is done to the detriment of those industries. When I refer to exports and industries engaged in export I also include those industries which are engaged in import substitution. They are enterprises which make things that we could make here and perhaps do make here but which we are at present importing from elsewhere, either wholly or partly. Every time we increase the costs through our economy by increasing taxation, those costs are passed on by those supplying services, and producing the goods that are manufactured here in Australia, to the Australian customers who use them, and the money ends up in the pockets of the people in those enterprises, detracting from the bank balances of those people who are engaged in exports or in import substitution production.

Import substitution production is at present vital to this State and this nation, because we have a parlous state of affairs in our balance of payments deficit. We need to increase our exports and establish viable import substitute industries. Therefore, Government policy, whenever it expands the size of the public sector, is directly detrimentally affecting the viable prospects of being able to do that in the private sector. Governments cannot make wealth. Governments do not create prosperity. People and enter-

prises do that. Governments merely take the wealth from those people and enterprises and redistribute it. Those who imagine otherwise are kidding themselves.

Our State's history, especially during 20 of the past 25 years when the Labor Party has been in office, is replete with examples of where Government attempts to engage in enterprise have been abject failures. Among the most scandalous of those examples has been the kind of problem to which the member for Victoria has drawn attention in recent times, involving the South Australian Timber Corporation. It is an ill-advised exercise on the part of this Government to have become involved in such a commercial activity, as the facts put before the House by the member for Victoria, my Leader and others, testify.

A glaring example of the stupidity of that policy and the anomalies which it exposes, which are unforgivable, is that we are paying money to a lost situation commercially in New Zealand in order to prop it up. The Government tries to continue to hide that matter by juggling figures in a fashion that only the member for Briggs is an expert at doing, such as in the case of SAFA deciding to take equities and then writing off those equities in that enterprise so that it does not look as though it is such a loss-making exercise.

Worse than that is this broken down mill which was procured in the South Island of New Zealand against the sound advice of people employed by the Government, such as the Auditor-General, and paying rates to the New Zealand local government authority, as well as taxes to the New Zealand National Government, while the South Australian Woods and Forests Department does not pay rates on its forests here in South Australia.

This Government, which is engaging in an enterprise not even based in or providing employment in this State, cannot afford to go outside this State and continue engaging in an exercise that loses money. Part of the expense involved in that exercise is to pay rates and taxes to a foreign Government and a foreign local government organisation. That is disgusting! The skill with which this Government is covering the kinds of scandals which it has erected in its ill-advised attempts to become involved in private enterprise is very alarming to me.

A further example is the Clothing Corporation, another ill-advised enterprise into which the Government decided to invest as an excursion, and on which it has lost more than \$1 million over the past two years. Did you know that, Mr Acting Speaker? I wonder! Well, let me assure you that my facts are absolutely impeccable in their accuracy because my source is the Auditor-General's Report. The corporation lost \$591 000 last financial year. In fact, it would have been \$700 000 if the Central Linen Service, another Government enterprise, had charged for all the management services which it provided to the corporation. So, add that to the losses of the previous year, totalling \$1.087 million, and it has been kept afloat by Government grants of \$729 000 and, again, the South Australian Financing Authority's decision to write off loans of \$600 000. The jolly thing cannot be made profitable by manipulating the figures.

This business of fabricating a result to suit the perception one wishes to set in the mind of the public is catching up with the Bannon Government, and I hope that journalists pay heed. It is not good enough to use the services of skilled fabricators to con the public. That is what Goebbels did, and that is disgusting. That kind of treatment of the truth should have no place in our society.

Not only is it up to the Opposition to draw attention to what is happening in that regard but, more importantly, it is up to the journalists of the day to publish the facts so that the public of South Australia know what has been

happening to their tax dollars and why we have had a budget this year which, in its total outlay, is 2.5 times greater than it was when this Government came to office in late 1982. If the Government is not embarrassed by those kinds of revelations, and if the journalists are not motivated to write about them because they are too busy listening to the fabricators who would tell them something different, both the Government and the journalists need to hang their heads in shame for ignoring their responsibilities to a democratic society and ignoring their responsibilities to the public interest, the welfare and the common good of the people of South Australia. I refer to the hypocritical way in which the Government has set about covering up its profligate expenditure, its own ineptitude and inadequacy, and its failure to come to terms with the inability of its philosophy to generate the wealth that it needs. The Government ought to go, and happily it will whenever the election is called.

Let me make a few more points that I believe will underline the case I have been making. This year, total estimated budget expenditure has risen by 11.5 per cent, and that is a real increase over and above the allowance for inflation of 4.5 per cent. That will increase demand in the economy when the Federal Government is really trying to reduce demand, control the current account deficit and bring down interest rates. That is what it says, anyway. I doubt that the Federal Government is really serious about that matter. There is no doubt that charges of public sector trading enterprise have been artificially held down this year. There are large operating deficits, and they are predicted in the budget for the coming financial year, but the Government is doing nothing to improve the productivity or efficiency of those enterprises.

Further, during the seven Labor budgets that we have had since this Government came to office, there has been a growth in State taxation charges of 163 per cent. That is a real growth over and above a CPI of more than 90 per cent. Per capita, Federal and State tax is now \$71.99 a week in this State compared with \$34.21 in 1982, and if that does not make you, Mr Acting Speaker, and all other members of the Government hang your heads in shame, then it jolly well should. Fifty cents in every tax dollar that the Government takes this year will be needed to pay off interest on past and current borrowings. The Bannon Government has borrowed almost \$2 billion to fund its budget on top of record tax increases. What is more, we need to know that the total interest bill has got to the point where it is \$657.2 million out of that total budget, and that is a disgrace.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wonder why the people of this State and this country cannot see through Labor Government budgets much more easily than has been the case so far. We heard the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating, the other week bring down a budget supposedly providing for a surplus of about \$9 billion, and we have here a State budget supposedly with a surplus, yet at the same time we have seen both federally and in this State give-aways of a magnitude that we have not seen before.

People are taken in by Labor socialist Governments with their big spending sprees. People say, 'What a marvellous Government we have, because it is prepared to spend more.' Yet, those same people do not seem to realise that the only place Governments get money from is the people's pockets. The very people who are saying that we have a Government which is spending money as it should be, are actually losing because they are paying more and more in taxes. Of course,

that is part and parcel of the socialist ploy to tax anyone who can be taxed; to ensure that people who have not worked for their money or, we could say, do not deserve certain items, will receive them because everyone is a potential voter and must be looked after and considered, especially at election time.

This State budget seems very typical in the lead up to an election because, outwardly, it shows that the Government has been responsible in its financial management. However, closer examination shows very clearly that the responsibility has not, in most cases, been that of the Government. Rather, some fortunate events have occurred and a manipulation of the figures has ensured that everything seems to have come out the right way. I will detail that more in due course. There is no doubt that, by and large, socialist philosophy envisages the implementation of high taxing policies and that those policies will be kept in place. The reason for that is very simple: it ensures that people are reliant more and more on Government; that they do not have the freedom of choice that they formerly enjoyed; that the capitalist system of being able to invest and spend where one wishes has serious constraints placed upon it; and that the Government is in a position to control much of what occurs on a day-to-day basis. Of course, that is the basis of socialism.

For some years I have been saying that we are heading towards a welfare state. I no longer say that because I can see that we already have a welfare state. There is no area that is not touched by welfare. I have no objection to welfare payment. In fact, members of this House would know that it was the Liberal Government of the late Sir Robert Menzies that introduced aspects of the social welfare system as we know them today. Sir Robert should be applauded for that action as it was necessary at the time.

The Liberal Party can stand high with its head in the air in saying that it has, in past years, ensured that those in need received welfare payments where necessary and, if at all physically possible, no-one would go without. However, we have seen an increase in welfare payments of astronomical proportions. We have seen socialist Governments decide that money and welfare payments will be the cure-all for our ills. Perhaps the best recent example has been Prime Minister Hawke's statement that no child would live in poverty by the year 1990.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Perhaps he was imitating our fabricator from the other side of the House. However, he said it and the newspapers printed it. If he had meant it, one could sympathise with the Prime Minister; one could applaud him for his remarks. However, what method has he used to achieve that goal? Since that time, he has given more and more money, supposedly to the children. I do not know what are the latest figures, but it involves millions and millions of dollars. Yet, only a week or two ago we saw figures in the press which indicated that poverty amongst children seems to be increasing, not decreasing. Poverty has reached new heights. Unfortunately, all the extra millions of dollars—which will grow into billions of dollars—that the Prime Minister has given away is for nothing.

The Prime Minister is not striking at the root of the problem. He does not realise that money, of itself, will not solve any ills. I look with great sadness at some of our Aboriginal communities—communities that, some years ago, sought additional funding and, in some cases, communities which received land. They gained the right to oversee the land; they have received, or are receiving millions of dollars in payments annually; and the Aborigines who are living in those areas are receiving that money. In addition to the extra money, they receive unemployment benefits or other

social security benefits where they apply. One would think that many of these Aborigines would be the new elite of Australia; they would be taking their position with the wealthy in this country; and, they would be starting up new business enterprises and showing the way, hopefully, to Australia generally, but certainly to other Aborigines. Is this occurring? No.

Reports come to me indicating that money is being squandered and wasted. Unfortunately, in many cases, it is being spent on alcohol at an enormous rate and is causing more hardship to Aborigines than has ever been the case previously. Whose money is being spent in this way? It is our money—the taxpayers' money—and it is not helping the Aborigines at all. A few of the Aborigines can see what is happening and they are trying to highlight the problem. However, it seems that the majority do not want to hear; they are rather more concerned, or more eager, to say, 'No, the answer is not lack of progress, it is that we need many more millions, then we might be able to get somewhere.' It is tragic that we, as citizens of this country and this State, are not rising up in anger; are not rising up to overthrow this corrupt administration, which is allowing this money to be siphoned into useless ventures; and are not putting a stop to it here and now.

I guess it is one of the problems confronting conservative Governments: we tend to look to the democratic system, namely, voting at elections, and at elections through appropriate channels, for change to occur. As a result, change will occur only slowly. However, we are the poorer for it. I am sure there must be many countries laughing at us and saying, 'How you waste your money,' and 'How you do not see that you are being bled as a result.' I must not sidetrack unnecessarily to those events. As I said earlier, clearly this budget is a pre-election budget. It sets before the people of South Australia a general scenario of things looking good—things look all right. But, behind the facade, it is not that way at all. What amuses me is that so many announcements came before the budget and we have already had a major announcement since the budget; namely, the HomeStart Loan Program.

Why were these things not put into the budget and why cannot we deal with it as part and parcel of the budget? It is clearly a fact that the Government does not want to show all its cards at once. The press would only be able to give it so much attention for a day or two. By including new provisions, time will allow the media to highlight some of the supposedly helpful initiatives. I say 'supposedly helpful'. If the new HomeStart Loan Program helps put people into a house, who would not applaud it? It should be applauded, but it is very worrying to read the fine print and wonder how a young couple will handle the new HomeStart program.

We know how many families have been ruined already with the current 17 per cent interest rates for homes and 22 to 24 per cent interest rates for business ventures and the worry it brings at night in discussing it with one's spouse and trying to work out how the family will proceed with things as they were in the past.

Now we have a HomeStart program which, in essence, says, 'Do not worry for now—your payments will be relatively small. You can worry about it in the future, because your payments will increase with time and your loan will increase.' I know how concerned I have been with loans I have had in the past. I try to keep a solid watch on them to see that they are going down and to see whether the amount I am paying is having an effect. Constituents of mine have come in and expressed concerns when their loans

are not going down and wondering where their next move will be or how they can refinance things.

Here we see a HomeStart Loan Program designed to increase the burden over time. Is this the type of thing that we want to impose on our young marrieds or those starting a home for the first time? If it is, I must admit that my assessment of the way society works is wrong and I stand corrected. I guess I will not really be able to find out whether or not I am wrong for some five or 10 years because that is the way this program seems to work. It is a case of 'do not worry about it now, worry about it later'.

We have not only had that program come in but also many other social welfare programs have been introduced over time. I refer to the HOME program (Home Ownership Made Easy). So much was said about that at the time. I have not heard the Premier stand up and expose the benefits of it for some time. Maybe before the election he will recycle it and say that it is okay. I refer also to the YES program (Youth Employment Service) announced right before the election before last. The Government made a huge issue of it stating how many thousands of people would benefit from it. The obvious happened: thousands did not benefit from it, although some hundreds might have received some benefit. It was then recycled before the last State election with the Government indicating how great it would be.

We last heard about it a year ago when some publicity was given to it. I dare say we will hear about it between now and the election, if not during the election campaign. It is free Government advertising and Dr Cornwall clearly highlighted how the Government uses its alternative methods of advertising. I guess it will have all strings pulled ready for extra advertising come the election.

The YES scheme has many flaws. A constituent came in a few weeks ago, having applied for the YES scheme. He wanted to buy a small business.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: If you start off with a big business in this State you soon end up with a small one, given the attitude of some local governments.

Mr MEIER: Yes, how true that is. I called into one of the smaller businesses in my electorate the other day. It is now employing three people altogether whereas several years ago it employed seven. I was told that there is no incentive to employ more, and they wonder whether they will have to reduce by one more with such things as WorkCover, registration of the workplace, compulsory superannuation to be paid by employers and not employees, the 17.5 per cent pay loading and so on. It has made them wonder why they are in small business.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Let alone other State taxes and imposts. It is a great worry and concern when the State should be encouraging small business for all it is worth. Every help should be given and every Government hindrance taken away. As members opposite would be well aware, the whole philosophy of the Liberal Party is that we want to get Government out of the way. With each successive budget since this Government came to power we have seen Government get bigger and take a larger role in the affairs of the day-to-day running of the State in businesses generally and in enterprises overall. It is of great concern that if Government takes such a major role private enterprise will have a smaller role to play. Small business will not have much to look forward to in the future.

I refer also to the social welfare state. Besides the YES scheme, the HOME scheme and the new HomeStart Loan Program we also had the rent relief scheme announced by the Premier a few weeks ago. He has not announced any more figures since. Less than 100 people would be eligible

on the first figures. That was obvious when one first considered it, and one of the reasons he started the new scheme is that we will not be able to assess it for some years. Rent relief would apply to few people because of the lower salary provisions incorporated in it. Yet, the average wage earner is suffering from the 17 per cent interest rate.

We have had examples of child-care receiving added input from the Government. Why should it not, but unfortunately it has been at the expense of kindergarten funding and facilities. That is real worry to many of us not only in city areas but also in country areas because it has been taken from Peter to give to Paul. It is a sleight of hand. So often child-care centres have gone into marginal Labor seats in an endeavour to shore up those seats rather than lose them.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is over 90 per cent of them.

Mr MEIER: The member for Mount Gambier says that over 90 per cent of new child-care centres have gone into marginal Labor seats. That is absolutely despicable and discriminatory. It is despicable because it shows that the Labor Government could not care less about people but only cares about holding on to Government. This budget clearly supports that.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I have been here for a few budgets now. One wonders about changes that have taken place. No doubt exists that the changes that have taken place under the Bannon Government, having been started by the Dunstan Government, in making sure that Ministers are protected by minders and media communicators, at the expense of the public, is a scandal and a disgrace.

If the Opposition attacks the Government on any issue or attempts to seek information, automatically Government minders approach media reporters and say that the Opposition is scaremongering or knocking and is not being positive. However, to some degree the Opposition has a duty to investigate matters on behalf of the public. When the Government is cornered on a matter Premier Bannon, who is a past master at this, does not make a statement. Instead, a spokesperson for the Premier is reported in the press.

However, if it is a good news story, Premier Bannon is there getting all the glory to try to hold up his image. I admit that the Premier has been successful in doing that because many people do not have the time in normal life to cut through the superficial aspects of life and the Government plays on this. The Government uses people's money to do this. I know that members of the Government laugh about this, but this trend is not in the best interests of the State in the long-term. If the goal is to win elections at all costs, then the present Government is successful.

The system is also tied up in another way. Immediately after the Second World War, which was a long time ago, the men and women returning had been through a depression and a war. Those joining the ranks of the media were of mixed political persuasion and, in the main, held every-day philosophies. As the years went by, those reporters moved out. Because they had seen both the tough times and the good times in the 50s and 60s, they were able to give good balanced reporting and they had to chase their story.

Nowadays, Ministers use departmental officers or their minders and are able to feed reporters with a mass of information, often comprised of half truths, and an opportunity to manipulate thinking in the community has developed. It is natural in normal every-day circumstances now that a person with a socialist view is more likely to report Parliament or the political scene than tourism, the com-

mercial pages, real estate or work as PR people for companies in the private sector or quasi government organisations. That situation presents a difficulty for a non-socialist Opposition, as is the case now.

The Liberal Opposition has two problems to overcome. First, we are dealing mainly with people not necessarily strictly politically socialist but, because of their training, they tend to lean towards highlighting stories of individual hardship and making that a dominant factor instead of the hard commercial side of the question whereby if the State is not run correctly or on a proper commercial basis, huge debts are built up to the detriment of the State—short-term and long-term—and there is less chance of money to help people who are genuinely disadvantaged.

As a result of the sensational reporting of these individual cases which are not great in number (and sometimes people get into such a position through their own fault), extra programs are brought in to try to cover the area of disadvantaged people in the community, but less money is made available. Now we have reached a point where the Police Force is seriously short of staff, equipment and resources. It is short to the point that the vast majority of people in the community have erected security fences around their houses, and have installed security equipment. As an extra safety precaution they have had to find extra money to buy and feed a dog of a reasonable breed. Further, many people have become involved in Neighbourhood Watch or Rural Watch, and I agree that that is a good idea.

In fact, the police are so devoid of proper resources and personnel that citizens in many suburbs believe that they are prisoners in their own homes. I refer to the situation in my own electorate and the changes that have come to pass since the time when front doors were left open, when there were no front fences, when there were few dogs and no security alarms. These days I have constituents who have had their house broken into four times in nine months. This is soul destroying. It is no good anyone in this place or the Government saying, 'We are providing enough resources and equipment for the Police Force.' Clearly, we are not.

We could make better use of computers and communication systems. We could make sure that we knew where every patrol car was for every minute of the day, just as they do in Tokyo where, as the police cars drive across intersections, their position is registered on a master board at police headquarters. Certainly, we can spend \$100 million on the Justice Information System, on a computer network which is still not proven to work. Certainly, the end result is that we are trying to make justice work in an area where we are not supplying it.

In the area of education, in 1982 the then Bannon Opposition promised that if it won government it would not decrease the number of teachers. Seven years hence it has decreased the number by over 800 teachers. The then Labor Opposition knew that its so-called promise was a blatant lie at the time. It claimed that it would not decrease teacher numbers regardless of falling enrolments, yet it has done that. It knew when it made that statement what it was going to do, and it made a similar statement in 1985.

People cannot be reminded every day by the media or someone else, and it is certainly beyond the resources available to MPs to do so, and so the big con goes on. At the same time, the children of parents grow up and the parents move on. The parents who heard the story seven years ago are no longer so involved. Seven years hence different parents are involved. I refer to the media minding unit, which is comprised of protectionists who smother each Minister at taxpayers' expense. When I first came to this place I

doubt whether there were any more than three so-called press secretaries, researchers, or others attempting to work the communications system to protect the Ministers and the Government. However, if one includes departmental officers, something like 10 people now protect each Minister. Departmental officers are given the task of researching and releasing stories so that each day Ministers can rely on a bit of paper to give not the whole truth but only the half truth.

On top of that, I cite the abuse that goes on in this place which is not intended under Standing Orders. However, I cannot go much further than that without being in contempt of this place. When members abuse or attack an individual or his or her philosophy, or do not answer a question, it is little wonder the community has no respect for this place. I hope that, after the next election when the Government changes, those on my side of politics do not carry on like that and that they give short answers.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: You won't have to worry about that.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Minister will not have to worry about that because he is one of the members who will lose his seat. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has admitted that he will not be here after the next election. I am sure that Joy Nimon will be pleased to know of that interjection. I now turn my attention to local government boundaries. When the Mitcham/Happy Valley issue blew up the Minister of Local Government said that the people had had an opportunity to put their point of view and had not done so. The Local Government Advisory Commission, appointed by the Government—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: A point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe that the member for Davenport is now referring to a matter that is on the Notice Paper. It is due for further discussion on Thursday.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine): Order! The honourable member for Davenport must link his remarks to the budget.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am doing that, sir. The Local Government Advisory Commission has—and will in the future—cost a lot of money this financial year. The Minister of Local Government said that in the past the community did not take the opportunity to present evidence to the commission. What would happen if the 22 000 people who signed the petition or the 10 000 people who attended the poll wrote to the commission and asked to give oral evidence? The commission could not operate in such circumstances. If each person gave only 15 minutes evidence, it would still take many years to complete a review. The commission can not decide to pick at random who it hears evidence from or to hear only one-third or so of the evidence. What weight will the commission place on the votes that are cast next Saturday? Will it understand that the votes cast for and against the proposed city of Flinders are the genuine intent of each person, or will it place little value on those votes as the voters did not write to the commission and detail their support or opposition? If we believe in the community having a say, we should accept the majority vote.

I now turn my attention to the Heritage Commission and its attitude in relation to placing trees on the Heritage Register. The Heritage Commission has placed interim orders—I do not think as yet they are final orders—on a tree at Millswood and on a tree off Hallett Road in the Burnside council area. Those two trees are not dissimilar in age or character to another 4 000 or 5 000 trees in the Adelaide metropolitan area, some of which are on public land and some of which are on private land. Taxpayers'

funds are provided so that the Heritage Commission can employ people to look at these trees and consider whether or not they are heritage items. Why have other trees not been listed? What if somebody in Unley or Norwood requests that the trees in those areas be heritage listed because they are just as important as the trees in Millswood or Burnside?

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Minister for Recreation and Sport said that that would be good. I cite the case of the commission being asked to look at a tree at Glen Osmond three weeks ago. The lady first rang the Burnside council but was told that she had to go to the Heritage Commission in the Department of Environment and Planning. The Heritage Commission said that somebody would look at the tree, but no-one did. She rang back a week later, but no-one came. I suggest that, because a group was not stirring hard enough about this tree, it was not considered important enough. It suggests that matters are not considered on their merits.

This House should consider which budget will carry the financial burden of placing trees on the Heritage Register. What would occur if a limb fell off a tree on the Heritage Register and killed or injured somebody, fell on a neighbouring house, or cracked a drive or the foundations of that neighbouring house? The heritage listing includes the tree roots, so one cannot dig a swimming pool or trench if the heritage listed tree is in one's garden; nor can the E&WS, ETSA or the Gas Company dig a trench or put power lines underground. If the State wants to protect a tree, it should carry the burden of its insurance or any claims that might result from such a heritage listing. That is only fair. I am not saying that trees should not be on the Heritage Register; I am saying that the State should carry the cost of placing them on it. A horticulturalist or a botanist can look at a tree and say that it is past its age of safety, but the Heritage Commission will still list it.

I have not used facts and figures because I believe that one of the greatest speeches ever made in this Parliament on a budget was made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I will use that speech as I move around my electorate. It clearly shows that the Government is a sham and that Mr Bannon, the Premier and Treasurer and Federal President of the ALP, does not attack his Federal colleagues for the harm they are doing to this State in respect of high interest rates. Whenever the pressure is on, the Premier ducks for cover. I am sorry that the community does not know that, but the Liberal Party knows it is the truth—and so do the Premier's colleagues. Eventually the community will wake up, and I am sure that this Government will lose the next election.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate. Budget debates should be the most important of all debates; they should seriously address themselves to the appropriation in a conscientious manner. Contrary to what one might think, when given the attitude of members opposite, we are about to agree to the appropriation of some \$5 000 million, which is probably one of the most significant decisions a Parliament makes each year. It will set in train the Government's financial program for the next 12 months. Many of the decisions will have a significant effect on the services and facilities available to the population generally, whether relating to education, development, the mining industry or the welfare systems. These are all important matters to which I will refer in more detail later.

In considering a budget, one should look at the philosophy behind it. I believe that the role of the budget should be to encourage people to go forward and improve themselves, not to control them. We should encourage invest-

ment. We do not want vague policy announcements made only for the purpose of resolving today's political crisis. Further, a great emphasis should be placed on the need to encourage people to save, and incentives should be given for people to invest and to produce and for the creation of wealth.

This budget, unfortunately, does not live up to those expectations. If we are to provide a better South Australia, we have to create the circumstances where the population is encouraged to work harder. People must be encouraged to save and to reinvest in both their businesses and the State. We will thereby have a better South Australia and we will create more jobs, more opportunities and more successful people. Successful people create success around them. Governments in this country at present seem to have completely overlooked this aspect and to have forgotten about it. To raise the standard of living in this State and improve commerce, we have to create the circumstances where people want to come here to live, to invest and to develop industries.

Unfortunately, the current policies of the Commonwealth Government do not give people the incentive to invest. In my view, the high interest rates policy currently in force will rip gutters across the landscape of not only this State but the nation for years to come, denying people the opportunity to own their own home, to start their own business and to improve themselves. Coupled with the capital gains tax which is currently in force in this country, anyone who wants to buy a property, improve it and sell it in order to get into a better or more successful business, is penalised. These direct policy decisions which are being put into law will have a long-term disastrous effect on this nation.

It is essential in any free enterprise economy for commonsense to prevail. We must have a certain degree of regulation. I am not one of those people who believes in total deregulation for the sake of it. We are not playing on an even field in this State or in this nation; we are competing on an international scene and our major competitors are subsidised and supported by the Treasuries of some of the most wealthy trading blocs that have ever been in creation, namely, the EEC, Canada and the United States. If we are to compete with them on a realistic and sensible basis, there must be some degree of Government support. The best way to do that is through a system of reasonable regulation, such as orderly marketing of primary products. That has been the hallmark of a successful agricultural sector in this country and in this State.

The previous Minister of Agriculture sits up and smiles at me. I make no apology for saying that I am not convinced yet—and never will be convinced—in relation to any other course. I do not speak on matters about which I do not have a great deal of knowledge, but I think I can speak with some authority on the basic wheat-sheep industry. I think I can say that my family has been reasonably successful in this industry. The reason for our success is that we have been assisted by a sensible arrangement for marketing our products. In the past, we had a system of taxation incentives in this country which encouraged primary producers, those in the farming communities, to reinvest in their properties.

Many of those benefits have been foolishly removed and they must be put back in place. A number of years ago we had many very successful agricultural industries in this State. There were machinery manufacturers and our small country towns had numerous garages undertaking light engineering work. These were all supporting the rural industry. Many of these garages have gone. The mechanics have lost their jobs, the people who worked in the offices have all gone, as have the people who were involved in the spare

parts operations. This was a retrograde step. These problems should be redressed by budgets brought down at State and Commonwealth levels.

Insufficient emphasis has been placed on the need for sensible development. As to the value of agriculture to South Australia, I refer to table 10.1 provided at page 35 of 'Economic Conditions and the Budget 1989-90', tabled by the Premier with the presentation of the budget. One notes there that the total value of agricultural production estimated in the 1988-89 budget was \$2 073 million. That is a most significant percentage of the State's export earnings and of the value of the total economy. These figures are not only significant but they indicate clearly how reliant a State like South Australia is on the agricultural side of the economy and how important it is that policy decisions that are made do not unduly affect agricultural producers or impede them. Successful operations in the agricultural area employ a lot of people, both directly and indirectly, and they should be encouraged.

In relation to production, we can see that it is estimated that this year wool will be worth some \$560 million, while last year it was actually worth \$575 million. We can see the value of wheat, barley, vegetables and wine—all very significant. The important thing to remember is that this relates not only to this year but that it will continue to happen every year in the future if the right economic and climatic conditions prevail—and if commonsense prevails. If Governments believe that, for example, the wool industry is simply a willing cow there to be milked, taxed, controlled and interfered with, then we will have a problem.

A problem faced by people in the agricultural sector on a daily basis relates to the fact that, unfortunately, there is in the community a large group of perhaps well-intentioned but completely misguided people who lack any knowledge of agriculture. These people try to impose their will and their ideas on the agricultural sector. We have a large Department of Environment and Planning in this State, and we have other groups that have been set up, and various other departments, all employing people who are racing around making decisions and endeavouring to impose conditions.

Many of these people, with no understanding of or concern for the rural industry, seek to impose their unwise ways upon this section of the economy. This is regrettable; it involves a most unfortunate set of circumstances, and it is unnecessary. I suggest that it is certainly time that some of these people were advised to keep their noses out of areas that they know nothing about. They are not required, they do no good, they are a burden on the taxpayer and they should be dispensed with.

In looking through the budget papers and at the increase in the public sector and the number of people on the payroll, one wonders what the sole purpose of these people is. Would the economy of South Australia be affected if we did not have many of these people? The answer of course is, 'No'. We have various officers endeavouring to impose their will on people. In many cases people are prevented from investing. I cite the example of constituents of mine who were granted less than a hectare of land, about a half a hectare of land, on which they built a service station. It has taken the couple involved years to get a freehold title. They have been given all the reasons in the world why they should not have it. They are serving the public and are living in a part of the State where most of these people who attempt to impose their will would not live—and if they were there they would go broke and starve. They would be of no value. These people with all this so-called wisdom make decisions which do not contain an ounce of commonsense. These

people imposing their will on these unfortunate citizens really should be dismissed. In my view, they are anti-South Australia; they are acting contrary to the best interests of the people of this State and, in my view, the courses of action being undertaken are non-essential. Their employment should be terminated, because they are a burden on the taxpayer.

Another example of where perhaps well-meaning people, but completely misguided in their endeavours, have imposed certain courses of action on the rural sector relates to the pastoral industry. Now, thanks to the intervention of one Mr Elliott, a system of rating pastoral leases is to be instituted. I do not think that the Hon. Mr Elliott has had any experience in this area, but he is out to impress a small section of the community, that vocal minority of people who call themselves the environmental lobby. He wants to make sure that he has their ear. He put forward this proposition, which was taken up in both hands by the Government, to impose a new system of rating pastoral leases.

Any system of taxation which is not based on profitability of the enterprise is doomed to failure and is doomed to cause problems. When you over tax, you over control; or, when you endeavour to arbitrarily reduce the size of agricultural operations, the end result is always failure, both economically and environmentally. Throughout the world, history will indicate that disasters result when that sort of thinking has been imposed. The *Advertiser* editorial of Monday 28 August this year clearly indicates how the Government has not completely understood the course of action it put into effect. Entitled 'Battling urban ignorance', it states:

The State Government may have allowed itself to be conned by the conservation movement into making pastoral land changes that could become anti-conservational. Its Pastoral Land Management Conservation Act passed last week but by no means assured of acceptance proposes stricter Government control over the ecology of the State's north. This would be generally welcomed by the community. But hand in hand it also proposes a new resources tax—through swinging increases in the rent which pastoralists pay to lease this crown land.

As farmers elsewhere in the State on other forms of lease from the crown start sweating that they might be next in line for this kind of bold revenue grab, and as the whole philosophy of who should own and control land is resurrected, it seems to be yet another example of the Labor Party's longstanding inability to understand rural affairs.

Objections to high pastoral rents can be based on the real disadvantages of Outback life; but there is also an important principle behind pastoral leases. This Government has lost sight of that principle; outback land, useless to white society save for grazing sheep and cattle (although we have come to discover mining, weapons testing and tourism), was leased to pastoralists at low rental in order to provide a buffer against unpredictable droughts. The community got its returns by soaking the farmers for tax in the good years. The 1927 Royal Commission into the pastoral industry agreed. But this Government proposes to soak them every year with high 'market' rentals, in effect taxing them on investment.

An immediate effect will be that profits which pastoralists frequently plough back into land improvement will be diverted to Government coffers. And in bad years, many pastoralists would either simply have to walk off the land, causing a vast array of problems from social welfare to injured exports, or would be tempted to circumvent conservation controls . . . Many pastoral properties are run by families who have future generations to consider. This is one of the sharpest motives for caring for the essential resource of the land.

There are environmental problems in the north. But these can be individually identifiable; and it is the Government's Lands Department that needs the bomb under it, for it already has the power to control abuses. Hitting all the battling leaseholders whose contribution to the State economy and environment is so vital seems merely to be the bureaucratic result of urban ignorance, of the very kind which the Royal Show seeks to counter. And urban ignorance may be the greatest enemy of this State's environment.

I hope that the Premier, when he responds to this debate, will clearly indicate where this Government stands in relation to Crown perpetual leases, miscellaneous leases, mar-

ginal perpetual leases and annual licences. I understand that a new Crown Lands Act is being drafted. Does the Government intend to break the contract that currently exists between pastoralists and the Government? The Parliament is entitled to a clear and unequivocal answer from the Government, and that should come from the Premier.

Further, it is disturbing when one goes through the budget papers and finds that services have been reduced and taxes have risen. These matters were eloquently pointed out to the House by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. When one thinks that nearly 50 per cent of the revenue collected by the State goes to meet existing interest payments, it clearly demonstrates the sorry state of affairs South Australia is currently facing. Members on this side are not advocating a massive spending program. We have been advocating a better utilisation of the resources currently available to the State Government, a proper business plan of operations and a close examination of those facilities which are no longer necessary or which need to be justified. All statutory authorities should be examined. An investigation should be undertaken into whether or not the State Government should be involved in operations such as the Timber Corporation.

We need to see if we can improve efficiency and how we can increase productivity so that the revenues to the State are also increased; not by unduly taxing those successful industries and people with a view to helping those people who unfortunately cannot look after themselves. In any system of social welfare there should be an incentive for people to help themselves. There should be incentives for people to get back into the work force. The budget papers state that nearly 30 per cent of the State's recurrent payments go to education and nearly 22 per cent go to health. It is obvious that the community at large has had its expectations, particularly in some of these areas, unduly raised.

One problem faced by all communities is that Governments, particularly Ministers, race around the country, unduly raising the expectations of the community. They encourage all sorts of groups to make claims upon the Treasury, and the Government starts handing out a few dollars to try to appease them. This is particularly so in marginal Government held electorates. Governments these days have one thing in mind—re-election. Long term planning and the welfare of the State and the nation have become a secondary issue. Top priority appears to be re-election. Governments say they will provide funds for the most crazy and illogical programs if it is believed they will help save the seats of some of their members, particularly those in marginal districts. Surely Governments should be spending money which will be in the long term best interests of all South Australians.

Some of the decisions we have seen are quite amazing. It is like a motherhood attitude. Having an entertainment centre maybe a good thing but, at the end of the day, is it the most important resource that we should have? How many jobs will it create? What is the long term benefit? Would it not be better to encourage people to go out to explore for minerals? Hopefully, we will find another Roxby Downs or a copper deposit or large coal deposit. Then we would be creating wealth. We should offer incentives to the private sector to provide those facilities, because they will manage them better, build them more cheaply, and at the end of the day they will benefit all citizens. We must have more incentive, more encouragement and more investment, with less control and less interference by Government.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am pleased to be able to participate in this debate. At the outset I commend

the Leader, as my other colleagues on this side of the House have done, for his excellent contribution to this debate. I urge any person who has the opportunity to read this debate in *Hansard* to look at what the Leader has had to say in response to the budget. Among other things, the Leader stated:

Over the next 10 years, we must inspire a more productive culture, a culture which insists on quality and excellence in everything we do . . . 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 . . . 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.

I concur with those words.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, it is all very well for the Minister of Agriculture to be making a great issue of this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: He has been demoted. That is right; he is now the Minister of Recreation and Sport—the Minister of section 50s. I was amused this afternoon when the Minister on the front bench referred to the rights of people. By way of interjection, members on this side were pleased to remind the Minister that he had forgotten the rights of people in his own electorate who wanted to build a church in the Minister's street. The Minister engaged in a very heavy-handed action and encouraged his colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning to bring down a section 50 decision. I know enough about the Planning Act to understand what that means. It is a very heavy-handed measure on the part of the Minister. So, it is not for him to talk about the rights of other people. However, I am not particularly interested in what the Minister has to say at present; I am more interested in speaking about the budget.

This budget raises a considerable number of concerns for the average South Australian, and in the past few days constituents have made that very clear to me. As the member for Eyre said, we are not listing the things we want for our electors or for the State; that is not what we are about. We are more interested in the need to redetermine priorities. We have been encouraging the Government to take that action for a long time. However, it is very difficult to get the present Government to understand the priorities of members on this side of the House. It would seem that with an election around the corner the Government is interested only in determining priorities that will bring it votes; it is not in the slightest bit interested in helping the average South Australian—the average family.

I am particularly concerned about the average family, because it is that unit in South Australia that is slipping further and further behind. As a father of four children, I know what it is like to face Government charges and costs at present. We are paying more and more for electricity, water, public transport, and so on. That is not to mention crippling mortgage repayments under this Labor Government. The average family is left with much less for its weekly household budgeting than has previously been the

case—much less. What Labor is giving with one hand, its policies are more than grabbing back with the other.

While Premier Bannon is trying to convince South Australians that, in this election year, he is being easy on their pockets, his Government has been a high taxing Government and State charges have risen by more in Adelaide than in all but one other capital city in Australia. One can look at the record of this Government since the last election: motoring costs in Adelaide have risen more than in any other capital city; public transport has risen in this State by about twice the national average; and we have the second highest electricity tariffs in the nation. The Premier has added to the pressures facing families and individuals because his Government has wasted public money on projects like the investment in the New Zealand Timber Corporation, the blow-out in the cost of the ill-fated *Island Seaway* and the implementation of the Justice Information System, to name just a few.

Over the past few years, we on this side of the House have had the opportunity to come in contact with many business people—small business people who have had to pay rising land tax bills at the expense of either retrenching existing employees or not taking on new employees. I find it amazing that so many people in small business say that their greatest wish is to employ more people. In most cases, they believe that the market is there and that they have the capacity to do so. However, because of the disincentives provided by this Government, they are finding it virtually impossible to employ more people. With the unemployment situation in this State, that is a very sad situation. The Bannon Government is systematically hammering small business, yet small business is the biggest employer in this State. Members on this side of the House have stated on many occasions that it is unnecessary. It is sheer greed on the part of the Government. It is frequently forgotten that land tax bills also affect those people in rental accommodation. It is not just the tall poppy syndrome, as the Government would have us believe. It is keen to penalise people who are able to make a profit—people who are able to put money back into the economy.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Because of the rude interruption by my colleague the member for Alexandra, I seem to have lost my train of thought. I was asked earlier about my priorities. Perhaps at this stage I could talk about the Bridgewater railway, which would certainly be a very high priority as far as I am concerned with a change of Government. I was very interested to attend the Festival of Spring at Stirling. The Minister of Tourism was also at the festival and told us how wonderful the Hills are.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They are; I agree with the member for Mitchell. We are very proud. We can see the potential for tourism in the Adelaide Hills, but all that the Government will consider is inappropriate development in parts of the Hills where, for the past two years, members of this side of the House have been trying to promote the Bridgewater railway. That would do more for tourism in the Adelaide Hills than anything else that the Government could put forward, particularly when we realise that there is no need for any investment in respect of basic requirements. The line is there, there will be no interruption, the rolling stock is there and there will be no detriment to the environment. Feeder buses can be provided from various points in the Hills to take people around. The Minister of Tourism was up there the other day at the Stirling Spring Festival. When the concept of the Bridgewater railway was raised by a couple of people, she found it necessary to leave

early. The reintroduction of the Bridgewater railway is a priority of mine.

In the last few minutes, before my colleague the member for Alexandra takes over, it is important that I try to get across to the Government the need to show some sympathy towards people in small business. I mentioned earlier the land tax bills which affect thousands of people in small business. Since the Premier came to office New South Wales and Victoria have contained land tax below that in South Australia, even though property values in those States have risen more sharply. This is because the Government of these States have been prepared to make more regular adjustments to thresholds and rates to take account of rising property values and so on.

This Government is putting more business and more people renting accommodation under greater financial pressure than has been the case before. It is not good enough for the Premier to promise extra relief in an election year. His record—which is the important factor—since he was elected in 1982 indicates that he has failed small business and people renting accommodation. The Premier's greedy attitude to taxes, including land tax, means that the family person and those trying to bring up a family on a single income are having great difficulty. Very few people can afford for the wife and mother to stay home, if she wishes, to take a greater role in looking after small children. Fewer opportunities exist for that to happen now. In the majority of cases both the husband and the wife are forced out to work to try to build up sufficient income to be able to afford to keep their children. At the coming election South Australians will not forget that the Premier came to office promising no tax increases, because over the past seven years tax revenue has risen in this State considerably.

Mr Lewis: By 163 per cent.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: By 163 per cent, the member for Murray-Mallee says. I was going to say that it was in the vicinity, but he has been totally accurate. Do not let the Premier think that the people of this State will forget that. He can pull the wool over their eyes or attempt to do so. However, the average person is very conscious of what this Government has done to the average family, to the person in small business and to those in this State who attempt to put something back into the State through making a profit. Unfortunately, for far too long members opposite have seen the achievement of profit as unacceptable. We on this side of the House will continue to aim for that.

To enable my colleague the member for Alexandra to say a few words, I will wind up. I reiterate what I said before in commending the Leader of the Opposition on the contribution he made in this debate. I urge people who read *Hansard* to study that contribution which sets out very clearly where the Liberal Party stands in regard to the past seven years, the situation which relates to this budget and, more importantly, where the Liberal Government will take South Australia in the future with confidence.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Leader and members on this side of the House have referred to the \$5.2 billion budget for 1989-90. It is interesting to note that some 16 or 17 years ago when I came into this place the South Australian budget figure for that year was but \$612 million. I mention that comparison between the amounts applicable to those respective years in the context referred to by the Auditor-General in this year's report. He states:

That interest is being driven by a public which is becoming more concerned about Government activity and is demanding to be assured that:

- moneys they provide to Government by way of taxes and charges are being spent in accordance with the law and on the purposes for which they have been provided.
- the relationship between the taxes and charges paid and the community services provided, reflects value for money.

It is not a new demand. It was first voiced in England centuries ago and gave birth to the Westminster System which is the basis for government in Australia today.

Disclosure and accountability to the Parliament is the cornerstone of the Westminster System. It brings an added discipline to the management processes of the Executive Government.

Fundamental to the system is the Parliament, the Executive Government—and the Auditor-General, an officer totally independent of Executive Government who has the statutory responsibility to report to the Parliament on the integrity, economy and efficiency of the financial operations of Executive Government.

Those three bodies are the statutory links in the financial accountability chain of the Westminster System.

I draw those remarks from the beginning of the Auditor-General's Report. As members of Parliament and members of various committees, both statutory and subsidiary to this House, our responsibilities should be highlighted from time to time so that we do not get carried away in other directions from that strict line of accountability which is fundamental to the principle within which we work.

This year the Auditor-General has referred to the shortcomings in accountability by a number of departments. His expressed concerns and criticisms of financial management or the lack of it is greater in volume this time than I can recall in a previous Auditor-General's Report. In his report this time he has referred in some detail to his concern for the lack of good management and accountability within departments, which has been referred to by previous Auditors-General for many years in this place. It is about time some of those departments listened to what the Auditor-General has to say.

It is all very well for a Government in this place to issue a bundle of documents covering the budget for a given financial period, adjourn Parliament for a week (as has been traditional) and then expect members to come back and give a detailed address to the House about those documents. However, in his general comments the Auditor-General states:

Effective resource management and the need for a lean public sector cost structure has been the central theme of all my reports to the Parliament. Ongoing review of the relevance, efficiency and cost effectiveness of operating, administrative and support service programs, processes and procedures are the fundamental elements of that theme.

So, he sets the theme for going through the year's financial activities in some detail. Frankly, I rely more heavily on that careful and professional study of the year's activities as set out in the Auditor-General's Report than I do on the premises incorporated in the budget papers provided for us. I recognise that this debate is designed to enable members to pull to pieces the budget speech and the contents of the associated papers. I repeat that the Auditor-General's Report, on which the Public Accounts Committee of this State relies, is the report on which I rely heavily.

One of the areas in which the Auditor-General expresses deep concern is in respect of the activities of Marineland. At page iii of his report he 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 . . . State Services Department . . . These matters are covered in more detail on pages vi and ix respectively of this report. Those matters are covered in such detail that time does not allow me to canvass them now, except to quote the Auditor-General's following comment:

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

In my view, these are clear and positive warnings given to Parliament generally and the Premier and Treasurer in particular. These warnings to the Premier come via the reporting mechanism of the Auditor-General to ensure that taxpayers' moneys in this State are well spent and cared for in the meantime. At page v of his report, in respect of public accountability, the Auditor-General reminds us of his expressions of concern in previous years, especially about loans made by the South Australian Financing Authority. The report contains some detail about the departments and other areas into which SAFA funding was directed. In his conclusion this year, which is equally disturbing as former comments made, the Auditor-General states:

Appropriation of these moneys through the Consolidated Account would still seem to be justified.

That is, rather than direct to the department which, once again, has been the practice in the past year. The Auditor-General continues:

It would be consistent with the arrangements now in place and operating under the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, which requires all Commonwealth Government funds to be appropriated through the Consolidated Account. It would also afford Parliament the opportunity of scrutiny of their nature and purpose and their relative priority with the competing demands for funds of other public sector programs and projects, during Parliament's consideration of the Appropriation Bill.

The Auditor-General highlights an important function of this Parliament: one which individual members are entitled to peruse and debate in the proper course of their duties. In his conclusion, the Auditor-General states:

At 30 June 1989, net public sector indebtedness amounted to \$4 009 million, compared with \$3 985 million last year. The cost of servicing that indebtedness amounted to \$440 million in 1988-89, an increase of \$1 million over the previous year.

Such disclosure by the Auditor-General is bad enough but, when he chooses to draw the reader's specific attention to those points, it is fair enough that such comments are heeded. While I might heed and use those comments on this side of the House in order to draw them to the attention of members who are present, it is even more important for the Premier and Treasurer to take note of those fundamental principles and observe the fundamental requirements of money management on behalf of the State.

I refer to the Justice Information System and the registration and licensing system of the Motor Registration Division—these are all areas upon which the Auditor-General has reported. As to the shift of the registration and licensing system from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles Division to the Highways Department, I believe it is only moving the problem from one camp to another: in no way does it resolve the problem. The on-line registration and licensing system is yet to prove its worth in its new home. The on-line procurement system of the State Supply Department, education staffing and the protest which reflected the problems in that area are referred to at length by the Auditor-General.

The problem of sick leave/absenteeism especially within our hospitals and associated medical servicing areas is also a matter of great concern as are references by the Auditor-General about the Timber Corporation's activities. These comments are serious and are noted in particular at about page 110 of the report. The Agriculture Department and the Health Commission are also the subject of expressions of concern this year by the Auditor-General, and greater attention needs to be paid to the administration of those areas.

It is important that we pick up the references by the Auditor-General early after the delivery of his report to Parliament. We should not rely entirely on the post-activity committee—the Public Accounts Committee—to draw our

attention later this year or next year to such matters. Another matter in the report which needs and deserves careful reference by all members of Parliament is housing and construction, which is examined at page 105. The Woods and Forests Department is dealt with at page 211. However, at the beginning of his report, the Auditor-General says:

With the exception of the Woods and Forests Department, I have issued an unqualified certificate with respect to the accounts of all public authorities whose accounts are published herein. The reason and the extent of the qualification of my certificate is outlined in comment on that department later in this report.

It is about time that the department's administration took heed of the Auditor-General, in particular. Obviously, time does not permit me in the few minutes available in this debate to refer to the South Australian Health Commission sick leave debacle or that associated with the South Australian Timber Corporation or the West Beach Trust to which considerable criticism is directed by the Auditor-General and other areas of import in respect of public money management.

I am grateful to have had the opportunity of at least 10 minutes of what would normally be a contribution of 20 minutes on the understanding that immediately after the meal break the Premier will make a 10 minute address to Parliament and that subsequently each of us will have a further 10 minute grievance. I intend to continue my remarks in that debate.

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): The second reading debate on the budget has gone on for some considerable time. The majority of contributions in this debate have come from members opposite, and I believe there were three speeches from Government backbenchers. I expected that three observations would have been made by members opposite, the first being that this budget is fiscally responsible. It is fiscally responsible in that it wipes off the accumulated debts of the Tonkin years, something to which this Government has been working ever since the 1982 election. But, I did not hear that.

Members could have said that this is a humane budget. They could have noted that social justice has moved much closer to the centre of things in the development of the budget strategy. Members could have detailed to a degree some of the elements of that very important social justice thrust inherent in the budget. They also could have indicated that it is economically realistic in that, as a result of tax relief, a good deal of our surplus last year has been returned to the community, particularly to the employing sections of the community, thereby allowing for incentive for economic growth.

None of those things was said by members opposite, which is a shame and suggests a selective and, indeed, blinkered approach to the world; and I believe that that will cost members opposite dearly. Some things were said, by way of comment, about some of the more mechanical and particular aspects of the budget. I understand that some of my colleagues will take the opportunity of the debate to note grievances to comment on those matters. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House note grievances.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I acknowledge the interjection from the former Minister of Transport. That is the way I will always remember him.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Stuart, is he?

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Who is taking your place, Gavin?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I'm an old man.

Mr MEIER: We all get old sooner or later; as long as you are young at heart. I admit that in earlier debate it was remiss of me to not pay tribute to the former Minister of Transport for giving—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rann): Order! The honourable member for Goyder has the floor.

Mr MEIER:—due consideration to requests I put before him, and there were countless requests in the years he was a Minister—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Hear, hear!

Mr MEIER:—mainly in relation to roads. I heard the former Minister say, 'Hear, hear!' It is a pity that the Premier did not direct more of his finances towards matters relating to Goyder rather than to other areas. Nevertheless I acknowledge that the former Minister of Transport on quite a few occasions sought to assist my electorate. I must also pay a tribute to the former Minister of Water Resources.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Haven't you got much to say, John?

Mr MEIER: I have plenty to say. During the Address in Reply debate, various members were complimenting previous Ministers and I thought that perhaps they knew that an election was to be called and that it would be their last opportunity to do so.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Well, I have in my diary 9 December for the election, and nothing has come up to prove otherwise at this stage. So, there might be more than one opportunity for members to make their remarks. Perhaps I should also acknowledge the work done by the members for Spence and Mitchell as Ministers.

However, as to the budget, the subject of this debate, there are many points to be made. First, the budget does not look very far down the track to the future. This is unfortunate. It aims to appease people in the immediate future, to put up a bit of a smokescreen and pretend that everything is all right, when, in fact, the economy and the finances of this State have not been managed as they should have been.

Many thousands of people are disturbed about where we are headed in the future, and this is not to mention the input from the Federal Government, with its massive 17 per cent interest rates, the 22 to 24 per cent business interest rates and the massive balance of payments problems, or the way that Mr Hawke does not seem to be able to handle the pilots' dispute. In that regard, the Prime Minister is quite happy to allow the Builders Labourers' Federation members to get a 30 per cent rise; he is happy for the Federal parliamentarians to get a 36 per cent rise; but he then seeks to take it out on the pilots. He does not seem to know how to handle things now. At the beginning he attacked the Opposition for its policy of allowing pilots to negotiate directly with their employers, while on tonight's news I heard a Minister of his Government say how it would be up to the pilots to negotiate with the employers. So, the Federal Labor Government has come right back to the Liberal policy.

In relation to the South Australian situation, I draw attention to what I call the school maintenance sham. We see in

the budget some show recognition of schools: the Opposition has shown the supposed increase in numbers for what it really is, namely, a decrease, from 1982 to 1989. I urge all readers of *Hansard* to refer to the Leader of the Opposition's speech, which identifies the truth in relation to the budget. I am sure that more will come out on this matter during the Estimates Committees.

Some weeks ago the Minister of Education announced a back to schools grant, supposedly involving some \$10 million, which was to go towards cleaning up a lot of school maintenance matters that had not yet been attended to. I must admit that I was sufficiently impressed with the Minister of Education's announcement that I personally complimented him on it at the time.

It was only as the weeks went by and I had more dialogue with schools that I found that many of the maintenance items put on my list for Goyder, which were supposedly covered by this \$10 million back to schools grant, had already been completed. In fact, one lot of toilet blocks had apparently been completed 18 months earlier, and this was supposedly a new grant. I certainly felt embarrassed when visiting the schools and being told exactly what was the situation. I was very upset at the dishonest way in which the press release of the Minister was put out and at how, I admit, he fooled me. He had me on side for a short while. The schools have now been informed by me that I have seen through the smokescreen, and the general public—

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr MEIER: What is the member trying to interject?

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Didn't you listen? It is a pity that you don't stay in the Chamber sometimes.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rann): Order! Members will be referred to by their districts.

Mr MEIER: I will have to try to ignore those interjections. They get me very upset. I have just explained how the Minister's press release had fooled me. It was only after schools identified to me the truth of the matter, that many of the projects had been completed and that it was not new money, that I investigated further and found the schools to be correct. So, the real situation—

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I welcomed the money, as I said at the beginning, but I was found to be incorrect. I suggest that if you are suffering from a hearing loss you ought to see an appropriate specialist.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder has the floor.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker. It is a pity that some Government members cannot see through their Ministers—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra knows full well after his many years in this House that he should not interject from out of his seat, if at all.

Mr MEIER: Several weeks ago I presented to the House a petition from one school out of the many that need urgent maintenance. I was contacted by people at the school to visit it and see how the back to schools grant money was not doing anything for which it was supposedly provided. Certainly, thousands of dollars was to be spent, but it had already been earmarked well before any announcement by the Minister. I am referring to the Ardrossan Area School. I really feel for that school because, when I visited it, I noticed that the community library was falling apart. In fact, nothing has been done since the team from *State Affair* visited several years earlier. A few more boards fell off

while I was being shown around. The inside of many of the buildings is far from satisfactory. The dingy sick room area had to be shared with book storage and other things being kept there. It would have made people sick straight away having to go to that sick area, let alone trying to make them well.

Other schools in my electorate have highlighted similar problems, including deteriorating buildings, poor equipment and the urgent need for maintenance, yet so little is being done. If it is being done, I wish it was being stated honestly and truthfully as to how much is being spent, rather than the Government's merely recycling old projects with supposedly new money and saying, 'Here is the money; this is what was to be spent—let us see that that really happens.' I just hope that the Minister will ensure in future that large sums are put into these schools desperately in need of assistance.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): We now have an exposure from the inside of the Premier's *modus operandi*. Dr Cornwall has blown Caucus and Cabinet over. What he reveals to all South Australians is what some of us who have dealt with the Premier have long suspected: he is not a Premier with any principles. Rather, he is a person prepared to sacrifice a loyal colleague if it is in his political interests to do so. The Premier's part in the treatment of Mr Norm Foster, as revealed by Dr Cornwall, was shameful and scandalous in its complete lack of integrity and intestinal fortitude. No wonder this State is just drifting, when we have a Premier more at home with conniving than with showing courage and giving a lead.

Let me put into context the revelations of Dr Cornwall about the Premier and his treatment of Mr Foster. When the Liberal Party came to Government in 1979, we faced an economy in sharp decline after almost a decade of Labor. Labor had split not only itself but also the community over the important issue of uranium mining. Had the new Liberal Government adopted this Premier's code of conduct, we would have walked away from the issue. We would have decided it was too hard—that there was too much personal popularity at stake—and we would have left others to sort it out first. But we decided that principle did count for something. We decided that, while Labor was determined to go on misleading the public about uranium mining and Roxby Downs, we would work patiently and positively to change public opinion. We did not walk away from the fight. We waged it—and we won it; so much so that by 1982, with the indenture Bill before Parliament, majority public support was with us.

If, then, we had again adopted the present Premier's practice, we would have manipulated an early election on the issue. We would have sought to capitalise on the disarray of Labor, caused in the main by the Premier's own failure to give his Party a lead. There were many who urged us to go to an election, but we had other more important principles and priorities. Had we allowed the indenture Bill to be defeated there and then, it is possible we would not have the project today. BP had indicated to the former Liberal Government that without the indenture, it could end its obligations to the project. So we did everything possible to secure that project—and we succeeded—thanks to Norm Foster, as well, a man of principle. He had indicated publicly in November 1981 that in the interests of employment and workers in South Australia—the people the Premier claims to represent—he might support the indenture Bill.

I now let Dr Cornwall take up the story. In his memoirs at page 24, he writes that as a result of Mr Foster's attitude:

There were a number of senior members in the shadow Cabinet who began to see Foster as our potential saviour on Roxby

Downs. With an election due within months, his crossing the floor would have no practical effect on his parliamentary future. It would allow the Bill to pass and very effectively get the Labor Opposition off the hook.

So the intimidation of Mr Foster began. This is how Dr Cornwall now exposes it at page 25 of his memoirs:

By prearrangement I played the role of *agent provocateur* with considerable help from Chris Sumner. With John Bannon's knowledge and support, we had resolved to goad Foster whenever possible. The plan was clever and cruel. Ostensibly, our anger was because of our contempt for a colleague who was wavering on the hard-line anti-uranium policy. In fact, we had carefully calculated that, the more public scorn and ridicule we heaped on Foster, the more we would reinforce the chances of his defection. We reasoned that it would be easier for him to repudiate enemies than friends.

This strategy was used to particular effect on the evening of 16 June 1982 when the indenture was before another place and facing its first vital test. Before going into the Chamber to speak in the second reading, Mr Foster advised the Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, that he would follow Party policy and vote against the indenture. Within five minutes of beginning his second reading speech, he indicated this position to the House. But this only encouraged the present Attorney-General and Dr Cornwall to intensify their abuse of Mr Foster—to upgrade their interjections to very personal vilification.

The *Hansard* record of that debate shows Dr Cornwall questioning the mental capacity of Mr Foster. The present Attorney-General told him to stay away from Caucus. Mr Foster was shattered, because he had said he would follow Party policy. Overnight, he reconsidered his position, which had been made even more untenable by the telephone threat to his wife. In the morning, he announced that he would support the indenture. The price was forced resignation from a Party he had served for more than 20 years. At the time, Dr Cornwall, the Premier and the Attorney-General publicly denied that any pressure had been put on Mr Foster.

Dr Cornwall was quoted in the *News* of 17 June 1982—the day of Mr Foster's resignation—as saying of Mr Foster:

He has been under a lot of pressure from a lot of people but not from his colleagues.

The Attorney-General told another place on the same day that 'no pressure was brought to bear on the honourable member to vote the way he did'. When, just before the indenture debate began, Mr Foster had again publicly raised the possibility of supporting the legislation, the Premier had said in the *Advertiser* of 15 June 1982 that 'Norm will do the right thing'. Dr Cornwall has now revealed the true meaning of that statement. Behind all this manipulation and manoeuvring we see the hand of the Premier—the desperate hand of a person who saw the possibility of election victory slipping away—and who was prepared to sacrifice principle, decency, honesty and a colleague in his own quest for personal approval and popularity.

On the *7.30 Report* on Monday night, Dr Cornwall confirmed that the present Premier was fully involved in this despicable strategy. At the time, Mr Foster said that what had occurred had been 'the most scurrilous thing that ever happened' to him. We now have the Premier exposed as the leading architect of this strategy. The House should be quite precise about this point. Dr Cornwall's admissions mean that on 16 June 1982 Mr Foster advised the Premier he intended to oppose the indenture.

This had the potential to sink the secret Labor plan to get it off the political hook over Roxby Downs by making Mr Foster the sacrificial lamb. So, on the Premier's behalf, Dr Cornwall and the Attorney-General went into the Legislative Council intent on abusing and attacking Mr Foster to the point where he would support the Indenture against

the apparent policy of the Labor Party but to comply with the Premier's secret agenda—as I say, after Foster had indicated that he was going to vote against the Indenture. If Dr Cornwall's admissions were not the truth, I assume the Premier would have initiated legal action because they amount to a very serious charge of conspiracy, intimidation and vote rigging.

Because all the evidence is that Dr Cornwall has now spoken the truth, the Premier would, if he had any conscience, publicly apologise to Mr Foster and his family for the anguish he put them through—for the trauma the Premier's own lack of guts caused them. I challenge him to come into this debate tonight and do that. But, of course, he will not. The Premier does not operate like this. As Dr Cornwall also reveals, he is the Good News Premier.

Going back to Dr Cornwall's book, we read about the technique of reserving the Good News stories for the Premier. Continuing with his words:

They were invariably Government initiatives. On the other hand, individual Ministers carried any unpopular or controversial issues in their portfolio areas while the Eleventh Floor distanced the Premier from them.

We have seen this technique practised with Roxby Downs on a continuing basis since the Premier's cold, cowardly and cynical manipulation of Mr Foster. We have seen the Premier now claim personal credit for this project after failing to have the guts, when it really mattered, to speak up for it. This is the art of what Dr Cornwall has called 'the political imperative of perpetually seeking popularity'.

It leads him to write in the following terms about the approach of the members of this Government to their responsibilities:

Some relish being in Government because they achieve long-cherished goals. Eventually most like being in power because they can bestow patronage and lead the good life on a six figure annual income. It's important to be important. Generous expense allowances in their office budgets ensure that, wherever they travel on business, they travel in a cashless society.

It is little wonder Dr Cornwall writes like this when this Government is led by a Premier so utterly incapable of setting a personal example. I know from the few dealings I have had with him that he is not a person to be trusted. He has removed the moral and ethical dimensions from Government in this State. He is not what he seems. The Premier is in fact a political pygmy when it comes to any matter of principle. He was elected to lead but he consistently refused to lead. He opposed the Roxby Downs project. He refused to support the O-Bahn. He now opposes other major developments for our State after initially encouraging them.

Previous Premiers—like Playford, Dunstan and, more recently, Tonkin—had clear goals for South Australia and pursued them with determination. While all South Australians may not have agreed with those goals, they respected those Premiers for recognising their duty to lead our State. This Premier, however, is no leader of people. He is simply a manipulator of people in the pursuit of his own political interests. If the Labor Party has any credibility, any sense of decency, any political scruples, it will launch an immediate internal inquiry into the treatment of Mr Foster by his peers, as revealed by Dr Cornwall. I challenge it tonight to do so. If it refuses, it will be an indication that the Party is no bigger than the person who, for the time being, happens to be its parliamentary Leader.

It will be accepting the lowest of standards in the conduct of parliamentary affairs. This is what this House has come to expect from the Premier. Is it also what we must expect from all other members opposite? Are they prepared to be judged by the abysmal standards the Premier has set or will they join Dr Cornwall and condemn his perpetual pursuit

of personal popularity—even if it is any one of them who may be the next to be sacrificed?

The member for Hartley may be interested in responding to this challenge. He knows what Dr Cornwall means. He has crossed the Premier on matters of principle, so he is on the outer—and there are others I could name. We have incompetent lackeys like the Minister of Housing and Construction, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Emergency Services, the Minister of State Development and Technology on the front bench because they are prepared to play the game the Premier's way—without any principles whatsoever. I challenge Government members to respond to the issues I have raised tonight. What do they believe in—principle, or the Premier's practice of personal and political manipulation? I bet Frank enjoyed the speech!

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): On every occasion on which members of the Opposition have had the opportunity to comment on the Budget they have attacked and undermined the respect and confidence that people can have, should have and ought to have in our public institutions. In particular, a number of the comments that have been made by members opposite have attempted to undermine the confidence of people in the public health system of this State.

It began with the Leader of the Opposition and continued with a large number of members from the other side of the House who indicated that there is no commitment to public health, that there is no commitment to ensuring that the people who enter our public hospitals are able to get good quality service and that the commitment of the Government to provide qualified staff, upgraded facilities and competent services is in no way respected at all.

I reject completely all of the claims that have been made along those lines. The budget papers belie everything that the Opposition has said about the public health system. There have been two occasions in the past 2½ to 3 months where a major commitment has been made to public health in this State. In June, the Premier announced a four year \$46 million package of increased funding for South Australia's major metropolitan public hospitals. That included \$20 million for the replacement of equipment, as well as for additional facilities for elective surgery operations designed to shorten the waiting lists.

That contribution will be spent substantially this year, but a further \$26 million will be spent in subsequent years as a result of the deal which has been arranged between South Australia and the Commonwealth for the provision of public health facilities in this State. The capital works program of the budget (between pages 35 and 42) indicates a substantial public works program for South Australia's hospitals. Every hospital is able to benefit from it, and it will provide money for equipment, for elective surgery services, for the restoration of services, for the increased demands that will be made on public health services, for new buildings, for increased staff and for the extra services required as a result of specialist services for the nature of our population.

That capital works program is part of the \$1.06 billion that is part of the record health budget which is part and parcel of the 1989-90 Statement of Financial and Social Objectives for the year ahead. In personal terms, that record outlay represents an expenditure of about \$750 a year for every man, woman and child in South Australia. A number of key factors have influenced the 1989-90 budget. Throughout Australia there is unprecedented demand for public health services which has been brought about by a large number of reasons.

Health care delivery is becoming more expensive. Medical technology and medical practices are changing rapidly and we have an ageing population which further increases the demand for health services. We must respond to that by the provision of adequate and appropriate services, both within the hospital system as well as within the community and domiciliary care sections of our health system.

We are funding the system to the level of \$1.06 billion at least through the health budget and I remind members what the Minister of Health said yesterday in response to a question that not all the money to be spent in the health area is to be found in the health budget. The Minister pointed out that large amounts are put aside in the round sum allowances, which is the money put aside in the budget to provide for a large number of salary increases and CPI wage adjustments that are made throughout the year. Over all, the budget represents a 5 per cent real increase on the amount of dollars allocated to the health system in 1988-89. It is not a reduction—it is a real increase. It is a real increase in actual dollars and an increase in services; and it is a real increase in the amount of money that has been allocated to the public health system.

The metropolitan hospitals funding package allocations for 1989-90 are split up as follows: Lyell McEwen, \$0.6 million; Modbury, \$0.4 million; Children's, \$2.4 million; QEH, \$1.6 million, Flinders, \$2.8 million; and RAH \$3.8 million. That is in addition to a number of specific programs which are identified in the six pages of the capital works program.

Yesterday, when speaking in the second reading debate on the Appropriation Bill, I mentioned a number of major programs that will be undertaken within the electorate of Adelaide, in particular at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Some of the more significant programs, which I did not get an opportunity to mention but which will be part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, will include the replacement of a linear accelerator, the total cost of which will be \$3.8 million, of which \$500 000 will be spent this year. There is also an upgrading of the centralised theatres, the admission areas and the Margaret Graham annex which is due for a complete external refit. These examples of the commitments which have been made to public health belie the attempt by the Opposition to undermine the confidence and integrity of those who work in and those who use the public health system.

The 1989-90 budget will also see the expenditure of \$11.6 million in health aimed at meeting needs in other areas. There will be equipment purchases and more money for elective surgery, restoring services to hospitals and meeting increased demand.

Many South Australians are using the services of our hospitals. It is important that we keep pace with new technology. It is also important that we take new initiatives. Some of the new initiatives in this budget are a mammography screening program, which is to receive \$150 000, a national better health program, \$200 000, and support services for intellectually disabled people, \$400 000. The country mental health services will receive an additional \$100 000. Schoolchildren with social and medically related problems will have a special program oriented to their needs.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Peterson): Order! There is audible chatter. The member for Adelaide has the floor.

Mr DUIGAN: That program will cost \$150 000. As a consequence of the Muirhead Royal Commission, over \$100 000 will be used to improve medical staffing resources in prisons. Some \$300 000 will be allocated to the establishment of diversionary services for Aborigines which are designed to avoid inappropriate detention in gaols.

Another program with which I have become associated is a youth sobering centre. There is to be a diversionary program to ensure that young people who are inebriated and found on the streets and who are inappropriately being dealt with in our public health system can be taken to a sobering unit, taken to a place where they can receive counselling and advice, taken to the appropriate agencies of Government, attempted to be rehoused or relocated with families, if possible, and, if not, found alternative accommodation. These are some of the new initiatives. They were not being done last year; they are being done this year. I believe that the health budget is an excellent budget.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to take up a point made by the member for Adelaide and comment on the reference that he made to the mammography unit for which additional funds have been provided and of which we are appreciative. I and a number of organisations in my electorate have lobbied the Government to try to obtain some country screening program that will enable women in country areas to take advantage of the mammography screening. Such a program would assist the health of women in country districts.

I am concerned about what is perceived to be a great problem by some people but not by others, and I refer to the practicalities of having a mobile screening unit visit country areas. Such a program would enable country women to have those screenings in the country rather than their having to travel to the metropolitan area. I hope that, as a result of what the honourable member said (and I hope that the Government and the Minister concerned will reconsider the matter) greater pressure can be brought to bear to provide that mobile screening clinic. Some 20 years ago mobile TB units visited country schools and communities. I am sure that if a similar program could be implemented for mammography screenings, it would benefit country women. I trust that we will see a further expansion of the scheme as outlined by the honourable member, and I hope that the Government will provide some assistance in that area.

Last night when I spoke about aspects of the budget, one of my greatest concerns related to degradation of country roads. A deputation comprising the member for Eyre, local government representatives from Eyre Peninsula and me made representations to the Premier and the Minister for some sort of assistance for those councils severely affected by floods and, believe it or not, by drift damage. The Franklin Harbor District Council applied for assistance to repair the massive damage that was caused to its council by road drifts. Many of its roads had to be closed and many of them were made unsafe because of the road drifts. If anyone who was not experienced in country travel had hit those drifts across the road, serious accidents could have occurred. The council was therefore obliged to close those roads and access was therefore impossible.

A few weeks after the drift damage occurred, the Cleve District Council, which is a neighbouring district council, experienced serious thunderstorms, electrical storms and rain storms. The council's estimate of damage done to its roads during the first storm, and which was subsequently verified by the Highways Department, amounted to \$604 000. The expenditure of that amount would have made the roads only passable and put them back into some reasonable state of repair.

However, one month later, a similar storm of equal intensity passed through the area and that only compounded the damage already done. That storm totally wiped out all the reconstruction work which had been undertaken following the first flood and, consequently, the estimate of the total

damage done to council roads by those two electrical storms was about \$1.25 million.

All members would know that no country district council would have the ability to absorb that sort of expenditure during the lifetime of the council and the community. That is why the deputation was arranged with the Premier and the Minister. We wanted to establish whether some assistance, even if it was on a one-off basis, could be made available to those councils. The irony was that the representation was made by two neighbouring councils, but one council sought assistance for drift damage and the other for flood damage. Even the Premier smiled when he recognised the circumstances. Only last week the Premier announced that the Government is prepared to make a once-only grant of \$500 000 to all those councils that incurred damage as a result of those electrical storms and drifts.

Of course, we do not really know how far that will go, because the funds will be allocated on the recommendation of the local roads advisory committee. We do not know how many councils have made application. However, whilst I accept that the Government has recognised the need, the \$500 000 will not go very far in terms of the requirements of the two councils to which I have referred, given that the Cleve District Council's estimate of damage was \$1.25 million.

I refer to an article in the *Port Lincoln Times* of last evening: one of the councils responded and said that the grant was really just a drop in the ocean. I will go further than that, because I am concerned about communication in particular school bus runs. In the same paper another article, 'Detours forced on school buses', epitomises what happens in these areas and states:

Student travelling time has increased dramatically as school buses in the Cleve and Darke Peak area are forced to use detours and drive on a below standard road network. Many roads in the area were in poor condition and unlikely to ever be repaired, according to Cleve Area School bus driver Varina Forgie. Ms Forgie said that the district council did not have sufficient funding from the Government to keep all roads in repair.

One of the students who travel on Ms Forgie's bus, Stephanie Skinner, said if a road caused an accident it would be potentially disastrous. 'Our bus is fairly full,' she said, 'as we have extra kids on it from another run.' She said the bus that normally carried the extra students was unable to reach them because of roads being closed. Ms Forgie said the worst problem the road network's poor condition presented was not being able to use the most direct route. She said her bus services Gumflat, Campoona, Kilpa, Killroo and Darke Peak. She said the Education Department paid for servicing, repairs and drivers, and the poor roads and many detours she was forced to use increased the cost of repairs and fuel.

Ms Forgie said the detours and extra students meant her morning run began at 6.50 a.m. and the afternoon run only finished at 5.45 p.m. Some of the first students picked up are very young, she said, and were given an occasional day away from school to catch up on lost sleep. Ms Forgie was very grateful for the foresight of the former Acting Principal of Cleve Area School, Graham Hambley, who had UHF radios installed in all school buses. She said buses could contact each other or any farmers on their channel in the case of an accident or breakdown.

I believe it is sad that UHF radios have to be installed on buses just to ensure that in the event of a breakdown drivers of buses are able to contact other school buses or farmers to come to their assistance.

I received communication from a mixed store proprietor in a small country town who sells processed and frozen fish packs. The Fisheries Department requires that he be classified as a fish processor. There must be some misunderstanding, because it is wrong to call any person selling processed and packaged fish a processor. Every supermarket in the metropolitan area and every delicatessen proprietor who sells packaged fish would therefore be termed a processor. I hope that the Government will consider this mat-

ter, because I believe it involves a matter of interpretation. It must be considered urgently.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Auditor-General's Report tabled yesterday has identified further issues of serious concern for this Parliament and the tax-paying public. Before I deal with specific issues, I first make the general point that the report offers further convincing evidence that this Government has become tired, lazy and arrogant after almost seven years in office.

Ministers are ignoring their duty to ensure the most efficient and effective use of taxpayers' money. They reject the plain evidence that millions of dollars are being wasted. For example, on television last night the Minister of State Development and Technology rejected criticism of his department's involvement in the Marineland bungle which has already cost taxpayers almost \$6 million and robbed this State of one of our prime tourist attractions.

This indifference and arrogance are reflected in numerous other examples given in the Auditor-General's Report of ministerial failure to ensure that when wasteful spending is identified it is acted on. It is telling that again this year. The Auditor-General has raised the issue of quality of information provided to support large spending proposals and of management arrangements for overseeing the implementation of these proposals.

A Government that has been in office for almost seven years should not have this recurrent theme being brought to Parliament's attention. The timber corporation and Justice Information System fiascos have been previous examples cited by the Auditor-General. This year it is the Marineland redevelopment and activities of the State Computing Business Unit.

In bold type, the Auditor-General, in his introductory comments relating to these projects, said:

... 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. This 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.

Considerable evidence is offered again this year that this Government is ignoring this basic need. The Auditor-General has also said:

The extent to which my officers continue to need to become involved in the preparation of some agency financial statements is a matter of concern. It raises serious questions concerning the priority given to financial management generally in those agencies.

This can only mean that Ministers are not managing and that they are not insisting in their portfolio areas on the proper levels of resource planning and management. The planning for and implementing of computer systems is one major spending area of continuing serious concern to the Auditor-General. He nominates a range of projects where there are large question marks over the quality of information provided to support spending decisions by departments or Cabinet and the management systems established to implement those decisions.

The Justice Information System has received attention in previous reports. That system, and the new courts computer system, will now cost \$44 million to establish on current estimates. The original estimated cost of a combined system for both was less than half this amount only four years ago. The Auditor-General has reported that the estimated cost of the Motor Registration Division's new on-line system will be \$9.7 million compared with a 1985 estimate of \$4.5 million.

Mr Ingerson: And it's not fixed yet.

Mr OLSEN: And it's not fixed yet. That is exactly right. Full implementation has been delayed by three years and serious questions remain about the cost benefits. The report also identifies a number of new concerns in computer purchases and the application of information technology. It is worth pointing out to the House that these are not my words; I cite the report of the independent umpire—the Auditor-General.

The Auditor-General's Report reveals that the Government plans to spend \$23 million by 1995 on the implementation of StateLink, a Government-wide communications strategy. However, the Auditor-General has found that the management organisation structure responsible for the development of this system is 'loosely defined' with 'insufficient specialist resources availability directed to policy and planning issues'.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: *Laissez-faire.*

Mr OLSEN: In other words, the Government does not have control of it. This suggests that we may be facing a repeat of the Justice Information System blowout, because loose planning and management were prime causes of the JIS going completely off the financial rails and costing the taxpayers of South Australia some \$30 million in wasted funds. It just so happens that the person who is looking after this project looked after the JIS project; and he happens to head up the Premier's Department.

The Auditor-General has given attention to proposals by the State Business Computing Unit to spend \$2.8 million this financial year to deal with capacity problems. He has questioned the quality of information provided to justify this spending, and has suggested a net cost of up to \$1.8 million involved could be a waste because other means to rationalise computing arrangements and save money have not been considered.

The Auditor-General has raised questions about the On-line Procurement Service for the State Supply Board, intended to improve the efficiency of ordering by departments and agencies. This has cost \$1 million so far but, according to the Auditor-General, no other Government agencies are convinced about its cost effective benefits and also 'inefficient processing practices' have been identified by the Auditor-General.

Another area of concern is the Austpay computerised salary and personnel system, in relation to which there have been considerable overruns in spending on its implementation. It will cost at least an additional \$2.5 million to expand to other agencies. There are doubts, as well, about the Education Department's strategic computer plan. While schools have already been allocated \$3.7 million to spend on implementation of the plan, this has been held back pending a reassessment.

I have referred to spending totalling almost \$90 million on new technology for the public sector which has been questioned by the Auditor-General in this and in previous reports. There are serious doubts that this spending has been properly justified, and there are also serious doubts that the management structures are in place to control costs. Last year, in addressing this issue, the Auditor-General recommended that before committing further significant capital spending to information technology the Government should initiate an independent management review in order to 'take stock'. The Auditor-General offered to make available a senior and experienced officer to assist in that review.

While the Government has committed further capital spending of more than \$18 million in 1989-90 to the acquisition of computers and associated equipment, it has not acted upon this important recommendation of the Auditor-General. He has observed, in raising the matter again this

year, that in developing information technology strategies 'there appears to be no overall coordinated plan for agencies to plug into'.

The Auditor-General has recommended four elements important to such a review, which are as follows: a broad picture of the public sector information base and the critical data links in that base; identification of the major data base processing locations to provide overall the most effective, efficient and economic operation and use of the information network; an equipment and software policy to ensure compatibility of the information network; and development of a management environment in which information technology needs are based on sound business cases. A Liberal Government will immediately initiate this review. Pending its completion, we would place a moratorium on spending on major new information technology programs in the public sector.

In his last two reports, the Auditor-General has presented strong evidence to show that consistent and precise policies and practices in the public sector's planning for and use of new technology do not exist. As a result, we already have one major system, the Justice Information System, that will cost double its estimated cost—involving a \$20 million-plus blow out. We must avoid a repetition of this. However, rather than ensure that we do, the Government has pressed on blindly, committing taxpayers' money for questionable benefit.

The budget papers even reveal that State Computing will spend \$1.8 million this financial year in acquiring computer equipment to support its contract with WorkCover. This sort of spending must be seriously questioned, for a number of reasons. The latest Auditor-General's Report, and previous reports, have made adverse comment about justifications given by State Computing for spending on new equipment. I am sure that there are higher priorities for capital spending in schools and hospitals, particularly when the type of computing work involved could be contracted out to the private sector at competitive cost.

There is sufficient comment in the latest Auditor-General's Report to suggest that taxpayers' money is already unnecessarily exposed in the purchase and management of information technology systems in the public sector. A Liberal Government will heed the warnings which Labor has consistently and repeatedly ignored. The Auditor-General has also raised a number of other important public sector management issues. In education, the non-instruction time of teachers requires urgent clarification and attention, with the potential to save up to \$7 million in secondary schools alone.

Sick leave also has emerged as an issue in the Education Department, as it has in a number of other departments. Last financial year, the Education Department increased by 13 per cent its spending on the employment of temporary relieving teachers to cover sickness. The Auditor-General has also identified concerns about sick leave practices in the Health Commission, in Community Welfare, the STA and the Highways Department. Interestingly, this morning's *Advertiser* headlines: 'Crackdown on Public Service Sickies' is very similar to the paper's headline the morning after the 1988 Auditor-General's Report was tabled—almost exactly the same as 12 months ago. The reality is that the situation is deteriorating. In the major metropolitan hospitals, absenteeism was on the rise again last year, despite the Premier's commitment 12 months ago to a crackdown.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If members read the article in the *Advertiser* this morning, unlike the member for Adelaide who read only the headline, it substantiates what I am saying. The

Auditor-General has accompanied his comments about the ongoing problems with non-medical staff in the major metropolitan hospitals by saying that there is an 'urgency for systems to be in place so management has prompt and reliable information available to regularly monitor leave trends.' However, it has been almost 18 months since the Auditor-General first raised this issue with the Government. On the evidence of his latest report, little has been achieved by the Government, in this area or elsewhere in the public sector.

It is certain, in particular, that nothing will be done about the problem within the STA. The report reveals that changes to industrial agreements will be necessary to improve the situation here, and, on the record of this Government, that clearly will not happen. It will continue to allow union officials to run the STA. The results of this abdication of responsibility are shown in the fact that patronage of Adelaide's public transport system last financial year was the lowest since 1974. I am glad that the Minister responsible is on the front bench presently, albeit reading the paper and not much interested in the patronage of the STA at the moment.

Over the past five years, passenger journeys have declined by almost 16 million—or by more than 300 000 per week. It now costs taxpayers \$2.62, including concessions, to subsidise each and every journey on our buses, trains and trams. This is outrageous inefficiency being paid for by all taxpayers. The STA is in need of major overhaul to encourage more people to travel on our public transport system. The fact that fewer people travel on our STA system in 1989 than did so in 1974 has got to signal a problem to members opposite. If they cannot identify it as a problem, the reality is they do not deserve to be on the right-hand side of the Speaker any longer in this Parliament. After seven years of Labor inaction, only a Liberal Government will achieve some changes in this area.

Members should look at the Fielding report that has been on their desks for some time. The Government brought out Fielding from America to present this report at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars to get the former Minister off the hook. Whenever there is a problem, the Government refers it to a committee for a report, just to put it on hold for a period of time. The Minister for Environment and Planning is a great one for recommending reports. She is so busy establishing reports on reports on reports that she does not actually do anything. Clearly, whenever there is a problem, members opposite close the door and wait for the problem to go away. They do not tackle it or attempt to solve it. In the meantime, the taxpayers are, because of the inaction, inefficiency and total disregard of their well-being, picking up the bill for this State's public transport system. The Government's efforts—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The member for Newland might well interject. I was pleased to see her up front at the O-Bahn opening. The member for Newland was quite happy to stand up for that good Liberal initiative and to say that it is a great scheme. It was only six years before that the Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, was canning the O-Bahn. He was saying what a disaster the O-Bahn was for South Australia and how the Liberal Government had got it wrong. I am pleased that we got so far down the track and locked into contracts that this Government had to complete the project, because it is good for the people of South Australia and especially for the people of the north eastern suburbs. They will know who initiated the scheme—it was the Liberal Party, not the Labor Party. This Government can put on all the extravaganzas it likes; it can provide free public

transport on a Sunday; but the bottom line is that this was a Liberal initiative, as was Roxby Downs, the Torrens linear park, Technology Park, and the international airport; and so the list goes on.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Because interest rates got to an all time high of 13.5 per cent! It is the Labor Party that has put interest rates through the roof to 17 per cent. The Labor Party should not be fooled that the electorate will not remember that. The Labor Party is in for short shrift and its members know that when the people have the opportunity they will tell Labor through the ballot box what they think of its economic policies.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They only won because they double-crossed Normie. Their boss did the dirty on Normie. That is the only reason they won.

Mr OLSEN: That reminds me, the honourable former Minister, Dr John Cornwall, blew the whistle on them. We can see how the Premier and the Attorney-General devised this scheme. No wonder people have a disregard for politicians when you have that sort of activity in order to win Government. No wonder that Government members shrunk under the bench in embarrassment. They were embarrassed about Dr Cornwall's exposures in relation to 1982. It shows the con and the fraud that members opposite are prepared to perpetuate to remain in Government. Forget honesty; forget principle; put anything out to get over the line in a ballot. That is what the Labor Party is on about, and it has been proved. In his book, John Cornwall clearly demonstrated what they are on about.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He blew the whistle on them.

Mr OLSEN: 'Honest John', they call him! Have a look at what he did! What did you do to poor Normie Foster? Six years after the event, he calls it cruel—after he was sent to coventry by the Labor Party. It was interesting that you welcomed Norm Foster back to the Labor Party earlier this year—you took his money. Having been in Government for seven years after what he did, no wonder you were prepared to take some money from him. To return to the speech, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Government's efforts—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: One cannot but respond to the interjections from the member for Hartley.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Peter Duncan had to bail out; he couldn't stand the orange flower water and the—

Mr OLSEN: He was another former Minister—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He couldn't hack it.

Mr OLSEN: He and I are poles apart politically and philosophically, but one thing Peter Duncan has going for him is that he is straight and honest.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is interesting that you might laugh. I spent some time on the PAC with Peter Duncan, and I got to know another side of him. There is one thing about him—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He's straight. He had to bail out; he couldn't hack this fellow any more.

Mr OLSEN: It is interesting that they don't think so.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the House to order. I ask that there be only one speaker at a time. The Leader has the floor, and I ask members to cease their interjections. I also ask the Leader to address the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: I am just stating a basic fact, something I believe about Peter Duncan. As I have said, he and I are poles apart in policy direction but there is one thing about him—he is honest. He will say one thing to you and he will follow it through whether you agree with him or not. Where he stands today, he stands tomorrow, and that is more than

can be said for a few people sitting on the front bench opposite now.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: There was another former Minister who had a difference of opinion—his name was Chatterton.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, he got short shrift, too. They will run out of people—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Three ex-Ministers—all the same story.

Mr OLSEN: It is starting to add up, is it not? A chink in credibility is starting to show. This Government's efforts to keep secret its complete mismanagement of the Marineland redevelopment have been hardly surprising given the Auditor-General's comments. However, last night, the Minister of State Development and Technology on television rejected the criticism. He suggested that the Tribond company was to blame for this multi-million dollar loss to taxpayers.

But Tribond was specifically invited to redevelop Marineland by the West Beach Trust acting on behalf of the South Australian Government, and in agreeing to become involved the company was deliberately duped about the appalling deterioration of the facilities at Marineland which this Government allowed to occur. This forced the company to radically revise its plans. However, a development still could have proceeded involving an oceanarium, had this Government not given in to sections of the Labor Party intent on stopping it.

This House should be clear about this point. Taxpayers are facing a bill of \$6 million to pay for this Government's weakness and unwillingness to see this project through. That is why the Government wants to keep secret what has happened. That is why the Government forced certain people who know the full story to sign a deed of secrecy.

The Abels family have signed a contract under which they cannot utter a word to the media or answer any questions on Marineland for fear of being sacked and for fear of having the remuneration package removed from them. Open government? If it is such a good deal, what do they have to hide? Why do people have to sign a deal that commits them not to utter a word about the deal on Marineland? It is crook, and members opposite know it is crook. It was this Government which stopped the redevelopment of that Marineland site. It was not the developer who said 'No'—it was the Government.

It was the Government which turned its back on agreements with Tribond which would have retained one of South Australia's prime tourist attractions. One day, the full story will emerge, and it will reflect no credit on this Government or on the Minister of State Development and Technology. I am absolutely amazed at his being involved in a deal of this nature, because he—above all—is someone for whose personal integrity I have always had regard.

But after this deal, you could not say that any more. Secrecy has been this Government's way of attempting to contain the backlash. It tried the same with the Timber Corporation deals, until my Party, through a Parliamentary Select Committee, forced the truth into the open. But even now, the Government tries to gloss over the continuing problems with SATCO's investment. The Minister of Forests came into this House on 10 August to boast that SATCO had made an operating profit of just under \$1.5 million last financial year.

But what he did not tell the House was that SATCO's operating costs last financial year were reduced by \$3.9 million in interest repayments following SAFA's decision to write down its equity in the corporation by \$17 million. That is a bit of creative accounting: you make the bottom

line look better so that the press release looks better for the public. No accountancy firm would support that.

This House has had to wait for the Auditor-General's Report to see the true situation in SATCO. It still has an underlying deficiency in funds of \$15.4 million. As the Auditor-General states, there remains considerable risk to taxpayers in SATCO's business activities.

Another business venture to have failed last financial year was the Clothing Corporation, which had an operating loss of \$591 000. This would have been even worse if the Central Linen Service had recharged management services of almost \$100 000. The corporation's loss included writing off \$74 000 for its investment in a joint venture for the production and marketing of reproduction convict shirts.

It is this Government which stands convicted for allowing the yearly operating loss of this failed business venture to mount from \$68 000 in 1986-87, to \$496 000 in 1987-88, to well over \$500 000 last financial year. There are other revelations in the Auditor-General's Report about Government involvement in business which are of concern. The Central Linen Service has been involved in the avoidance of sales tax on the sale of linen to Queensland. This agency already has significant income tax advantages over its private sector competitors. South Australia-Asia Proprietary Limited, which comes under the wing of the Minister of State Development and Technology, made further losses of more than \$360 000 last financial year, to bring accumulated losses to well over \$935 000.

The Centre for Remote Sensing lost a further \$300 000 to add to its \$241 000 loss in 1987-88. Last financial year, its income fell short of the business plan target by more than 50 per cent, while its cost recovery of 17 per cent compared with a projected 32 per cent. StatePrint, once known as the Government Printer, had an operating loss of \$1.2 million last financial year. Increasingly, StatePrint is seeking to expand its commercial activities, yet the Auditor-General has reported that there is:

... inadequate maintenance of financial records and processes inhibiting timely and effective management reporting [and] insufficient attention to accounting and control procedures.

This Government is so busy trying to get StatePrint into competition with the private sector that it is ignoring the duty to protect taxpayers' money. The operating deficit of the Adelaide Convention Centre for last financial year increased from \$4.35 million to \$5.8 million. Now the Liberal Party has been pleased to do its bit to enhance the viability of the centre with the functions that we keep holding down there.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: They are very successful.

Mr OLSEN: Very successful, with 800 people turning up to business lunches.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Compared with the number drawn by the Prime Minister.

Mr OLSEN: The Prime Minister had about 150, and most of them were staffers. With the Government committed, through the ASER agreement, to increasing its contribution to offset the deficit by a further \$900 000 last financial year to \$4.8 million, there is a need to consider what can be done to limit this contribution in the longer term—particularly as the Premier's original estimate of this commitment was only about a quarter what it has turned out to be.

The Auditor-General's Report also shows that another \$1.2 million of capital spending was necessary on the *Island Seaway* last financial year—and still the major modifications have not been completed. The Government subsidy paid to the operators in 1988-89 was \$41 a tonne of cargo—a 24 per cent rise due mainly to increases in the interest

rate component of lease payments made to the lessor of the vessel.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The *Falgie* can make it but the *Island Seaway* cannot. Despite repeated assurances from the Minister of Recreation and Sport that the financial performance of Radio 5AA would improve, it incurred a further significant loss last financial year. The 1988-89 loss was \$347 000, bringing accumulated losses since the Government takeover to \$4.3 million.

However, last year's real result was a loss of just over \$1 million given that in 1988-89 the TAB increased by \$750 000 the race broadcasting fee it pays to the station. While this Government has been busy expanding its involvement and influence in areas once left to the private sector, it has ignored some of the fundamentals of good public administration. For example, the Auditor-General commented in his report this year that 'progress has been slow' in determining future liabilities for superannuation and long service leave entitlements.

It is believed that entitlements already accrued could cost the taxpayers of tomorrow up to \$2.5 billion. The Auditor-General recommended last year that action should be taken to more precisely define this liability. This has not been done. Another recommendation from the Auditor-General ignored by the Government has been for two-year forecasts of the effects of new major revenue and expenditure initiatives to be given in the annual budget papers. It is well to point out that the list of Government losses has resulted from the Government's not taking action as recommended repeatedly by the Auditor-General to this Parliament. His warnings have been ignored to the cost of taxpayers.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to speak after the swan song of the Leader of the Opposition. We all know that, following the election, he will not be Premier or Leader of the Liberal Party. However, I am not going to be distracted by the political neuter opposite. I want to talk about the contribution made last night by the member for Light about the Neighbourhood Watch scheme. We have had hypocrisy from the Opposition benches about their alleged support for the Neighbourhood Watch scheme.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That is an interesting interjection by the member for Bragg. He says that the Liberal Party supports Neighbourhood Watch. I have in my possession a letter signed by one of his colleagues saying that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme is impractical. One of his colleagues on the front bench has said that it is an impractical proposition. The reality is that South Australians overwhelmingly support the Neighbourhood Watch scheme.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I ask my colleagues to contain themselves. I know that members opposite are interested, but they will have to wait until the last minute of my contribution. The reality is that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme was introduced into this State by the Bannon Government. All members on both sides of the House—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I thank the member for Briggs. On 17 November 1983 (I cannot remember the page of *Hansard*, but I will look it up for next time), I asked the then Minister whether he would investigate the feasibility of introducing a Neighbourhood Watch scheme for the State. The Minister

at the time, to his credit, picked it up in quick time and it is a reality today. That is in stark contrast to those so-called initiatives by the Liberal Party when it was in government. What initiative did the Liberals take in terms of community policing in South Australia between September 1979 and when they were defeated in 1982? Zilch.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Exactly. That political neuter opposite, who was not worth a cold pie as Chief Secretary, has the hypocrisy to stand up here tonight, holier than thou, and preach about what he would do as Premier. His record speaks for itself. He was hopeless as a Minister, yet he professes and aspires to be the leader of a future government. Years ago he could not even organise members on his side of the House. On two occasions in this House (his memory fails him badly) there was not one Liberal member in the Chamber. It was a disgrace. That was a future Premier of South Australia! The people of South Australia have seen through that. Indeed, in 1985 they rejected him.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You are a born loser. Let us get back to the real issues. When members opposite talk about law and order, they are being hypocritical. I refer to a statement in the *News* last Friday:

The gap between the perception and reality of Adelaide's reputation as the crime capital of Australia is as startling as it is wide. Extensive reporting of certain sadistic and bizarre murders has led many people in South Australia and throughout the country to believe that crime in Adelaide is out of hand.

Because of time, I shall not relate the whole of the article, but I refer the public and members opposite to it. It is very interesting. It is supported by other articles which, if I had the time, I would like to address in this debate.

I want to address the question of Neighbourhood Watch, the program that members opposite (it is worthwhile putting this on public record) have said is impractical to introduce. Further, a member who sits on the Opposition front bench wrote to me in his own handwriting, saying:

I would have liked to initiate it in my electorate but now is inappropriate. You may well have some success. Indeed, this Government did have a popular success with that scheme.

Mrs Appleby: Who wrote it?

Mr HAMILTON: The House is very anxious to know who wrote it: it was the member for Mitcham. He signed it and even said 'Merry Christmas'.

Mr Groom: The present member for Mitcham?

Mr HAMILTON: The present member for Mitcham, yes. He wrote to me and said that. Let the member for Mitcham deny in this place that he said it and, if he did so, I would say outside what I cannot say in this place—it would be an untruth. I do not want to use colourful language, because I know that you, Sir, would uphold the Standing Orders of Parliament.

Mr Tyler: And it's not your style, anyway.

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague said, it is not my style. That scheme, which was introduced by the Bannon Government, has been very popular in this State. In Semaphore in the western suburbs it has reduced the crime rate by 77 per cent. Last night, and on many other occasions, the member for Light and the member for Morphett have not got their facts straight. Having been fed with the gaff from the second floor they come, like parrots, into this place and read whatever the staff of the Leader of the Opposition tells them to read. They are too damn lazy to do any research. They are suddenly very quiet.

I talk to police inspectors very frequently. They come to my electorate office regularly and chat with me. They ask, 'How are things going down here, Kevin?' I have learnt

from senior police officers that the manning levels are not necessarily the problem. The member for Light and members of the Opposition are trying to convince the community that we need more and more police out on the beat. When one speaks to senior police officers, as I have done (and two months ago I addressed senior police officers at Echunga), one learns that that is not the case. Those police officers said, 'Kevin, what you said about financial resources had to be said. It is not necessarily numbers; rather, it is the utilisation of financial resources that counts.' That is what they say. The police inspectors in the western suburbs say the same thing, and that fact is supported by a number of my colleagues.

The reality is that the perception that the Liberal Party is dishonestly attempting to engender out in the community is taking us back to shades of 1979. Members opposite want to resurrect this law and order, doom and gloom and the belief that people cannot walk on the streets. When one looks at what this Government has done in terms of law and order, one sees that it is far superior to anything proposed by the Liberal Party.

In my remaining time I want to highlight what this Government and members on this side of the House have been prepared to do in terms not only of looking after their constituents but also in assisting the police. Some time ago I read an article about the property recovery card. Many colleagues in this House, including the member for Briggs—

Mr Rann: And overseas.

Mr HAMILTON:—indeed, many overseas and interstate people—have picked up this concept of the property recovery card. The initiative was taken by members of this Government to assist the police. To my delight at least one Liberal was prepared to acknowledge what this Government has done.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, he is too proud for that; it is one of the candidates (Dorothy Kotz).

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Be quiet, yap-yap. She has decided to support the concept of a property recovery card. That further supports what this Government is doing. Not one member opposite is prepared to endorse this concept, but one of their candidates has realised the value of this card.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have been accorded a favour by my colleagues to answer directly some of the trash that we have just heard from the member for Albert Park. I did not intend to read a speech, but I will read extensively from a document and, during the last minutes, I will provide the names of the persons who made the statements. One statement, headed 'Public is duped', is as follows:

People who complain about delays in response time by police at Elizabeth to deal with crime north of Adelaide are invited to contact their members of Parliament.

This is the frank admission of the officer in charge at Elizabeth police station—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The officer-in-charge?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The officer-in-charge of the Elizabeth police station—

in detailing a number of obstacles to police efficiency. The obstacles include:

- Private cars owned by police regularly stolen or damaged.
- Official police cars regularly damaged and often made inoperative.
- Seven incoming telephone lines but often only two police to answer the calls.
- Cells which were meant originally for five adults and two juveniles but now house an average of between 12 and 13 prisoners a day.

The officer said the three floored facilities for police at Elizabeth belonged to a bygone era and had now outlived their usefulness and efficiency.

A major function for us is through our cells because we service all prisoners in custody going to the Para district courts, he said.

'Receiving and escorting prisoners is a major function, but we would have to admit that the cells are dark and outdated, to say the least,' he said.

The senior officer said the cells meant for five adults shared a common toilet and there was no hot water and no shower.

'During the last financial year we put 5 300 prisoners through these facilities,' he said.

That is, 5 300 prisoners were put through facilities which were prepared for five adult and two juveniles.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The member for Albert Park says there is no problem.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly: the member for Albert Park suggested that no-one did any research or read anything; no-one told the truth in this place other than the member for Albert Park.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I wonder what he is trying to cover up.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I wonder what he is trying to cover up. We will come to that in a moment. The article continues:

There is a total lack of space and no security for our members' cars or for police cars. Most of the police cars themselves have been damaged at some stage or other.

Because of manpower shortages in the department we do not have the patrols that there should be. Obviously nobody would expect to see all the patrol cars that are supposed to be in their area at the one time but the real answer is that they are not there at all.

Continuing on, we find that the Police Association Secretary, himself a senior police officer with a good many years of experience, under the heading 'Public urged to demand bigger force', states:

The lack of security and other obstacles to police efficiency at Elizabeth are part of an overall picture in which the public is being duped, according to the South Australian Police Association.

Mr Hamilton: What page are you reading from?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Page one. I will wait to the last minute, and then I will let the honourable member know. I would not like to take a step ahead of him. The article continues:

'The public is being duped because they believe that in a given area they may have so many cars looking after them, but that is not so,' said association secretary, Sam Bass.

Mr Bass said the police at present were just holding their own by working well above the levels at which they should be working.

'Most people might put in so many jobs in an eight hour day but my members are putting in about one-third again just to keep up with the backlog of work,' he said.

'This can't go on because you have people breaking down under stress, they go off sick and the whole situation gets worse,' he said.

Mr Bass supported the senior officer in urging people to complain to the Government and to members of Parliament.

They should say they are sick of not getting police when they want them and that they are sick of having their police working under such terrible conditions. It is not fair on the police.

Mr Bass said the Government claimed there were sufficient police numbers and that the ratio of police to public was better than anywhere in Australia.

But the Government failed to take proper account of police working on day shifts, those working in country areas with very low populations and the non-active areas within the department such as mechanics and administration.

'Despite these difficulties for police now we are told of new initiatives which will require 30 men at Adelaide Airport and in other areas,' he said.

'We just can't go on—something has got to give and my suggestion is that it be the Government and its budget to take on more police.'

The person who had the fortitude to make this statement is Senior Sergeant Meertens, the Officer-in-Charge of the

police at Elizabeth. He is saying only what senior officers and commissioned officers in stations right across South Australia have been saying. People at the coalface have clearly indicated, as was stated last night—not from notes, not from reading but straight from my knowledge of what is happening out there—their serious concern about the lack of police services. Last night the Liberal Party outlined that people have grave concerns even about being in their own homes, and I detailed some of the problems that occur at Salisbury North, Elizabeth, Gawler, Christies Beach and Reynella; and the member for Murray-Mallee has told this House on an earlier occasion of the grave difficulties that occur in Murray Bridge.

The Liberal Party supports the police. Not a word of what I have said is a word against the Police Force; my remarks are directed against the Government, which preaches that it assists the Police Force but which fails to give the assistance it requires. The Leader and I, along with other colleagues, one day last year attended the City Watch-House to see the deplorable conditions under which prisoners were held. Not only had funds not been made available to upgrade the police cells but also the union would not allow prisoners to be taken to the Remand Centre—for which the public paid millions of dollars—after 4.30 p.m. If courts were delayed—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly. If the courts were delayed or if there was a problem of conveyance to the Remand Centre, the prisoner, whether or not guilty, was forced to spend the night in deplorable conditions at the City Watch-House. Some people there looked like and were being treated like animals—not by the police who were trying to give them succour but by a Government that had failed to meet its responsibility and, more specifically in this case, had failed to stand up to the union movement that was preventing the proper functioning of the Remand Centre. The member for Albert Park should not stand up again with his holier than thou attitude—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I told the House—Senior Sergeant Meertens, a man with conviction, who was prepared to stand up for those people in the force who are trying to provide a service but who are being denied that opportunity by a Government that has no conscience.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The member for Light has clearly demonstrated that the comments of the member for Albert Park have no substance whatsoever. With senior police officers coming out and publicly making statements such as those referred to, Government members should really hang their heads in shame. After seven years of the Bannon Government, one could be excused for thinking that the State of South Australia ends at the boundary of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide. However, having regard to statements that have been made by some senior police officers, one realises that the problems even within the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide are enormous.

There is no doubt, too, that in many instances the problems in the country areas are even greater. I remind the House that, whilst only about 30 per cent of the population of South Australia lives in the country areas of this State, 30 per cent of the population generates some 50 per cent of the State's wealth. Those people certainly do not receive 30 per cent of the State's capital expenditure. It is well known by senior people in the Education Department that nowhere near 30 per cent of the State's education budget, particularly the capital budget, is spent on country schools.

There is no excuse whatsoever for the Government's holding to ransom the children of this State who live in country areas.

Any reasonable person living in the metropolitan area of Adelaide would agree that those children in country areas should have the same opportunities that the children in the metropolitan area have. The Opposition is suggesting not that the budget should be increased but that the 30 per cent of people living in the country areas of the State should at least receive their fair and reasonable share of the education budget, along with every other section of the budget.

Last week I attended the annual general meeting of the Murray Valley League in Barham, New South Wales. At the commencement of the meeting and the two-day conference of the league, Councillor Ken Trewin, of the Wakool Shire, extended a welcome to delegates at the conference, and in so doing he enthusiastically spoke about the water filtration program that the Wakool Shire was entering into as regards the town of Barham, which has only some 2 200 people. After the official opening of the conference, I spoke with Councillor Trewin and he explained to me that many of the country towns in Victoria and New South Wales are supplied with filtered water.

I make the point that we in the country are not seeking any benefits over and above those that are received and appreciated by the citizens of South Australia who live in the city areas. The State Government has fed us the story for a number of years that there is no economical way to filter water for small towns and that therefore it is simply bad luck if one lives in the country. Had the Liberal Government not been in office from 1979 to 1982 the people of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta would still be waiting for filtered water. However, as a Liberal initiative we were prepared to proceed with that very important water filtration plant to service that area. There are numerous other smaller towns in South Australia that receive water directly from the Murray River, and the level of turbidity in the water running through the domestic taps is many times greater than that received in the metropolitan area.

While at the conference, the executive officer of the council in the town of Cahouna took me to see the water filtration plant in that town and at Leitchville. Leitchville is a town of only about 250 to 300 people with a very modern water filtration plant. As I said earlier, we have been told consistently by this Government that there is no economic way that small town water supplies can be filtered, and I am talking not of towns of 200 or 300 people but of towns of 4 000 or 5 000. It interested me that in this very small water filtration plant was a plaque indicating that it was opened in 1987 and designed by Kinhill in Adelaide.

During the Address in Reply debate, I suggested that the Government should call for registrations of interest of engineering consultancy firms interested in putting forward proposals for small water filtration plants. I have no doubt that the present Government will take no notice of my request, but I bring to the attention of the House that the technology is available. These small, efficient water filtration plants do exist. This indicates that the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales recognise that citizens living in country areas have the same rights as those living in the city and, quite obviously, the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales are prepared to dedicate an appropriate portion of their capital works program to making sure that people living in the country areas have a fair go.

It is time for the Government to get on with the job and call for registrations of interest. There is no need to increase the budget, but the Government should ensure that the appropriate proportion of the water resources allocation is

directed to the interests of country people. The same applies with the Education Department budget. There is no doubt whatsoever—and the figures will clearly indicate this—that children in country areas of South Australia are not getting a fair go. They should not be disadvantaged because of the colour of the Government in South Australia.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I listened with great care to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. If ever there was a swan song, it came from the Leader of the Opposition tonight.

Mr Lewis: He'll be Premier after the election.

Mr GROOM: The member for Murray-Mallee is in cuckoo land because he knows that the Leader of the Opposition will not be the Premier after the next election: he will be sitting somewhere on the other side of the House. One thing is for sure: he will not be sitting on this side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the years from 1979 to 1982 as if they were the golden days. Mr Acting Speaker, in economic terms, they were the bad old days.

Mr Hamilton: Talk about what they did—

Mr GROOM: Well, we have examples. The Leader of the Opposition spoke as though there was some purity in the Liberal Party ranks during those years, but look what happened to Allan Rodda. The Leader of the Opposition took Allan Rodda's job, and he had the audacity—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Coles knows the circumstances in which the present Leader of the Opposition took the previous member for Victoria's job from him. She knows—she was there, and she was party to it. The fact is that they were not the golden days: they were the bad old days in economic terms. We have an example in New South Wales. If members want to see what a Liberal Government will do, go to New South Wales. I went there with my wife and two young children in July and stayed with my brother at Annandale, which is as far out from the city as is St Morris here.

I took my wife and children on a bus to travel to Sydney. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about South Australia's transport costs, but they pale in significance compared to those in New South Wales. I queried the bus driver; I suggested that the ticket must have been for a return journey. He said that it would have been much cheaper to take a taxi to Sydney; he said you should not use public transport in New South Wales, because it was too dear. It is very expensive to travel on buses in New South Wales—make no mistake about it.

Members should see what is happening with State taxes and charges in New South Wales. They should look at what Mr Greiner has done. We know that its education policy is designed to get rid of teachers—they have had mass demonstrations. When I was in Sydney in July, I noticed that Nick Greiner is so popular that when he went on a fun run a big crowd was waiting for him at Darling Harbour, not to cheer him but to give him the message. The crowd booed him as he came in to the finish line—it was shown on television. That is how popular Liberal Premiers are. We saw what the Liberals did in South Australia between 1979 to 1982. The Liberal Party increased taxation, and so on, but I will not repeat my speech of last night. We know what they did.

However, let us compare the records. I accept that there is a different time frame in relation to Liberal and Labor Governments in recent years—six years of Labor Government compared to three years of Liberal Government. As a consequence, I will 'annualise' the figures for proper com-

parison. Between September 1979 and December 1982, when the people rejected the Liberals (and they rejected them again in 1985 and will reject them again in 1989, as the member for Bragg knows because he is likely to be the Leader of the Opposition after the next State election), the South Australian population grew by 2.72 per cent. We can 'annualise' that as a growth rate during those years of .8 per cent.

If one compares that with the period from December 1982 to March 1989—and I will 'annualise' it; I will not compare three years with six years—the population growth was 6.17 per cent. If one 'annualises' that, the figure is .96 per cent. That is much higher than the annual growth rate under a Liberal Government. If the Liberal Party policies were still foisted on South Australia there would have been 11 800 fewer people in South Australia today.

Between November 1979 and November 1982, employment under a Liberal Government grew by .1 per cent, or .4 per cent each year. However, between November 1982 and July 1989, employment grew by 16.5 per cent. Let us be fair: the 'annualised' figure is 2.3 per cent per year, compared with .4 per cent under a Liberal Government—it speaks for itself. Between the 1979-80 financial year and the 1981-82 financial year, private dwelling approvals averaged 6 520 per year. In the seven financial years since 1982-83, they have averaged 8 982 per year. If there had been a continuation of Liberal Party policy, 2 462 fewer dwellings would have been built each year.

An honourable member: What nonsense!

Mr GROOM: The honourable member can say that it is nonsense. In relation to non-dwelling approvals, in the three financial years 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82, private non-dwelling approvals averaged \$284.2 million per year. However, in the seven financial years since that time—since a Liberal Government—these approvals have averaged \$468.7 million. Therefore, if the previous investment rate had been maintained for the past seven years—if this Government had maintained the Liberal rate of non-dwelling approvals—\$1.3 billion of investment in non-dwelling construction would have been lost to South Australia. On average, every year, had Liberal policies been continued, we would have destroyed about \$185 million worth of investment in major construction in this State.

If one compares the six years since 1982-83—looking at the picture on an overall basis—real growth in gross State product in South Australia has been 31.5 per cent. Under a Liberal Government, when one 'annualises' the rate of growth, it actually fell by 1.1 per cent in real terms. That is a very sad story. Had Liberal policies been continued in this State, South Australia would have suffered dramatically. It is no good calling the years 1979 and 1982 'the golden days'—as the Leader of the Opposition virtually did. They were not 'golden days'. We know what the Liberal Party did in Government.

It used capital works moneys to prop up its recurrent expenditure. It pretended this was a low tax State, but anyone can do that. If you take capital works moneys, you have to have a recession. That is what happened under the Tonkin Government: it took \$100 million, which meant we did not have \$100 million worth of capital works in the economy—so we had a recession. Not only was there a recession as a consequence of that activity, but the Tonkin Government allowed the \$1.4 million surplus it inherited from the Corcoran Government to blow out to a \$63 million budget deficit in 1982-83.

All in all, it frittered away \$160-odd million and brought about a recession in South Australia. At the same time, it raised State taxes and charges on 194 separate items during

those three years. That is its record. I was not surprised: during this session I have constantly asked members opposite to give us a few policies—to tell us what they are going to do, for example, with education. It is no good the member for Chaffey going on about education: I have not heard one thing—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! I call the House to order. I remind the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Bragg that they are on the list to contribute to this debate tomorrow, and ask them to contribute at the appropriate time.

Mr GROOM: I have not heard one positive policy from members opposite. So what you have to do is look at their record when in government. They are the same people who were here between 1979 and 1982, so we can predict with reasonable confidence what they will do in government. They will follow the same old formulas, because they are yesterday's people. To reinforce that, one needs only to go to New South Wales. I was horrified. I just did not believe what a mess New South Wales was in until I saw the policies of the Greiner Government first hand—until it cost me \$13 to take my wife and two children on a return trip just a couple of kilometres in and out of Sydney.

Greiner put it on the under-privileged—make no mistake about that. When it came to cleaning up Sydney Harbor, where did he put the \$80? Instead of charging the companies which polluted the harbor, he put \$80 onto everyone's water rates, no matter whether they were pensioners, under-privileged or living on the North Shore of Sydney. That is what we can expect in South Australia. They talk about education policies: the Liberals' only education policy is to get rid of teachers. We know what the member for Mount Gambier was forced to do by his Cabinet when he was Minister of Education, and that was to get rid of teachers. Of course, they had protests. Of course, there are protests in New South Wales.

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

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Bragg to order. Before calling on the member for Murray-Mallee, I again remind the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Bragg that they are on the list to speak in the debate tomorrow, and ask them to comply with the request of the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order. There is no need for the interjection. The member for Hartley had the call and was speaking appropriately.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I have been concerned for a long time at the way in which members opposite have attempted to mislead the public by misleading journalists about the truth of many matters affecting the future of South Australians, many of whom, of course, have become fed up with the place and left. Not the least among those who have a substantial impact on what happens in that regard—that is, whether or not accurate information gets out to the public—is the member for Briggs. Even before he came into this place as a member, he was engaging in the practice of arranging information in such a way as to give it a favourable slant, regardless of whether that information was factual.

Consequently, he has earned himself the nickname of 'fabricator'. Other people think that perhaps 'contaminator' would be a more effective term. Of course, we have our Premier who is either a 'confiscator' when we look at his record as a high taxing Premier—the highest taxing Premier that this State has ever seen—or a 'prevaricator'. Perhaps I should have first referred to him as a 'procrastinator', because he never makes a decision about anything until it is inevitable and the time has passed when it could have been made anyway. What is coming is going; what is up is down; what is down is up; what is back is forward; and what is out is in.

Our honourable Deputy Premier is well known for his ability to provide us with information of a kind which emasculates the facts and, whether or not we see him as an 'emasculator' or 'obfuscator', I leave that for members to decide. The member for Ramsay takes the opportunity to say things again and again, and we can all be forgiven referring to him as the 'reiterator'.

Then, of course, we have the member for Norwood, whom various people have referred as either the 'pontificator', for obvious reasons, or the 'rotator': which way really is up, one is not sure. The member for Napier has often been referred to as the 'skater', or the 'deviator': he does not know whether he is on thin ice or is going in the right direction. The member for Whyalla has been known as the 'imprimatur'—whatever he agrees to gets done; or perhaps the 'reticulator', as he brings things down. Then we have the member for Unley. There are some people who believe that he likes to work behind a smokescreen and have affectionately referred to him, therefore, as the 'incinerator'—burning lots of rubbish, and not quite getting complete combustion—or otherwise known as the 'animator'—pulling strings behind the scenes with section 50s, and the like.

The member for Mawson is well known for her capacity to entertain the House, and she has been affectionately and variously referred to as the 'alligator' and some other things besides. One could be forgiven for seeing the facetious analogy. Then the member for Todd, of course, is something like a 'percolator'. When it is heated, it tends to splutter and bubble. Then there is the member for Florey, who knows how to keep everything in shape except, as it were, those things that really do matter. Anyone among the ranks of his colleagues who dares to question the wisdom of the direction in which he suggests they ought to go soon finds out that they have lost their prerogative to do anything else, and thus I guess it is acceptable to call him the 'decapitator'.

Then, looking along the bench of important people, we come to the member for Hayward, who is often referred to as the 'calculator', figures being her constant problem or, without wanting to draw too much of a comparison, there was back in 1986 a player for the successful premiers in the American Super Bowl football contest, the Chicago Bears, who was referred to as the 'refrigerator': someone of enormous power who could simply burst through the ranks and get the touchdown if necessary.

Then we have the member for Henley Beach who, because he is all Ayes, knows about nothing else, and he could be referred to as the 'potato'. The member for Peake is otherwise known as the 'detonator'—bang, boom and bust. Whenever he has the opportunity to let us have the benefit of his wisdom, it does not take long for an explosion to result. The member for Newland, of course, is sometimes known as the 'gravitator'—going down—or, because she moves and shakes so well—the 'vibrator'. The member for Price, who carefully measures things, is known as the 'calibrator' and the member for Albert Park, depending on the frame of mind in which we find him, is variously and

affectionately known as either the 'decorator'—he dresses up both his allegations or himself—or the 'bellyacher'.

As for the member for Bright, I guess enough is said: 'illuminator' fits that one well. As for the member for Adelaide, one could be easily forgiven for saying 'see you later'—he will be the first to go. If the member for Fisher swings, so does the Government, so we will call him the oscillator. The point is that when the member for Fisher departs this place, so will the Government depart its benches.

Moving along the back bench, the member for Mitchell is so well dressed, well spoken and well groomed, we could not miss if we called him the sophisticator. The member for Spence knows his way around everywhere. He has always been able to find direction in anything that he has tackled, especially with the *Island Seaway*, so we will have to refer to him as the navigator. The member for Spence, of course, has found his way onto the back bench next to the member for Hartley, who has not yet found his way from the back bench because he is too busy digging things up, including the ground beneath his feet so that he will never get away from that position. We had testimony earlier tonight of that with the contribution that he made. Accordingly, he should be known as the excavator.

The member for Stewart finds that things generally in this place, like him, are pretty well washed up, so we can be forgiven for thinking of him as the agitator. The honourable member for Gillies has such eloquence and body language that he is definitely the communicator. Finally but for one, we have the member for Playford who has been in this place for a long time and done so much but at present does so little that we wonder when he will be worthy of his name as the activator. Of course, the Speaker, the member for Walsh, I have sometimes thought of as one or other of two things. Whether he is the regulator or not, he is certainly the eliminator. If you incur his wrath, you will certainly be gone.

I do not think that I have overlooked anybody. I should be pleased to hear from them if I have. I reiterate what I said at the outset. The real problem that the Labor Party has in dealing with facts and the truth is that it relies too much on the talents of the member for Briggs who sets about putting a perspective on things that is other than honest and realistic, but it seems to be one which attracts the interest of the gullible. It is therefore appropriate (indeed, probably more so than for any other member) that he has earned the title of fabricator. He puts things together so well and they bear no resemblance whatever to reality or the truth. I hope that in future he does not earn the title of prefabricator. At least he is able to cook things up at fairly short notice. I am sure that much of what he has divined from time to time has not been in his mind for any great length of time. As time goes by, he will have more time to do that when he moves from where he is now to the mirror image position on this side of the Chamber after the next election. The public, like the journalists, now see through him.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! I call the honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Yesterday the annual report of the State Bank of South Australia was tabled in this Parliament. The report had been released the previous month. In an article in the *Advertiser* headed 'Bank's record profit', the following brief analysis of the highlights of the report was given:

The State Bank of South Australia has kicked \$88 million into the State Government's coffers after posting a record \$90.8 million profit for the year to 30 June. The profit was up 37 per cent from the 1987-88 result of \$66.4 million, and was achieved despite

a big rise in bad debt provisions and a decision by directors to protect SA house buyers from the worst effects of the current high interest rate climate.

That is a creditable result, and the bank and its staff are to be congratulated on it. However, behind that report an analysis of the bank's position shows that scrutiny by this Parliament into the circumstances in which the bank is operating at the moment is warranted.

The total subscribed capital and reserves of the bank now exceed \$15 billion and it will be noted from an examination of the annual report that the bank makes considerable use of borrowed funds as the means of financing its large investment in loans and advances which, at more than \$10 billion, represent the bank's major asset. It is quite clear that the bank's operations are highly geared, with a ratio of debt to capital of 10:1. This ratio does not appear to concern the directors and in the previous year's report and in the current year's report the Chairman refers to the bank's maintaining its position as one of the best capitalised banks in Australia. However, the real test of the bank's financial stability is not really to be discovered by considering how it finances its operations but, rather, by an assessment of the intrinsic worth of its assets under conditions of economic stress.

No-one would deny that we are in a period of severe economic stress. One has only to look at the collapse last year of Equiticorp and the bank's exposure of \$100 million, the collapse last year of the National Safety Council of Australia (Victorian Division) and the bank's exposure of \$35 million and the collapse not long ago of L.J. Hooker and the bank's exposure of \$40 million. It is difficult to determine the extent of the bank's exposure in relation to the comparatively recent receiverships of Laserex Ltd and Health and Life Care Ltd, because the loans were syndicated. However, let us say that there was significant exposure of tens of millions of dollars.

There is no way of assessing from the bank's annual report the degree of worth of the bank's assets, but suffice to say that the auditors are satisfied—and their assurances are given. From those assurances one can reasonably conclude that the finances of the bank are in good shape and they have given unqualified reports that the published financial statements give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the bank.

There are other considerations and, when one looks at the current annual report, some things stand out to most people concerned about financial security and represent warning signals. At 30 June 1989 our State Bank, in its new form of amalgamation of the Savings Bank and the former State Bank, had been in operation for nearly five years. In that period it has made remarkable progress. Its profits have increased from \$35 million for the year ended 1985 to \$90.8 million in the year just ended, and its assets have increased from more than \$4 billion to more than \$15 billion. These figures reflect the outcome of the managerial philosophy which has been brought to bear on the way that the bank's affairs should be run by its Chief Executive Officer (Mr Tim Marcus Clark), who in the previous year's report described the bank as an aggressive and forward-thinking group, and a group which was moving towards attaining a higher profile on a national and international level.

An examination of the Chairman's statement in the annual report, which was tabled yesterday, indicates that the assets held offshore by the group rose from \$1 038 million at 30 June 1988 to \$2 754 million at 30 June 1989. This represents an increase in offshore assets as a proportion of the group's total assets from 9.4 per cent to 18.2 per cent, which is almost double. The Chairman states:

Capital markets had an active year in offshore markets, raising the equivalent of \$A1 500 million of medium and long-term

funds. This section was also involved in strengthening the bank's capital base with issues of subordinated debt totalling \$US250 million.

Six major issues were launched in the Eurobond market. Short-term liquidity funding was also expanded with the establishment of a \$US600 million commercial paper program, which was awarded the highest possible credit rating by Standard and Poor's and Moody's. Increased utilisation of the existing \$US400 million euro-commercial paper program also increased available funding. Thus, we can see that the bank's directors have endorsed a policy which aims to have a constantly enlarging exposure to the risks involved in borrowing and lending billions of dollars on the national and international money markets. The South Australian Government, as the owner of the bank's share capital, can be assumed to have given the bank's directors and management approval to take these risks. In any event, it does not appear that any action on the part of the Government has been taken to deter the bank from taking these risks.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan asked a question yesterday in another place about an exposure of the State Bank to Remm amounting to \$500 million which, together with other loans for development in Adelaide at the present time, bring the bank's exposure to development risk in the city of Adelaide close to \$1 billion. In the light of that, we are bound to ask whether the Bannan Government is content to allow the bank to pursue a policy of borrowing increasingly large sums of money to be on-lent to interstate and overseas borrowers. I might add that those borrowers have their financial credibility dependent on the opinion of others: they cannot be dependent upon South Australian opinion. Does the Bannan Government claim that it has no responsibility to account to the electors of this State—namely, the shareholders of the bank—for this policy?

If one looks at the Premier's statement to this House in April this year, one can assume that to be the case. I simply stress that the bank's rapidly increasing and very large borrowing and lending operations, in so far as they are undertaken offshore, are not directed to the development of this State or the needs of its corporate and private clients. The very essence of what the bank is doing is risk-taking for profit. Writing business is taking an enormous priority with the bank. The Opposition assumes that the current Government appears to have decided that this is quite acceptable. I believe that this Parliament is entitled to ask: is there to be no limit? When the State Bank Act was passed it was in a regulated financial environment. Since then, deregulation has taken place, and this has enabled the bank to embark on its present ventures without let or hindrance.

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): The Leader of the Opposition speaks with an amazing breathless quality as he turns from page to page of one of the most comprehensive budget documents published by any Australian State and discovers a range of terrible facts. The interesting feature of this fearless pursuit of truth was that all these terrible facts were published by the Government. The Leader of the Opposition then complained that some of these facts were not on the right page. The fact is that this Government published full and comprehensive papers that helped the Opposition and, indeed, helped it misrepresent them.

I wish to refer to the Leader of the Opposition's claims about the net operating deficits of public trading enterprises. There is no doubt that he set out in his speech to lay the groundwork for the Liberal's secret agenda to privatise major institutions in this State. That has been well documented over the past seven years. One has merely to listen to the Liberal's economic spokesperson in her desperate efforts to

undermine the State Bank to know that that institution is at the top of the Liberal's agenda.

Let us turn to the information that was published in the budget documents. The Leader of the Opposition claims that the Government has deliberately increased the deficit of certain enterprises by \$92 million. This is simply wrong. Had he read the information that followed in the table on page 88, to which he referred, he would have seen that a series of particularly good performances during 1988-89 had reduced these operating deficits well below the trend lines and that the performance estimated for 1989-90 is consistent with the 1988-89 estimate and is, in fact, a reduction in real terms.

I now mention four major Government enterprises. In 1988-89 the South Australian Housing Trust reduced its deficit from an estimated \$82.8 million to \$38.8 million. The Woods and Forests Department increased its operating surplus from an estimated \$24 million to \$46.5 million. ETSA reduced its deficit from an estimated \$16.1 million to \$700 000. Finally, the Engineering and Water Supply Department reduced its estimated deficit from \$16.5 million to \$4 million. The total impact was a turnaround of \$88 million in the estimated operating deficit for these four major enterprises. The 1989-90 figures represent conservative estimates of the performance of these enterprises during the next year and are not a sudden blow-out in their deficit levels.

I will use my remaining time to speak about the first of these major Government enterprises—that is, the South Australian Housing Trust. I applaud what the Housing Trust has done in South Australia, particularly in the electorate of Price. With well over 4 500 Housing Trust dwellings in my electorate, and with my extensive dealings with trust tenants and the trust management, I feel well qualified to give a good assessment of the trust's performance.

The impressive reduction in the Housing Trust deficit has been achieved through sheer good management by the Government and the trust. Many factors work against the Government in the area of public housing. One of these is the pressure of the waiting list of families and others who are urgently seeking public accommodation, and of the ageing population requiring specialised accommodation different from what the typical nuclear family requires in public housing. Elderly people want small allotments and only one or two bedroom units; they cannot look after the gardens as they used to when they were younger; and they need the security of other tenants living in close proximity.

The other areas that put extra pressure on the Government and the Housing Trust to provide housing are marriage break-downs caused by unemployment and other factors. High interest rates hurt the Housing Trust in the same way that they hurt individual home purchasers, and, of course, there are the high cost of buildings and maintenance problems. Many of the trust homes in my electorate were built just after the war, and they were not particularly low maintenance houses. The trust is now finding that whole tracts of these homes require major maintenance—new roofs, gutters, fences and plumbing. That causes many problems.

Another problem that faces the Housing Trust and the Government is the lack of available suitable land on which to build public housing. It is no use going further into country areas where there are no services such as schools, public transport, shops and other such things. So the emphasis must be on urban consolidation, and the Housing Trust is taking a positive approach in this area.

Probably the most major problem that the Housing Trust faces concerns the fact that a few short years ago only 7 per

cent of Housing Trust tenants were on reduced or assisted rents, while now almost 70 per cent of tenants are on reduced rents. Added to this is the fact that the Housing Trust assists low income people in private accommodation with rental assistance.

Following the war, many rows of double unit Housing Trust houses were built. Without criticising the Government of the day, I point out that it was considered at the time that these houses were necessary. In retrospect, it is considered now that there was too much of the same type of thing, on large quarter acre blocks of land. As people got older, the blocks of land were too large to maintain, etc. I am pleased to say that, in line with the urban consolidation policy of the Government, the Housing Trust has set in train major programs for urban consolidation and redevelopment of existing dwellings and large tracts of public housing, to make the areas more amenable and more attractive to live in.

In the Parks area of my electorate, redevelopment is well under way, and many people are purchasing their own homes. This often involves people who have been in trust homes for many years. This is having an influence on the social mix of the areas involved, and this is a big plus for these areas. Other areas will be sold off to private developers, and there will be joint developments with local government and building companies. The whole social mix should change and it will make some of these areas much better for people to live in.

The local councils are cooperating very well with the Housing Trust and are assisting in this redevelopment. They consider matters such as closing roads and overcoming serious traffic problems and industrial problems, and they undertake careful planning in order to assist in this process. They also consider proposals to change some of the boring straight streets and to put in curved roads, landscaping and plantings to make the areas more attractive.

Another exciting thing that the Housing Trust is starting to do in my electorate concerns tenant participation. This involves working on getting tenant participation groups together so that the people involved can have more input in relation to their housing. This is more fulfilling for them and they can communicate with the trust and the Government more effectively concerning their future needs. These are all positive things which are being done by the Housing Trust and which are being backed by the Bannon Labor Government.

Many of the problems that the trust is facing are certainly making things very difficult for it, but I applaud the Housing Trust for its efforts. It has again reduced its deficit, and that is a marvellous effort, for which the trust is to be congratulated. There are many other things that I wanted to mention, but I am running out of time. I was going to mention the industrial estates in the electorate of Price in the Gillman, Wingfield, Regency Park and Dry Creek areas. Some very impressive factories and warehouses are going up, and that is certainly not an indication of economic stagnation.

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

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Tonight I want to refer to some ground that has been fairly well worked over by my colleague the member for Albert Park, amongst others, and to turn to some of the figures which I have been able to find on the success of the various programs that this Government has mounted against various forms of crime in our community.

It is reasonably well known that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, implemented by this Government, has been an outstanding success. There is universal agreement about that, and the Neighbourhood Watch scheme has been undertaken in most other States of Australia and, indeed, overseas. It is universally agreed that Neighbourhood Watch schemes have brought about a dramatic cut in petty crime and street crime, but I suppose it remains to be seen whether there is any overspill from those areas into areas of more serious crime.

Presently, about one-third of the metropolitan area has been covered by Neighbourhood Watch schemes, and roughly another third is on the waiting list. As schemes are coming on stream at the rate of about one per day and as the resources allocated to Neighbourhood Watch have been virtually doubled in the last budget, I am confident that the remaining areas will be served in the near future. However, that is contrary to the views of one of my less gracious and grateful constituents who wrote to the local paper suggesting quite the reverse. There is no doubt—and I do not think we would hear any argument about this from the Opposition side of the House—that Neighbourhood Watch is an effective scheme. I want to ask why Neighbourhood Watch has been so successful. It seems to me that it has been successful because it has enormous community support.

Whilst that is encouraging on the face of it, one has to ask why the community has supported Neighbourhood Watch so enthusiastically. Part of the answer derives from a genuine public insecurity, a genuine feeling in society that perhaps things are not as secure as they used to be; perhaps we are not as safe as we used to be; perhaps we cannot walk down the street at night the way we used to. I have to ask myself whether that fear is justified. I suppose the short answer is 'Yes, it is, but only in part.' Should we in fact be as insecure as we are? Have levels of crime increased? The answer is that Neighbourhood Watch has done a lot about the reduction in street crime but it may not have gone very far at this point towards addressing the problems of serious and violent crimes.

If one looks at the tendency for South Australians to commit those sorts of crimes over the past decade or so, one finds that in the Liberal years from June 1979 to December 1982 the incidence of rape increased by 38 per cent; other sexual offences, by 23 per cent; serious assaults, by 62 per cent; robbery, by 20 per cent; drug offences, by 172 per cent; offences against people, in other words other forms of violence, by 43 per cent; and break-and-enter offences, by 20 per cent. That was the record of the Liberal years.

Fortunately, the record since that time has not been so bad. In the first third of the Bannon years, from 1981-82 through to 1986-87, the sentencing records from prisons indicate that, although there have been slight increases, they have been patchy. Indeed, the number of prisoners sentenced for major offences such as homicide, assault, sexual assault, robbery and extortion, were as follows: homicide, a decrease from 18 to 15; assault, 293 down to 292—in other words, it remained static; sexual assault, from 58 to 61; and robbery and extortion, from 43 to 46. They are pretty mild increases when compared with the previous three years of the Tonkin Government.

I want to look a little further into this, not just at the trends but at the way South Australia compares with the rest of Australia. We are told repeatedly, *ad nauseam*, by members opposite that we live in a violent State. If one looks at the impartial figures, one sees that we do not live in a violent State. Far from being more violent than other States, South Australia is indeed less violent. Unfortunately, figures from the Australian Institute of Criminology published in 1987 are not recorded after 1984-85, but they indicate that for murder, for example, the rate per 100 000 of population in South Australia in 1978-79, prior to the Tonkin years, was two; and in 1984-85, the figure was 1.18. For the same period, the Australian average went from 1.7 to 1.68. The incidence of murder, the most serious of serious crimes, decreased during that period in South Australia.

From the base years 1973-74 to 1984-85, serious assaults in South Australia rose from 14.6 per hundred thousand people to 61.3 per hundred thousand. That is a decided increase, but one can compare that with the situation in other States: the figure for Queensland was 87.9 per hundred thousand and in the Northern Territory—that lovely relaxed territory governed by a succession of Liberal administrations—the figure was 360 per hundred thousand. In fact, serious assaults have increased in that decade, but far more so outside South Australia than within this State.

The statistics for robbery in South Australia are, again, fairly static from 1973-74 to 1984-85. The figure for those years is 20.6 per hundred thousand up to 28.7 per hundred thousand. At the same time, the Australian average went from 23 to 42.8 per hundred thousand—almost twice the rate of increase in South Australia. South Australia is not a vicious State; the incidence of vicious crimes—murder, robbery, and the like—have not increased here in the same way as they have in other States. Indeed, the population of South Australia can be said to be comparatively well off.

It is worth looking at another level of the statistics to see how Australia compares with the rest of the world. What has happened outside our shores in the same period? What has happened in America and quiet little places like New Zealand? Again, I draw on the same Institute of Criminology figures to make these comparisons. In relation to robberies, in the year 1985, for example, to take a base year, the figure for Australia is 42.9 per hundred thousand compared with 39.2 per hundred thousand in New Zealand and 208 per hundred thousand in the United States. That is five times the number of robberies per capita in the US. I now refer to another violent crime: rape. In Australia in 1985 the figure was 12 per hundred thousand; in New Zealand the figure was 16 per hundred thousand; and in America the figure was 37 per hundred thousand. Again, Australia is less than a third the figure for the USA.

Homicides seem to be an American specialty. In Australia the incidence was 4 in one hundred thousand; in New Zealand the figure was 3.4 per hundred thousand; and in the United States the figure was 7.9 per hundred thousand. Burglary is open to some contentious argument, because it is not a capital offence anywhere—even in America. However, for the sake of comparison, in Australia the figure per one hundred thousand is 1 746, which seems pretty horrendous, but New Zealand has 2 580 and America, oddly enough, has 1 287—a little lower than Australia. Even compared with countries such as New Zealand, Australia is a relatively passive place. In that context, South Australia is a relatively passive State.

We do not have to concern ourselves that the sky will fall in. These figures and the public unrest and insecurity show us that people are feeling insecure. If that is not because we are violent, what is it? It seems to me that it

can be attributed to a number of causes. There are more single parent families and therefore people are more insecure because there is only one parent in the household. There are more people who live longer and more older people living on their own who need to be reassured and to feel secure. I hark back to a point that I have raised in this House before: our housing is so often inappropriate that we have single older people occupying single dwellings in the suburbs and, as a result, they feel insecure. I believe the perception is far more severe than the reality. By remedying some of these problems—housing, housing styles and the way we look after our old people—we can do a great deal to remedy some of the problems of insecurity which have arisen.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): During the course of my contribution to the supply debate, I drew attention to the absolutely appalling record of the current Government in engaging in profligate spending, which is not at all justified. This has occurred particularly through its involvement in enterprises that were ill-advised from the outset.

I pointed out that the budget for 1982-83 had been just under \$2 billion, but this current budget is for \$5 billion—the biggest in the State's history. Yet we see waste in the form to which I have referred without there being a reasonable level of services provided to a decreasing population in rural areas, decreasing if for no other reason than that they simply cannot get reasonable access to Government services, in spite of the fact that they pay more and more of their annual incomes in the form of taxation. Whether that taxation is hidden in the cost of the goods they buy from other people or the services they pay for from other people as part of the taxation those enterprises must pay, or whether they are direct taxes or charges against them and their businesses in those rural areas is immaterial.

The fact remains that they are left with less of their efforts annually to dispose of in ways which they think appropriate than was the case previously. There is just no caring for folk who live outside the metropolitan area. A further illustration, which has been referred to from time to time in this Chamber and again today, is the way in which the State Transport Authority's budget has been allowed to continue to blow out. Twenty years ago it was not even a deficit, yet now it is over \$125 million. That is about \$350 000 to \$360 000 per day, about \$15 000 per hour, \$250 per minute, or \$4.16 per second.

For instance, the State Transport Authority, for the three minutes or so during which I have been talking, has cost the State another \$750. That is the rate at which we are wasting money, yet members opposite—such as the member for Hartley—try to make a virtue of the Government commitment to that kind of waste. I do not see any justification for it whatever. Country people do not have access to that subsidised public transport. They do not even have reasonable roads on which to drive, compared with the situation in the city. It would not be so bad if we had one or the other, but we have neither.

I will give some examples. If members do not believe me all they have to do is look through my correspondence file. The Forster-Bowhill-Mannum road is constantly being drawn to my attention as a road which is increasingly dangerous, even though the traffic volume on it is small. The number of misadventures suffered by motorists who have to traverse that part of the world is quite disproportionate to the number of people who use it.

Consider the extremely valuable asset of the bridge across the river at Murray Bridge—the only stable bridge across the Lower Murray. The Blanchetown and Swanport bridges

will both eventually collapse because of the structural capacity they have to flex. They will simply fall to bits. We have already seen the connections of the western end of the Swanport bridge fall to bits under fatigue at a far greater rate than that anticipated by the design engineers or the people who built it. There is nothing wrong with its construction: it is simply unable to cope with that kind of work.

I do not know when the bridge at Murray Bridge was last painted or when it will next be painted. It has not been painted since I have been a member of this place. The cavities appearing in the steel pylons which penetrate the bottom of the river are quite alarming.

The bridge needs once more to be given its regular maintenance, the like of which it has not had since I have been a member here. There is no indication that I can find anywhere in the budget papers that it will be given that attention during the next 12 months. I could go on and name roads everywhere, but perhaps the worst example that I can draw to the attention of the House is the road between Murray Bridge and Karoonda. This badly made road, which follows the bullock days track, has on it a camber on a corner that goes in the wrong direction. In the middle of that corner, on the inside lane, is a hole more than four feet long and three feet wide, and as much as six inches deep. If one takes that corner at any time, particularly at night, and one cannot see that there is a cavity in the middle of the road where one's wheels could go, one could easily come to grief.

There are some 15 cavities—I am not just talking about small cracks in the pavement—several inches deep and several feet across on that road between Murray Bridge and Karoonda. It is a sealed, major arterial road, but no funds are allocated for its reconstruction in this coming year.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The former member for Mallee, W.F. Nankivell—

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, I know William Field Nankivell—and nothing has been done. He also made the same point about the road between Parilla and Pinnaroo. It was not until the Liberal Party was elected to office and I was elected to this place that I was able to prevail on the then Commissioner of Highways, with the assistance of my colleague the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson), the then member for Adelaide, to get funds allocated for the repair of that road before it cost someone their life.

That road caused illness to several people when they were trying to traverse it. It was like life on the ocean waves. It was constantly packing up and costing an enormous amount in maintenance. I daresay that the Karoonda road is costing even more now on a pro rata basis, if we were to adjust the dollars outlaid for maintenance by the deflator that is used in such calculations for roads. It is higher than the CPI because the cost of maintenance and/or construction of roads has gone up faster than the CPI since this Government came to office, and that has happened for reasons directly related to the policies pursued by the Minister of Transport in particular and the Government in general.

More and more money collected as fuel excise has been directed to general revenue and away from roadworks, anyway. Indeed, whatever is directed towards roads is not directed towards rural arterial roads but is spent in the metropolitan area, where it is more likely to gain favour for the Government and help to secure its re-election. That is terrible because, although we are human beings and we need to be able to get around, we have poor access to roads and no access to public transport. This has had an adverse effect on the capacity of people to participate in the life of the schools to which their children go and, more particularly, it prevents some children going to preschool, because

certain parents consider it too risky to allow them to go out on the roads in that sort of situation.

We suffer also from the fact that we do not have the same quality of water as people in the metropolitan area. The Government crows about its filtration program here, but the member for Chaffey drew attention to the parlous state of the water that is supplied to towns in rural South Australia, particularly those along the river. Whilst the Government at the same time makes private landholders forgo their prerogative individual private property rights, because of what it considers to be risk of pollution on the flood plain, it nonetheless continues to maintain its own effluent disposal evaporation ponds right on the flood plain, less than a few feet from the main channel, in places like Waikerie, where raw sewage has recently got into the main channel. Further, in places like Murray Bridge the effluent disposal ponds are right next to the main channel, less than 10 feet away from it.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I should like to continue from where I left off earlier this evening. I should like particularly to refer to what I believe is a misleading contribution by the member for Light when he quoted from the *Australian Standard*—the so-called voice of the people. My understanding is that he was not lazy in his research. He had done some research, but the research came out of this paper. Anyone who knows anything about politics would understand the worth of that paper. The paper is an arm of the Liberal Party, the conservatives, and the extreme right wing element in this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The League of Rights, indeed, as my colleague says. I think it speaks volumes for the 'contribution' made by the member for Light. At least we know that he has exposed himself for what he is: a member of the extreme right wing faction of the Liberal Party. For those who did not know it, they certainly do tonight. His contribution reveals that, and well may he blush.

I want to address the issue of crime, and I will continue to do so, because I have never forgotten the outrageous and dishonest contribution by the Liberal Party in 1979. As long as I am in this Parliament, I shall constantly remind it of the disgusting and filthy campaign that was waged by the Liberal Party and its supporters. It is on record.

I want to address the present day issues of law and order. In the *West Australian* of 2 February 1989 there is an article on the problems of law and order in that State. Dr Paul Wilson, assistant director of the Australian Institute of Criminology, talks about the problems in Western Australia. There were similar expressions on the law and order issue in that State by the conservative elements. Dr Paul Wilson, commenting on the situation in Western Australia, is reported as asking whether it is any worse than in other States. I am quoting selectively. He says:

There are similar trends right across the country. Analysis of crime figures in two States with a similar population, South Australia and Queensland, shows that, if WA has a problem coping with the increasing incidence of crime, it is not alone.

This is interesting, and I hope, for the edification of members opposite, they will digest it. It says:

South Australia has more police than WA, looking after 12 000 fewer people. South Australia's police strength is 25 officers per 10 000 population, while WA has 21.3 officers per 10 000 population. Queensland's rising crime rate may be partly attributed to its inferior police strength of 19.2 per 10 000. But ironically, it has the best record for solving crimes and bringing offenders to justice.

I deviate from the article to say that, on the basis of what has happened with the royal commission into corruption in Queensland, one would question the validity of the report by the police there given the reputation of the Police Commissioner at that time. The article continues:

This suggests the success rate of solving, or clearing up, crimes may not be directly related to strength of police numbers. But the ominous news for West Australians is that WA has the lowest clear-up rate of 30.72 per cent. South Australia registered 33.5 per cent while Queensland police succeeded more than half the time at 52 per cent.

As I pointed out previously, one would question the validity of the figures in Queensland, given the corruption allegations there.

I turn now to the article that I quoted previously from the *News*. I will again quote somewhat selectively:

In his report, Dr Sutton, who is on secondment as Crime Prevention Policy Unit Director within the Attorney-General's department, claims there are many myths about the extent and nature of crime in SA. The document claims some widely circulated reports suggest SA has more minor crime per head of population than cities like Los Angeles and Detroit.

It claims local media have quoted apparently reputable bodies as suggesting South Australia:

- Has a disturbing juvenile crime problem;
- Tops the larcenies list;
- Has more minor crime per head of population than the world's so-called crime cities.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table.

Leave granted.

SERIOUS OFFENCES IN ADELAIDE AND SIMILAR U.S. CITIES

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Population	Murder	Robbery	Serious Assault
Adelaide	1 023 517	14	613	962
Birmingham, Alabama	917 901	127	2 169	3 685
Buffalo, New York	967 572	40	1 736	3 216
Honolulu, Hawaii	832 614	36	985	915
Jacksonville, Florida	878 124	162	4 258	6 114
Louisville, Kentucky	963 727	65	2 220	2 329
Memphis, Tennessee	969 020	164	4 963	3 756
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	973 217	71	1 729	3 100
Rochester, New York	981 111	36	1 301	1 870

Source: Adelaide data from SA Police Department regional summaries of offences reported. US figures from FBI Uniform Crime Report.

Adelaide data is for 1988 calendar year; US data is for 1987 calendar year.

Mr HAMILTON: The article continues:

And South Australia's homicide rate compares favourably with other nations which have a low incidence of murder.

'Our crime rates are well below those of US cities of comparable size, let alone the so-called "crime cities"; the report says . . .

'South Australia does not have a worse crime problem than the rest of Australia and is still appreciably behind many other Western countries.'

When one examines the way in which figures are utilised in the criminology field, it is worth reflecting on this article from the Australian Society in 1987. It refers to rape statistics and states:

If national rape statistics require sensitive interpretation then State figures have to be handled with kid gloves. The South Australian media made much of the fact that the institute statistics portrayed a rate of rape in that State well above the national average. But these statistics could well be inflated because—

and this is the relevant part of the article—

South Australia has a broader definition of rape than most other States, a definition that includes rape in marriage and rape of males.

The point here is that although, in South Australia and elsewhere, rape is at unacceptably high levels and that each case is a tragic reflection of Australian male attitudes towards women, the publicised police figures may reflect the fact that, at long last,

victims are asserting their undeniable right to be taken seriously when they are raped—and are increasingly taken seriously.

It then mentions burglary figures.

The reality is that this Party quite properly has been prepared to provide the tools to the judiciary and to the police in these fields. I applaud that. All members agree that we must provide the appropriate tools and penalties for these offences, but when people quote selectively and dishonestly, as members opposite have done, and when they try to mislead the public, one must read between the lines. As my colleague the member for Bright has correctly pointed out, many elderly people in the community are concerned. If a story is told often and long enough, a Goebbels mentality arises where these people try to force their views down the neck of some of those poor unfortunate people in the community who believe the garbage peddled by members opposite.

The reality is that, when one compares the statistical information of 1979 to 1982 with today's figures, one can establish that there has been an increase in the rate of crime, but it is no different in comparison with other States; in fact, in many cases it is lower. Many interstate colleagues of members opposite who are not prepared to talk about this topic use those statistics. The reality is that crime does occur out in the streets. I believe that every honourable member sincerely wants to see a reduction in the crime rate, but it will not be done by dishonestly misusing the statistics as have members opposite tonight. Indeed, the garbage peddled by the member for Light exposes exactly what the Liberal Party stands for. It wants to win an election at any cost and it does not give a damn about the people whom they purport to represent.

Motion carried.

At 10.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 7 September at 11 a.m.