

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 September 1990

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

PETITION: BREAST X-RAY SERVICE

A petition signed by 268 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to continue and expand the South Australian Breast X-ray Service was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

FISH PROCESSING CERTIFICATES

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 16 August.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: In March 1990, fisheries officers visited all hotels in the Yorke Peninsula region and advised them of their responsibilities pursuant to the fisheries legislation. On many occasions, fisheries officers assisted hotel operators to complete the registration forms at the time of the visit and informed the proprietor/manager of the expiry date of the registration.

Fisheries officers are under a standing instruction that, where a fish processor is encountered for the first time who is not registered, they are to provide the processor with the appropriate forms and instructions and to not take prosecution/penalty action unless other circumstances would warrant. Except in unusual circumstances (that is, where other offences are detected), penalty provisions are to be applied only where processors are found to be still unregistered on the second visit or subsequent visits.

Yorke Peninsula hotels were visited again on or around 14 August as part of Operator Processor. Fisheries officers found that the following hotels were not registered (had failed to renew their registration): the Edithburgh Hotel, Edithburgh; the Melville Hotel, Yorketown; and the Yorketown Hotel, Yorketown. Fisheries officers ascertained that renewal notices had been received prior to issuing expiation notices. They also were aware that the date of expiry of registrations was listed on the previous registration forms issued to the hotels and was detailed in the first sentence of the renewal notice forwarded to all fish processors earlier in the year.

Two other hotels in the area were visited and found to be correctly registered. The fisheries officers involved categorically deny that the words 'we dipped out badly here' were mentioned in any action taken in relation to the hotels concerned. It should be noted that the objective is to ensure that processors are registered, not fined; and that more serious offences detected (such as the illegal trading in fish) would be more likely resolved by prosecution than by expiation.

Hotels and restaurants are considered to be important outlets requiring checking, along with all other processing operators, for fish taken and sold illegally in South Australia. The concentration of effort on processors over the

past two years, and in particular through current operations, is part of a concerted effort to detect illegal operations within the processing/marketing sector, as well as within the traditional catching sector.

As well as surveillance, the department is encouraging fish processors to understand the nature of the problem and to secure their assistance in protecting the future of the fishery by complying with the management regulations. This has generally been well received. In view of the need to minimise the administrative cost to both industry and the Government, the department is examining the option of requiring fee-exempt processing to renew their registration every five years rather than annually. This matter will be discussed further with industry.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): How does the Minister of Labour account for the massive increases over the past two years of 561 per cent and 241 per cent respectively for Government employees claiming workers compensation for stress and over exertion?

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY**: I thank the Leader for his question. He ought to consider what we have been doing with workers compensation in the Department of Marine and Harbors and refer to his colleagues who have been involved in the Estimates Committees. The apparent large increase of \$960 000 in the 1989 year to \$2.493 million in 1990 is caused by a payout of about \$1.3 million to a person who was injured some years ago in an accident. That person was severely brain damaged, and that was the arrangement reached. We are having it checked to ensure that that is what it is. That is what I think it is, having had it pointed out to me. I know from checking with officers of my department on a monthly basis that there has not been a blowout but rather a reduction in real terms.

ADULT MATRICULATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education explain whether adult students will be disadvantaged by the transfer of adult matriculation from TAFE to the Education Department, and what impact will such a move have on the studies of those students currently enrolled in matriculation courses at TAFE colleges? I have been contacted by a constituent from Woodville south, Mr R.W. Pitcher, who has expressed concern about the budget announcement that adult matriculation will be transferred from TAFE to the Education Department. Mr Pitcher has raised a number of concerns about this matter and is seeking guarantees that adult students will continue to be taught by suitably experienced teachers and will continue to have the same choice of subjects.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: The transfer of the TAFE adult matriculation program to the Education Department is certainly consistent with a joint ministerial announcement made on this issue in 1989. Arrangements for this change in adult matriculation will include the transfer of the administration of the program to the Education Department next year, as was outlined in various budget papers. However, it needs to be understood that this change will not affect students enrolling in 1991. Students already enrolled in matriculation

studies at TAFE will be able to complete their studies. There is no question of that.

During the next year, negotiations will take place on the progressive transfer of staff involved in the program. Various options will be available to them, including possible transfer to the Education Department or reassignment within TAFE. An interdepartmental working group has been set up comprising members of TAFE and the Education Department to assist in the transfer of adult matriculation programs. The principals of Education Department senior schools will meet with TAFE officers to ensure an effective transfer of the program which will result in the maintenance of a high quality matriculation studies program for adults.

Regular meetings are planned between the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Deputy CEO of TAFE and the departmental program management group for adult matriculation studies. I am grateful that the honourable member was able to give me a copy of Mr Pitcher's letter. He raises a number of concerns and I will write to him through the honourable member's office.

TEACHER EXERTION CLAIMS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Education say why the number of workers compensation claims for overexertion in the Education Department increased by almost 25 per cent over the past two years to number 445 last financial year (a rate of two every school day of the year)? The Auditor-General's Report reveals that workers compensation claims by Government employees increased by \$4.2 million last financial year to \$36.5 million. The claims include almost \$5.9 million for overexertion. The largest number of claims in this category was 445 in the Education Department. The question relates to stress and overexertion, not to the general disposition of claims within the public sector.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I do not have a detailed explanation, as the honourable member seeks. I will certainly undertake to obtain an explanation from my department and have some analysis done of the figures over recent years so that this matter might be put into context. I know that the Opposition might like to engage in a little teacher bashing along the way, but I warn members that, before drawing conclusions about taking one year's figures and comparing them with the previous year's figures, this matter should be put into a broader context. Appropriate conclusions should be drawn from those figures.

ROAD SAFETY SLOGANS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate whether police management are considering a proposal by the Officer in Charge of the Far Northern Division, Superintendent Barry Willoughby, that police cars could carry road safety slogans as a means of combating the rising road toll in the division? Superintendent Willoughby outlined his proposal in a recent edition of the *Flinders News*, a newspaper in my electorate, following a spate of fatalities in the Port Augusta district some weeks ago. He indicated that the proposal had gained some support from the Deputy Commissioner, and I would appreciate knowing whether any progress has been made.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Deputy Commissioner (Mr Hurley) has advised that Superintendent Willoughby's proposals are still at a fairly early stage of development and, while the Deputy Commissioner supports the thrust of

that suggestion and the aim of reducing the road toll, he indicated that no decision has yet been made as to the appropriateness or otherwise of putting slogans on police cars.

So far, the Deputy Commissioner has written personally to a potential sponsor of such a scheme seeking discussions in order to explore the matter a little further. If those discussions are successful and it is decided to accept slogans of some kind on police vehicles, it is probably intended that such a scheme would run first only in the Far North division of the State but, if it is successful there, it might well be extended to other parts of the State.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Following his statement to the House yesterday about the importance of the vehicle manufacturing industry to South Australia, will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology investigate immediately why GMH has been virtually excluded from supplying the vehicle requirements of the South Australian Government for the next two years; why the major part of a six cylinder contract has been awarded to Ford and Nissan, companies which do not assemble vehicles in this State; and why recently amended tender requirements included a provision for an upfront cash payment of \$50 commission per vehicle purchased to be paid to the Department of State Services?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would be happy to obtain a report on this matter from my colleague the Minister of State Services who is, of course, responsible for this area. However, I will say that there is a very important principle involved with respect to the tendering of Australian Government departments for the purchase of vehicles. Some years ago the States followed a State preference system which amounted to almost a State tariff with respect to purchases by State Government departments. This meant that industries within South Australia got preference over those in other States in terms of purchases by the South Australian Government, and purchases by Government departments in other States likewise tended to exclude South Australian suppliers.

The reality of the situation was that industry in a State of 1.4 million people had preference in that State but did not have preference in the rest of Australia, which has a population of 14.6 million. Victoria and South Australia proposed that the States should abolish the preference agreement with respect to State Government purchasing, in other words, to abolish those margins that worked against out of State suppliers. From our point of view, we did this partly out of altruism but also partly out of sheer self-interest, because this meant that South Australian manufacturers, instead of having preferential access to a market of 1.4 million people, had better access to a market of 16 million people, and that made much more sense.

I will look at a number of areas. For example, the automotive industry in this State produces nearly 30 per cent of the country's automobiles, but South Australia does not have 30 per cent of the country's population. Clearly, we rely upon the fact that we sell automobiles in other parts of the nation. If we produced only 8.7 per cent of the country's automobiles, perhaps we would expect to win the entire market within this State. So that was why we moved against the preference situation at the State level.

The other point that needs to be taken into account is that South Australia is not only the home of two very good automobile manufacturers (Holden and Mitsubishi)—notwithstanding the member for Goyder's derogatory com-

ments yesterday—but also the home of automotive component manufacturers. It must be understood that we make 40 per cent of the automotive components in this country, and indeed cars that are manufactured by car makers in other States consume a large percentage of South Australian car parts. It has been estimated that 40 per cent of the automotive components made in this country are made in South Australia, so a significant percentage of the parts in Ford and Nissan vehicles made in this country originate from South Australia.

The honourable member is obviously trying to take issue with the comments I made yesterday in this House in respect to tariffs on overseas vehicles. Is he about to suggest that this State Government should put a submission to Canberra saying, 'Wipe out the tariff level on automobiles'? Is that the intent of his question? If it is not, I would like to know exactly what is the intent of his question. We are operating within the existing regime of tariff levels—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am answering the question. The point I am trying to make—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is traditional in this House that the questions come from this side and the answers come from the Ministers.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I acknowledge the point: it is not worth asking questions of the Opposition. The point I want to make is that there has been an easing down of the tariff regime for the automotive industry since the introduction of the automotive plan that will continue until 1992, and we wish that to continue for a further period, although not below 20 per cent. The view being supported by the Liberal Party is that it should go down to zero tariffs for the automotive industry. The point I was making yesterday was that that would do untold damage to the automotive industry in South Australia.

The other point I want to make is with respect to this Government's purchasing of vehicles: we will give fair access to producers in any part of this country, because in the end run it makes better value for South Australian industry if it, likewise, can obtain equal access to the purchasing power of the Governments of every other State in this country. Any attempt to try to talk us out of that situation would be foolhardy in the extreme and would damage job opportunities in this State. I will refer to the Minister responsible the particular tender matter to which the honourable member has referred.

RECYCLED PLASTIC

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Can any action be taken to promote the recycling of plastic material by reducing or removing the sales tax applicable to products made from the recycled material? I have received many complaints about the disposal of plastic materials and about the pollution by plastic materials of stormwater drains, especially in the upper reaches of the Port River. My constituents have urged me to see whether a solution to this problem can be arrived at if the materials are recycled.

I understand that Smorgen Pty Ltd uses plastic waste to produce a material called Syntal. That firm has made rep-

resentations to the effect that the recycled product would be more competitive if it were not subject to sales tax.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in the whole question of recycling and the way in which we can facilitate a recycling industry not only in South Australia but in terms of a general philosophical position on recycling in this country. Recently, I met with representatives of Smorgen Pty Ltd, and it is correct that that company manufactures a product which is made entirely from post-consumer plastic waste. This product is called Syntal.

It is moulded into solid bars, which have a wide variety of potential uses throughout the community. This excellent example of recycling, which is already operative in Victoria, uses waste materials from a non-renewable resource base, addresses one of the more difficult portions of the waste stream and deserves support from all sections of our community. In fact, recently I wrote to the Commonwealth Treasurer recommending that the Commonwealth Government should also show its willingness to support such schemes via the simple mechanism of removing the sales tax applicable to products made from Syntal.

I believe that the Treasurer has already demonstrated his and the Commonwealth Government's support for recycling by taking similar action for products made from recycled paper. If the Treasurer agrees to my request to remove the sales tax from recycled plastic, in this case from Syntal, this action would add to the competitive edge that is needed for us to get the recycled product into established markets. I look forward to Smorgen's establishing a recycling plastics manufacturing plant in South Australia, and to the support of the Federal Treasurer in this matter.

STA WORK PRACTICES

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer. Will he direct the Minister of Transport to implement the Auditor-General's recommendation that 'all STA work practices and associated labour utilisation' be included in the current review of the authority's operations, in view of the fact that the Auditor-General first referred this matter to the Minister in August 1989? The Minister did not reply for 10 months, and then only to say that the STA General Manager had responded to audit concerns, and the Auditor-General has now reported that the STA has taken 'little or no action' to address those concerns.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Hayward for his question. It did concern me when I read the Auditor-General's report yesterday. I think that to some extent the report was slightly overstated (and I emphasise 'slightly'), because considerable efforts have been made to comply with the request of the Auditor-General last year. I will be making a full report to the Parliament, probably during the Estimates Committees, responding to some of the points that the Auditor-General made.

The STA is at present conducting a number of programs looking at work practices, many of which have been altered relatively recently; for example, AFULE members—engine drivers—have agreed to split shifts, as have the bus drivers, and these changes, which give us a great deal more flexibility are very welcome. We still have some way to go with the ARU on the question of split shifts, but we will persevere. In the award restructuring process taking place, considerable progress has been made—again, on certain work practices, multi-skilling and on a whole range of attempts at breaking down some of the demarcation barriers that have existed.

Without in any way criticising the Auditor-General, I point out that it is a quite simple process to identify work practices that were perhaps more appropriate for another time; it is a different thing altogether to negotiate through those work practices to achieve the result that we all desire. I am very pleased to say that we have made considerable progress, details of which I will be outlining during the Estimates Committees. I am sure that if the Auditor-General chooses to refer to this matter in his next report he will comment favourably on the measures that the STA has taken to ameliorate some of the adverse consequences of past work practices.

MAGAREY MEDAL PRESENTATION

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport verify that this year's Magarey Medal presentation will once again be conducted in the presence of an almost exclusively male audience, unlike the Victorian Brownlow Medal count; and, if so, will he make representations to the South Australian National Football League to remedy this situation, if not for next Monday's presentation then at least for future years?

In recent years there has been adverse community comment on the absence of spouses, girlfriends and female relatives of the footballers who attend the presentation. A supportive audience of family and friends is present at annual trophy presentations for other leagues and for local South Australian Football Association clubs, such as the Edwardstown Football Club in my electorate, as well as at the Victorian Brownlow Medal presentations. Several press commentators in recent years have expressed the view that one of the most appealing telecasts of the Magarey Medal count ever held was that of 1981, where women guests were permitted and the winner, Michael Aish, shared the occasion with a member of his family.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. It has been the clear policy of this Government over the years not to interfere with the administration of sport and, of course, that applies very much to league football. I am not sure whether the reference to 1981 has any connection with the honourable member's obvious and notable support of Norwood: maybe it is his ambition to see another Norwood player win the Magarey Medal this year. I will certainly raise the honourable member's question with the President of the SANFL. Obviously, the honourable member must appreciate that the Government does not interfere with the administration of sport and that it is a matter for the SANFL to resolve.

STUDENT TRAVEL

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Does the Treasurer agree with the Auditor-General that the introduction of free STA travel for students will increase the likelihood that STA cost savings of more than \$24 million per annum, identified in the business plan endorsed by the Government in February this year, will not be achieved? If so, will the Government review the free travel scheme and, if not, does the Government have any alternative proposal to meet these cost saving targets?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Eyre for his question. The Auditor-General is absolutely correct; the STA will not be able to meet its business plan targets for the simple reason that the fare policy of this Government prevents it from doing so, and long may it do

so, because about 60 per cent of STA passengers are concession passengers, and a slightly higher percentage than that involves passengers who do not own motor vehicles. We have made a very clear policy decision to keep STA fares at or below the inflation rate and, inevitably, when you are doing that whilst at the same time spending hundreds of millions of dollars as we do, on new rail cars and buses, the difference between our income and expenditure will increase. There is no mystery in that; it is very simple arithmetic. Also, for social reasons, we maintain STA fares at a low level; and, for environmental reasons, we want to encourage as many people as possible to use public transport rather than their private vehicles. It is much more energy efficient for that to be done. So, there is a whole range of environmental, social and financial reasons for the policy.

As regards free fares for schoolchildren, I have stated quite clearly in this Parliament and elsewhere that that program is under review; it has been under review from the day it was implemented, as all our programs are under review. At the end of 12 months operation of that program, I would be happy to give members opposite a report on its success or otherwise. I have been heartened as a Minister, because it is very rare, to receive letters from and have conversations with people who have found that this policy has saved them hundreds of dollars a year, and they appreciate that. Also, certain private schools—and I am not talking about wealthy private schools—have expressed to me their appreciation of that policy. It has enabled people from poorer backgrounds to continue to go to private schools where otherwise they may have had to withdraw. To get praise in this job is very rare, so I appreciate those remarks.

When free fares were introduced, I estimated the full-year cost to be between \$7 million and \$7.5 million. From memory, I think it has turned out to be \$7.2 million, so it was not a bad estimate, and it is contrary to the wild fantasising of the Opposition spokesperson on transport, who, I think, at one stage put the cost of free public transport at over \$40 million. I found that an astounding figure, and I could never work out where she got it from, I think that the \$40 million would exceed our entire fare take in the STA, let alone the cost of providing this program for schoolchildren. However, I am sure that the member for Eyre will be pleased to hear that, after a year's operation, I will be in a position to report to Parliament and the public of South Australia on the efficacy of this program.

IPL AUSTRALIA

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Forests provide the House with information on the success of the laminated veneer lumber product being produced by the Satco subsidiary, IPL Australia, at Nangwarry, in the South-East? I recently attended a function at Gillman (and it was not the opening of the MFP—that is further down the track) at which the Minister opened a new building for Oveco Enterprises, which marked the launching of the IPL Hyframe Building System onto the Adelaide market. This system enables a client to order a timber framed building off the shelf—something the timber industry has not previously been able to offer. Oveco is going into the business of erecting Hyframe buildings and has great confidence in the system and laminated veneer lumber (LVL).

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in laminated veneer lumber and in the Satco Hyframe Building System. Like him, I was impressed when I went down to Gillman and saw the clean lines, the cheap construction and the rapid speed with which

the building was erected. I think he is quite right to give his electorate a bit of a plug while asking his question. It is true that Satco's introduction of laminated veneer lumber technology to South Australia—and, in fact, to Australia has been an outstanding success—so much so that the capacity of the LVL line at Nangwarry has had to be doubled to meet demand. Satco is the only producer of LVL in Australia and markets the products under the trade names of Hyspan and Hyplank.

As the member for Price has observed, IPL Australia has moved into the area of building commercial and industrial warehouses and factories. Clients can order such buildings off the shelf from a range of standard sizes and skilled licensed erectors can have the building up in a matter of days. The application of mass production techniques by IPL and speedy erection in the field combine to make the Hyframe system exceptionally price competitive.

The House may be interested to learn that Satco recently received a significant endorsement of its LVL products from one of its industry peers and competitors. The LeMessurier Timber Company, a name which would be well known to the members for Victoria and Mount Gambier, is building a large warehouse in Melbourne covering some 5 500 square metres. An IPL Australia engineer was involved in the design of this warehouse and this led to IPL's successful tender for the supply of 149 cubic metres of LVL and I-beams, plus a quantity of plywood bracing, altogether worth \$210 000. This is a significant confirmation that LVL/I-beam building systems are cost-competitive against other building products, since in this case the client is a major competitor in the industry. Just to put some icing on the cake, I understand that a South Australian-based builder, Bissland Construction, will be erecting that building.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is to the Minister of Forests. In view of the revelation in the Auditor-General's Report that the cost of the scrimber project is now \$56 million, and of the Auditor-General's opinion that the financial results of the Timber Corporation now depend on the success of the scrimber project, will the Minister say when scrimber will go into production? I believe Mr Higginson has hinted at November this year. What are the proposed earnings for this financial year?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Not much of this is new and, in fact, I have spoken about this on a number of occasions both inside and outside this place.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: When the honourable member has finished asking the next question perhaps I can go on with answering the existing one.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Perhaps I should sit down and let the former Deputy Leader have a go. Scrimber is a world first; it is not just a minor thing that we are doing in South Australia. It is something that will use small timber or reject forest material that would normally be thrown away to make large scale construction timbers which currently have to come out of rain forests. However, the Opposition is taking every opportunity to be nasty about these kinds of artificial timbers, if you like.

The fact that it is a completely new and totally innovative product means that it will have teething problems. I have given instructions that it is not to go onto the market until

it is as good as it can be. The worst thing that could happen to scrimber as a new, world-class product is if it has to overcome early teething problems and a consequent decline in market confidence in the project. Therefore, I am prepared to hold it off the market until we are confident that we can offer a good product.

WORKCOVER

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Labour advise the House as to the attitude of worker occupational health and safety representatives to the WorkCover scheme?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question because it raises some very interesting points. WorkCover samples its customers to find out how its product and services are being received in the community and whether it is achieving its targets. It surveyed occupational health and safety representatives in over 500 places, and the results speak for themselves. It seems that 79 per cent of respondents agreed that WorkCover forced employers to provide safer workplaces and 58 per cent agreed that WorkCover has made it harder for people to make fraudulent compensation claims. It was revealed that 56 per cent agreed that, since WorkCover began, there is not the same stigma attached to being on workers compensation. All those responses indicate that employers and workers in factories are taking occupational health and safety seriously.

It also indicates that for the first time in many places employers are aware of their responsibilities. Prior to the introduction of WorkCover, employers presented their claims to the insurance companies and forgot about them. In many cases, they had no more input into the compensation or rehabilitation of the person injured at their work site and, in many cases, never saw the person again. Now, they are personally responsible and they are required to complete forms, sometimes quite detailed forms. If workplaces have a high injury rate, WorkCover people see them about reducing it. I predict that, with the introduction of the bonus and levy system, we will see a greater interest by employers in reducing their payments because poor performance will be levied more.

PORT LINCOLN SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House of the latest position in relation to the planning and preliminary design work for proposed sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln? Will the Minister advise whether a construction timetable has been established and, if so, what is the anticipated date of the commencement of the work and the estimated time of completion of the project? I have been contacted by constituents seeking information on the progress of the design work. However, I am also aware of some public consultation that has taken place encouraging public input into the project and the possible options that could be implemented at that site.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in and support of this project. As members would know, Port Lincoln is the last remaining sewage treatment plant that discharges directly into the ocean and, as all sections of the community would agree, we must move to ensure that we provide a proper sewage treatment facility for that area to protect the marine environment. In the middle of 1989 I undertook to have designs for a sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln imple-

mented. I announced at that time that construction would proceed when funds were made available. Preliminary concept work and designs have been done and the budget estimate is in place. The value of the project is some \$5 million.

The sewage treatment process to be used at Port Lincoln will be the intermittent extended aeration process. Initially, the works will have the capacity to remove nitrogen from the effluent, and phosphorus removal can be retrofitted should monitoring indicate that this is necessary to alleviate any particular problems. These nutrients, in particular nitrogen, are considered to be one of the major causes of seagrass degradation in Gulf St Vincent.

I am delighted to tell the honourable member that the commencement of one of the major projects that we are looking at funding from the initiative of the environmental levy, which is now in place and operational, has been brought forward and funds will be made available this financial year for the detailed design to be completed. Construction should commence in the 1991-92 financial year and completion is targeted for the end of 1994. I would be very pleased if the honourable member would convey that information to his constituents. I believe that he will be quite delighted with it as indeed I am as Minister of Water Resources.

PRISON WORK GANGS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Correctional Services say whether we have any form of prison work gangs in South Australia? It has been suggested that we should reintroduce prison work gangs to the South Australian correctional system.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Yatala for his question.

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: I believe it is contrary to Standing Orders not to refer to members by their correct title or district.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is correct. The Minister will refer to the honourable member by his electorate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise; I could not resist. A few weeks ago I was rather surprised to read in the newspaper about the member for Fisher's foray into regal breeding in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is a Standing Order that refers to relevance. This is completely irrelevant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the point of order and I ask the Minister to kindly confine his remarks to answering the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I certainly will, Mr Speaker. I was only leading up from that press release to the latest press release. The first one surprised me, because to all appearances, although I have had a very short acquaintance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, the Minister is flouting the Chair. He really needs to be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will not direct the Chair on the action to be taken. Points of order may be made, and will be judged, but the Deputy Leader will not direct the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister is flouting the Chair by the way he is responding to the question.

The SPEAKER: I think the Minister is stretching the friendship a little. He has referred again to the original newspaper article, and I ask him to confine his comments to the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Certainly, Sir. Admittedly on short acquaintance, I thought the member for Fisher looked a normal enough sort of chap.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order. He has referred again to the member for Fisher, who has nothing at all to do with the question. If he digresses again, I will withdraw leave to respond.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: When I received this particular media release I was not as surprised as I was on an earlier occasion, because the member for Fisher appears to have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): How does the Minister of Education reconcile his statement on radio yesterday morning, that Education Department committees should continue and be strengthened, with the findings of the Auditor-General, reported to this Parliament only hours later, that there was a potential to rationalise their numbers, membership size and frequency of meetings? Will the Minister now immediately initiate a review of all departmental committees, in line with the suggestions of the Auditor-General, and aim at reducing their overall numbers and membership size? The Auditor-General referred to 169 obvious committees he found in the department, plus others. On page iii of his report, regarding the Education Department, the Auditor-General stated:

I am reminded of the statement that committees keep minutes but take hours. I believe it would be appropriate for all agencies to undertake a review of their use of committees, in particular their cost and effectiveness.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: First, I should comment on the fact that yesterday a press release was issued by the Opposition which quoted almost word for word, as I understand it, the comments made in the Auditor-General's Report, which was released many hours after the release of that press release. That certainly requires the investigation of the Auditor-General.

With respect to the comments of the honourable member, I refer him to the Auditor-General's Report, in which the Auditor-General has, I suggest, commented quite favourably on the action that has been taken within the Education Department for an ongoing review of the committee structure of that department. Indeed, he comments on the criteria that have been established in the department, and administered by the department's area officers, for the ongoing review of the work of committees within that department.

I reiterate to the House the words that I used yesterday in relation to the value of the consultative processes established within the education system in this State. It is one of the great strengths of our education system that there are opportunities for parents, students and members of the broader community—particularly those involved in industry—to participate in key policy areas of the Education Department and, further, there is the opportunity for particular interest groups to participate in the education

process, multicultural education, special education and so on.

That is and has been for many years a feature of the work of the Education Department and something that I value very much. Certainly, I appreciate the enormous voluntary effort that is put into education by people across the length and breadth of this State. I am sure that the Auditor-General does not wish to curtail that in any way, although I am most concerned about the comments made by the Opposition that many of these committees are unnecessary and the numbers ought to be cut down. I should like members of the Opposition to tell the community which of these committees they would eliminate and which functions they would rather leave to administrators and Ministers to take alone. We may then find some substantial criticism coming from the Auditor-General if a Government took that attitude, and in that autocratic way made decisions about something as fundamental as education in our community.

I accept the need for that ongoing review and analysis of committees so that they do not take on a life of their own and do not continue when they are no longer needed; that new committees be given very strict terms of reference and projects to perform; and that their membership be appropriate and so on. All that is commented on—and favourably—in the Auditor-General's Report. It is unfortunate that the honourable member chose not to put his question into the full context. It is also interesting—and a sad reflection on an Opposition—that the Opposition chose to comment on this matter in the way in which it did yesterday, prior to the official release of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Auditor-General is answerable to this House and, if there is a question relative to the Auditor-General's capacity or integrity, it ought to be by substantive motion to this House, not by a reflection, which the Minister of Education has made twice now, relative to a leak from the Auditor-General's department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a Standing Order that states that no member may reflect except through a substantive motion. I must say that I am not quite sure in this context whether or not the Minister crossed the boundary, but I will check the *Hansard* report.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. Again, it is not for individual members of this House to direct the Chair on anything. If members are not happy with a decision of the Chair, opportunities are available to them. I will check the Minister's comments and take up the matter with him if necessary. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: On a point of order, Sir, I wish to clarify those comments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is very serious. It has been alleged that this Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister is now trying to clarify the situation for me and for the House, and I believe that he has that right. The Minister.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, when such instances arise in other circumstances the member concerned makes a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. First of all, the Minister had not completed answering the question; he was still on his feet and was sat down on a point of order. He had not finished his answer

and any other members who are sat down have the right to complete their remarks. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Mr Speaker, I certainly have been misrepresented and I believe that I have the right to clarify the matter at this point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the Minister wishes to make a personal explanation, as is the case for any member, he can make it at the end of Question Time. Has the Minister completed his response?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am still answering the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister had completed his remarks. At the completion of those remarks—

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand what the honourable member is saying and in the opinion of the Chair the Minister had not completed his answer. He was sat down by the Chair when the member for Light rose to take the point of order. If members are sat down when a point of order is taken, they have the right to finish the statement they were making or the answer they were giving. The honourable Minister

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The concluding remarks I was making prove that this is a matter that I believe should be taken up by the Auditor-General. I think it is embarrassing for this to have occurred prior to the release of the Auditor-General's Report, and I think it is appropriate that he take up this matter. That is certainly the intent of my remarks.

HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. What steps does the Government propose to take to reduce the danger from hazardous chemicals? On 10 May this year there was a serious chemical spill from a metal finishing factory at Edwardstown within my electorate. This accident required the evacuation of some households. With a large concentration of hazardous chemicals in this industrial area, residents are naturally concerned that similar accidents may occur in the future.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question because it is one of real importance. This morning a two-day seminar on hazardous chemicals commenced at the Amdel Research Centre. About 170 people are attending that conference, and they will be discussing the code of practice being prepared by Worksafe for the use of hazardous chemicals.

The matter which has arisen and which is of grave importance to the occupational safety and health of people in industry involves workers' rights to know what hazardous chemicals they are working with and what can happen with the processes in which they are involved. I am of the view, and experience has led to that view and reinforced it, that many workers, as well as employers, have no idea what could happen in connection with the chemicals and processes being used. I am also of the view that many people do not know what can happen if they store some chemicals together and there should be a fire. In many instances a lot of farm sheds contain dangerous cocktails of chemicals, and the people who own those chemicals have no idea what could happen if there is a fire in their shed. They themselves have little idea of the compositions of chemicals and what

could happen to them in certain circumstances. This code will establish a practice that ensures that people know.

Further, I hope it will ensure that the 25 per cent of people in industry who are non-English speaking backgrounds and who predominantly make up the blue collar work force have access to this information in language they can easily and readily understand, because ignorance in this area may mean that later on in life their ability to enjoy retirement, or even a long life, is limited.

In this unfortunate incident in Edwardstown, we saw that a very dangerous chemical had inadvertently escaped from its tank. If the necessary action had not been taken, it could have led to the death of some people, and it was only prompt action by certain emergency services people that prevented such an outcome. Having read the reports, I am of the view that neither the employer nor the workers there understood. Industry should, where possible, design out the use of chemicals and processes that are dangerous but, where they cannot do that, they should ensure, first, that the process is absolutely as safe as it can be; that all workers are trained and have complete knowledge of how to deal with the chemical in question and of all circumstances of the processes involved should the chemical escape from its container; and any other untoward activity that may take place. They should also know what to do if something happens to one of their fellow workers.

I hope that, out of this conference and out of the new code of practice that will eventually come from Worksafe, as recommended by the tripartite committee, we will see a large body of information given to workers so that they can work safely and so that we can reduce potential accidents and the sort of accident that occurred at Edwardstown a few months ago.

ENVIRONMENT SURCHARGE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I wish to ask a question of the member for Albert Park. In view of the answer to my question yesterday by the Minister of Water Resources, stating that the Government would not use the environmental surcharge on rates to fund the removal of effluent disposal ponds from the Murray River flood plains, why did the honourable member, on behalf of the Minister, give an assurance last Friday to the Murray Valley League annual conference that the surcharge would be used for this purpose? Did he seek the authorisation of the Minister before making that statement, and what action will he now take to see that this commitment to the Murray Valley League is honoured?

The SPEAKER: The question is out of order, on the basis that the member does not have a ministerial responsibility to this House for the matter reported. As I understand the question, it concerned something stated by the member, but he does not have responsibility to this House for that portfolio.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe it comes under Standing Order No. 96 (2), which states:

Questions may be put to other members, but only if such question relates to any Bill, motion or other public business for which those members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the House.

I contend that the honourable member was speaking on behalf of the Minister when making that statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Standing Order 96 (2) provides:

... only if such questions relate to any Bill, motion or other public business for which those members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the House.

The Chair does not consider that the member for Albert Park is responsible for that portfolio in this House.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, if the member for Albert Park is not responsible for the statement that he made—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. The Minister of Water Resources is responsible to the House for that portfolio. The honourable member is not responsible and, therefore, the question is out of order.

ABORIGINAL ART AND CULTURE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs explain to the House what steps are being taken to promote Aboriginal art and culture overseas?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There have been a number of measures recently and, given this is NADOC week, it is very appropriate that this question should be asked. Indeed, members will be aware that Aboriginal art is gaining international recognition and, in fact, a number of exhibitions have been held recently in New York and London. I think the honourable member is particularly interested in the recent Venice exhibition which featured a considerable range of Aboriginal art and artefacts, including some from this State. I am also aware that Tandanya is currently involved in exhibitions at the Edinburgh Festival and in other parts of Europe, and this, too, is attracting considerable international interest.

CONTAMINATED SOIL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Has the Minister for Environment and Planning sought advice on any legal responsibility the Government may have for any health effects and relocation of residents arising from the Government's failure to inform Bowden residents about the contaminated soil in their neighbourhood? If so, will she reveal to the House the extent of the obligations that the Government has been advised it may face and, if not, will she seek immediately this advice?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have publicly on a number of occasions, including in this House at Question Time yesterday and again on the *7.30 Report* last night, as well as at the annual general meeting of the Bowden/Brompton Community Centre last Friday night, clearly addressed the whole question of contaminated land sites in this State. I have particularly addressed the question of the Bowden/Brompton land. I believe that last night, in the short time that was available to me, I attempted to make very clear the fact that one of the officers of my department (and I am very pleased that the honourable member has given me the opportunity to speak in the House on this because I would like to get on the public record that this man is a fine, caring and competent person) has taken the responsibility for this issue and, in fact, I think has treated himself very harshly.

The whole question of legality has been looked at with respect to the health of individual people. My colleague, the Minister of Housing and Construction, announced about two weeks ago in Parliament that any community member in that area who wished to be tested—to see whether they had within their bloodstream elevated levels of cadmium, lead, zinc, arsenic or any other chemical—would have that facility provided under the auspices of my colleague the Minister of Health under the Health Commission. That, in

fact, has taken place. Those citizens who came forward were tested.

The latest information that I have is that all those tests that have been conducted so far indicate that the levels are within the limits and, in fact, within the lower levels of the contaminated substances that were found on the site. I think it is quite inaccurate and inappropriate to say that any particular officer did not hand on that information. In fact, my reading of the documentation and my inquiring into the whole matter indicate that the officer in question had contacted an officer at the Hindmarsh council who was also employed by the Hindmarsh Development Committee (and I think that is a piece of information that has not yet come to light) and requested of the Health Commission that the site should be watered, which in fact, was carried out.

I understand that the Works Manager or the Works Department of the Hindmarsh council subsequently carried out the watering of the site. The Works Department also levelled, rolled and compacted the site and, in so doing, removed a couple of loads of soil, which is now stored at the council depot under a plastic covering. It is drawing a long bow to suggest that, because this site was for a time unfenced and had not been accurately watered, it is the responsibility of the Government in the sense that it has been negligent.

I believe that I have a responsibility to the residents of Bowden/Brompton to be absolutely open, and I have been and I will continue to be open. I will certainly seek some legal advice on this matter. In fact, I tell the honourable member that, this morning, I received a note from the Director of the Department of Planning in the Department of Environment and Planning. I understand that he is already seeking Crown Law advice on the Government's position. It would be mischievous if anyone either on the *7.30 Report* or in this Chamber were to try to conduct a witch hunt that might end up in destroying a very fine, upstanding officer. I will not be part of that. I will go on the program—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very interesting, Mr Speaker: they want to ask the question, they want to set the hares running, but they do not want to have the responsibility for being part of what was done to a very fine public servant on last night's *7.30 Report*. Members on this side of the House have given me the carriage of this particular matter and I am proud to say that we will not stand idly by and watch one of our public servants set up as some kind of a scapegoat. I will get that information for the honourable member. It is already in train and I am delighted to have had the opportunity to put the Government's position on this matter on the public record.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AUDITOR-GENERAL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: During my response to a question this afternoon from the member for Davenport, the member for Light rose to take a point of order and indicated that, in his mind, I may have reflected upon the Auditor-General. I assure the House that, if that was the impression that the honourable member or any other member obtained from my response to that question, it is an incorrect interpretation and I take offence at the comments that were made by the member for Murray-Mallee about my intentions in this matter.

It has been pointed out to me that I may have said of the Auditor-General in terms of my asking for there to be an inquiry into the circumstances whereby the Opposition commented on a matter prior to the Auditor-General's Report (either by pure and miraculous chance or for some other reason) that it is properly a matter for investigation by the Auditor-General, and I believe that he is capable of doing so and that it is appropriate for him to do so. I certainly did not intend any reflection upon the Auditor-General, for whom I have the greatest respect.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CONTAMINATED SOIL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat for a moment. Leave was sought and granted. The honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In answering a question, the Minister for Environment and Planning suggested that I was reflecting on a public servant. I make quite clear to this House that I was not doing so. I made no reference to any particular person or to any particular public servant. I inform the Minister that I have the greatest respect for the person to whom she referred as a public servant. I was seeking a response from the Minister to determine whether she, in turn, had sought advice on any legal responsibility that the Government may have, and that was entirely what the question was about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AUDITOR-GENERAL

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: During the personal explanation given to the House by the Minister of Education just now he reflected on me by saying that by way of interjection I had inferred or stated that he was reflecting on the Auditor-General in the answer he gave to the question involving the Auditor-General. I did so only by way of exchange of interjections with the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Recreation and Sport. My impression of the Minister of Education's impropriety was confirmed by them and the Minister of Transport who nodded in assent that the Government was pursuing the Auditor-General. On that basis I then said, 'You're damn right.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is fully aware that under Standing Orders interjections are out of order. So, all of that procedure was out of order under the Standing Orders of this House.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.

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.

Motion carried.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982, the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 and the Wills Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to make sundry minor amendments to the Correctional Services Act and the Legal Practitioners Act in order to correct several small errors of a drafting or clerical nature that occurred in recent amendments to those Acts. The Bill also contains amendments arising out of a revision of the Wills Act carried out for the purposes of rendering its language gender neutral and for generally bringing it a little more into line with modern expression. It is intended to publish a reprint of the Wills Act shortly.

As always, this Bill does not seek to make any substantive changes to the law contained in the three Acts in question. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 allows for the amendments to the Correctional Services Act and the Legal Practitioners Act to come into operation on assent. The amendments to the Wills Act will come into operation by proclamation to enable, as usual, the reprint of the Act to be published at the same time.

Clause 3 and the three schedules effect the various amendments.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. 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 main purpose of this Bill is to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to enable the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to authorise certain persons and employees of certain organisations to handle various transactions under the Act. Police cadets and public servants stationed at police stations will be authorised to issue permits to drive unregistered motor vehicles. Australia Post employees will be authorised to issue temporary driver's licences and collect driver's licence renewal payments and motor vehicle registration renewal payments.

These amendments to the Act extend existing arrangements by which police officers issue unregistered motor vehicle permits (see section 16 (2) of the Act). Permits to operate unregistered motor vehicles are issued by police officers at locations outside the metropolitan area where the community is not serviced by a local motor registration office. Unregistered vehicle permits provide a means of giving temporary registration and insurance cover to allow a vehicle to be driven while an application for registration is processed by motor registration.

This Bill will ensure the validity of unregistered vehicle permits issued by police cadets and public servants employed at police stations. This is a matter of convenience for the Police Department and also minimises inconvenience to clients seeking permits where a police officer is not available to issue permits.

The second aspect of this Bill relates to the move towards authorising agents to handle other transactions. Since the introduction of photographs on driver's licences in September 1989, Australia Post has acted as an agent for motor registration, receiving driver's licence renewal payments, taking photographs and issuing temporary licences. This Bill will ensure the validity of temporary licences issued by Australia Post.

It is proposed to allow the payment of motor vehicle registration renewals at Australia Post Offices. Australia Post will issue a receipt and forward details of the transaction by electronic medium to motor registration. A wind-screen label and certificate will be prepared and posted to the owner. A regulation will be made to enable a motor vehicle to be driven where the previous registration has expired between the time of payment of the renewal fee and receipt of the new registration label, provided a receipt issued by the agent is carried.

In the longer term these amendments to the Act will empower the Registrar to further extend the network of agencies that may conduct motor registration business. It is proposed that certain motor vehicle dealers be authorised to handle new registrations and the transfer of registration of vehicles they buy and sell. This arrangement will significantly increase the level of service provided to clients purchasing both new and second-hand vehicles. Arrangements under which dealers are able to register motor vehicles are currently working successfully both in Victoria and New South Wales.

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, an interpretative provision, by inserting a definition of 'authorised agent' and by providing for references in certain provisions of the principal Act to extend to an authorised agent.

Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act to empower the Registrar to authorise any person or body to exercise or discharge any prescribed powers or duties under the principal Act.

Clause 5 makes a minor consequential amendment to section 52 of the principal Act.

Clause 6 declares valid the exercise or discharge of a power or duty under the Act by a person or body purportedly authorised by the Registrar, before the commencement of this measure, to exercise or discharge that power or duty.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish the University of South Australia; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a great privilege to have this opportunity to present a Bill for an Act to establish a third university here in South Australia. It is certainly not a common occurrence for universities to be established; in fact, this is only the third time in South Australia's 154 years that a university has been established. There have, of course, previously been numerous rearrangements of tertiary educational institutions in the past, but now we are on the verge of an historic step. We are bringing together a college of advanced education and an institute of technology and changing their status and mission, and in so doing enriching the educational profile of South Australia and setting us firmly on the road to our becoming the smart State in the clever country.

In changing the status we are mindful of the very special characteristics of a university, of the principles of academic freedom, of the autonomous nature of the institution, and of the entry into the international network of similarly designated institutions. I want to make it quite clear that this status change is not a cosmetic device but signifies a tremendous step forward and will lay the base for a standard of excellence, and accessibility to that excellence.

I mentioned three principles, first, academic freedom. By this we mean the absolute right of university academics to pursue areas of intellectual concern and teach and publish without Government interference. The second is university autonomy. The university, as clause 4 (3) states, is not an instrumentality of the Crown, and, as such, is governed by its council, and details of the freedom of governance are spelt out in this Bill. No longer will its course offerings have to be accredited by outsiders, as presently is the case in the component institutions.

The third principle of entry into an international network. Universities hold a special place in the modern world and are crucial to our economic, technological and social well-being. No longer will those who are from a college or institute have to explain, especially when accessing overseas markets, that they are part of the 'real' tertiary sector in Australia and that their offerings are legitimate. The designation of university status, justifiably earned, will make that an automatic presumption.

The establishment of a new university is not, however, an easy task, nor one taken without considerable thought, negotiation and resource allocation. This is even more the case when dealing with an amalgamation of institutions with solid track records reaching back more than a century and established goals, activities and procedures.

Members will be aware that Commonwealth Government support for growth and reform in higher education will focus on those institutions which make up the unified national system of higher education. As educational insti-

tutions fulfilling university functions, it simply makes a lot of sense to organise our institutions into a system that is recognised for what it is, provides social and educational value, and is eligible for substantial Commonwealth funding. The Unified National System provides for fewer and larger institutions than have existed in the past, and, in so rearranging, hopes to achieve more effective coordination on matters such as course provision, disciplinary specialisation and credit transfer.

The University of South Australia will be South Australia's largest university with approximately 13 000 students. Students will benefit from this concentration of resources. Larger institutions give students access to a more comprehensive range of course and program options, greater scope for transferring between disciplines with maximum credit and better academic and student services and facilities. For staff there is the potential for an enriched teaching and research environment, opportunities to participate in a wider range of courses and programs, for enhanced promotional opportunities and professional contacts, and more flexibility in the arrangement of teaching loads.

I also wish to highlight the very great importance this Government places on access and equity in higher education. As South Australia's largest university, spread across six campuses it reaches into all socio-economic strata. Many talented people have not, in the past, been served well by our tertiary education system. It was not so long ago that parts of the system were dedicated to excluding many apparently 'ordinary' people so that the excellence of a minority could be fostered. Our society, facing as it does, all the challenges of world competition, simply cannot afford to waste huge resources of talent on grounds irrelevant to ability and performance. All can contribute and all will have an opportunity to have the educational wherewithal to participate in a society in which economic growth, technological advances and social cohesion would depend as much on the confidence and talents of the many as on the brilliance of the few.

As we move towards the year 2000, here in South Australia we must ensure that our higher education system should maintain its commitment to excellence in teaching and research, yet at the same time be comprehensive, accessible and related to individual potential. Its curriculum and its processes should invite rather than impede, include rather than exclude. Now more than ever, sustained economic success and social development depends upon the continuing education of our people and the trained abilities of our workforce.

I am particularly keen that Aboriginal people see the university as relevant to their hopes and aspirations. For the first time in legislation of this type in Australia, there is highlighted, in the functions of the university, that it is to provide such programs as are appropriate to meet the needs of Aboriginal people. Of course, both the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology have a national pre-eminence in the area of Aboriginal education. Members will also note other community oriented access and equity issues.

This legislation recognises the diverse cultural life of our community. By listing in the functions equal opportunity measures for access and participation for disadvantaged groups, the legislation firmly establishes this Government's commitment to higher education as a means not only for social and economic development but for establishing equity. Of course, as legislation that broadens educational opportunities it will be very important for members whose interests lie in rural communities and for those in the less advantaged areas of the State.

The Government has gone to great lengths to consult widely on this legislation, and interestingly there has probably been more discussion about the name of the proposed university than about any other matter. Numerous suggestions have been put forward and the decision taken was that the university should carry the name of the State. The Government was happy to endorse the decisions of the councils of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology, both of which decided that the University of South Australia was the best and most suitable name. Many of the leading universities in Australia and overseas carry the name of the State, and this gives them a status and dignity. Of course I refer to the University of Western Australia, the University of New South Wales, the University of Tasmania, and the University of Queensland, not to mention such impressive and great educational institutions overseas as the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Virginia, the University of California and so forth.

Some people put the view that the University of South Australia could be confused with the Flinders University of South Australia. I believe that Flinders' reputation is well established internationally as well as around this nation. In its 25 years it has become a recognised and substantial university. I am certainly pleased to note that at its meeting on 24 August the Flinders University Council placed on record its view that the name 'University of South Australia' was no dire cause for concern.

The name is fitting, as the new university with its six campuses, including one at Whyalla, will be truly for all of South Australia not just the metropolitan area. One of its great strengths is that it will place particular emphasis upon distance education and a special focus on educational outreach. It will use new technologies to broaden the educational base and will bring education to people as well as people to education. The establishment of the University of South Australia involves the disestablishment of the two component institutions. Complementary to that are amalgamations which increase the size of the University of Adelaide and Flinders University. A separate piece of enabling legislation—a nuts and bolts piece of legislation to make it all work—will be presented to this House when this Bill is debated further.

I think that it is important to recognise the commitment of a number of leading players in the amalgamation process, which has been going on for some years but, principally, during the past eight or nine months. I refer in particular to the role of the President of the South Australian Institute of Technology, Mr Lew Barrett, the role of the President of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, Mr John McDonald, and, of course, that of the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology, Professor Allan Mead and the Director of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, Dr Robert Seagall and his successor, Ms Denise Bradley, and their officers. Of course, I must also mention the role of Mr Andrew Strickland, who was the chairman of the negotiating group on the mergers. Each of these people has put aside the parochial concerns of the various institutions to look for broader and better benefits for South Australia further education. I congratulate them for their commitment to excellence and their commitment to achieving a first rate new university in South Australia.

The progress of higher education is a vital element of the economic and social future of South Australia. The establishment of the University of South Australia is a major step towards realising that future. I seek leave to have the

detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act by proclamation.

Clause 3 provides several definitions for the purposes of the Act, all of which are self-explanatory.

Clause 4 establishes the University of South Australia as a body corporate of full legal capacity, and makes it clear that the university is not an instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 5 sets out the primary functions of the university, which are to further knowledge, whether through teaching, research, scholarship or consultancy, and to provide a wide range of tertiary education courses, including courses specially designed to meet the needs of the Aboriginal people and of other disadvantaged groups in the community. The university is to strive for excellence and the highest possible standards in its provision of tertiary education.

Clause 6 sets out the general powers of the university; first, to confer appropriate academic awards and, secondly, to do all necessary things for the management of the university. The power to sell or otherwise dispose of land is subject to approval of the Governor. The university has an unfettered power to lease any of its land if the term of the lease does not exceed 21 years.

Clause 7 requires the university to adhere to certain principles in the management of its affairs. The university must establish and regularly review principles for the sound and fair management of the university and its staff and must not discriminate against any person on political or religious grounds or subject any person to unlawful discrimination (that is, contrary to the Equal Opportunity Act) on the ground of sex, sexuality, marital status, pregnancy, race, physical or intellectual impairment or age or any other ground. These provisions are not to prevent the university from running such affirmative action programs as it thinks fit.

Clause 8 requires the university to continue to maintain the De Lissa Institute and the School of Art, both of which the South Australian College of Advanced Education is, pursuant to its Act, currently required to maintain.

Clause 9 provides that student associations cannot alter their constitutions or rules without the prior approval of the council.

Clause 10 establishes the council of the university. The council is the governing body of the university and has responsibility for the entire management of the affairs of the university. The council will consist of not more than 28 members, made up of 10 people from the governing body of the Institute of Technology, 10 from the governing body of the College of Advanced Education, not more than seven other persons nominated by the Minister, and the Vice Chancellor, *ex officio*. The latter category of members must be persons who were not involved with the institute or the college, and who are not staff or students of the university. The first appointment of the institute and college representatives will be made on a recommendation from the institute and the college. The Minister is to try to achieve equal representation, as far as practicable, of men and women on the council.

Clause 11 provides that terms of office will not exceed one year and makes provision for removal from and vacancies of office.

Clause 12 provides for the appointment of Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor from amongst the members of the council. The first appointment will be made by the Governor on a recommendation of the institute and the college. Thereafter, the council will appoint its own Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor. The interim Chancellor and interim Deputy Chancellor will be appointed for a term of office of one year. Subsequent appointments will be for terms of office not exceeding five years. A staff or student representative on the council is not eligible to be appointed Chancellor or Deputy Chancellor.

Clause 13 sets out the usual provisions relating to meetings of the council. It should be noted that the person presiding at a meeting does not have a casting vote.

Clause 14 provides for validity of acts or decisions of the council notwithstanding vacancies in its membership or any defect in the appointment of a member.

Clause 15 gives the council power to delegate to council members, employees, holders of any particular office and committees of the council or the university.

Clause 16 provides for the appointment of the Vice Chancellor of the university, who will be the chief executive officer of the university. The first appointment will be by the Governor on a recommendation of the institute and the college, and subsequent appointments will be made by the council.

Clause 17 provides for the appointment of staff.

Clause 18 requires the council to report annually to the Minister and also to report at the end of the first year of the university's operation on any changes that should, in the opinion of the council, be made to the council's structure, and on any other matter arising out of the establishment or operation of the university. These reports must be laid before Parliament.

Clause 19 requires that the university's books be audited by the Auditor-General at least annually.

Clause 20 provides for the payment of money appropriated by Parliament to the university.

Clause 21 exempts the university from land tax.

Clause 22 gives the Industrial Commission jurisdiction in relation to officers and employees of the university.

Clause 23 empowers the council to make statutes for the management and organisation of the university, for the admission of students and the conferring of academic awards, the imposition and collection of fees, and other matters of an internal nature. Statutes must be confirmed by the Governor and published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 24 empowers the council to make by-laws for the purpose of governing traffic on the university grounds, controlling the use of alcohol, tobacco and other substances on the grounds, and generally for regulating the conduct of persons while within the grounds. By-laws must be confirmed by the Governor, published in the *Gazette*, and laid before Parliament. By-laws may be disallowed by Parliament. The council is empowered to provide for expiation of offences against the by-laws.

Clause 25 provides that confirmation and publication of a statute or a by-law is conclusive evidence that it has been properly made. Statutes and by-laws do not derogate from any other Act or law. A person cannot be charged under both a statute and a by-law for an offence.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 September. Page 624.)

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am very pleased to be speaking to this Appropriation Bill, which is the first budget presentation since my election to the House along with five other Liberal compatriots and six members opposite. I approached the budget process with some enthusiasm. However, I would like to say that, if I was not wide-eyed before, I certainly was after the delivery of the budget. I found it a disappointing offering, filled with many inconsistencies.

As a new shadow Minister, I was interested to see the total process and I would like to make some observations about that. First, and I think most importantly, I believe that the presentation of facts in the budget process is specifically organised to make it difficult to check facts year by year. I query the reasons for that. I guess that it may be because there are better techniques for presenting facts from one year to the next. It could also be that there is something to hide. Creative accounting is a fact of life today. I believe that our immediate political opponents would be the first to criticise companies that indulged in creative accounting; however, they jump in at the deep end with alacrity themselves. This is poor, because the Government has a responsibility to the community to present the facts of the budget in an intelligible form to allow comparison from year to year.

The budget document is an important public document but it should not be a public relations document. However, it is quite clear to me, having been witness to this budget presentation for the first time, that the whole purpose of the Labor Party budget that was brought down recently is to weave an intricate web.

The strength of a democracy is measured by the facilities provided to the Opposition. I leave aside physical facilities such as offices, staff, researchers, press and media officers, and so on, because patently we do not receive the same facilities. But, leaving aside those physical facilities, the information provided to the Opposition is just as vital a part of the democratic process and I am appalled at the paucity of information provided to us.

I remind members opposite that, if the voting trends continue, they will be on this side of the House after the next election, and they would do well to smarten up their ideas as to the presentation of facts, physical facilities and information, such that the strength of democracy in South Australia can be measured to be in good health.

Why did I find this a disappointing offering? I found it disappointing because of the triteness of the attempts to mislead the public. The Premier prides himself on his intellectualism, having attended a private college and then university—

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: He prides himself on his intellectualism and his intellect. However, he has given to the House an intellectually impure document. I would like to draw the House's attention to the budget speech, presented on 23 August 1990. I quote from page 8 as follows:

The provision of health services remains one of the basic responsibilities of Government.

Thus far, it is intellectually fine, and I agree with his sentiment. The Premier goes on:

During 1990-91, the new 120 bed hospital will be opened at Noarlunga.

This leaves South Australians in no doubt that the whole hospital will be functional. The Premier even says that 120 beds will be opened at Noarlunga during 1990-91 and yet, in a ministerial statement presented to the House yesterday, 4 September 1990, a mere 12 days (or, indeed, eight working days) later, we have the Minister of Health presenting us with the following statement:

Initiative moneys advanced in the 1990-91 budget amount to \$1.8 million, which will allow 40 beds out of a total of 120 to be opened in late April 1991.

I further quote from the ministerial statement yesterday:

In the case of Noarlunga Hospital, it was determined that the hospital would not come on stream immediately.

Where, I ask, is the intellectual purity of the budget speech now? I believe it has gone with the wind, and the Government's attitude appears to be that, frankly, it does not give a damn. Similar sugar coating or glossing over of the cold, hard facts could be expected from the purveyors of snake oil, well depicted in movies. The Premier must have known on 23 August that Noarlunga Hospital would not be fully operational. If not, I believe he should not have been sitting in the Premier's chair. He must have known that the hospital would not be fully operational, yet the facts could not have altered within 12 days.

The only conclusion to be drawn is that, in the budget document, the most important public document put on the public record in this House, the Premier was attempting to hoodwink South Australians. If he is prepared to do this in the health area, which is of such vital importance, why should we believe any of the other conclusions in the budget document? It is quite reasonable that, if the Premier has made intellectually implausible statements in one area, they would be repeated in other areas. I believe that his credibility in the health area is mortally wounded and, in the other areas, it is therefore equally dubious.

I point out similar skulduggery regarding the Minister of Health. A news release dated 23 August 1990, entitled '1990-91 Health budget announced', begins:

A new initiatives package of \$5.7 million is the highlight of the 1990-91 health budget.

I emphasise 'the highlight of the health budget'. The news release then refers to 'additional funding for the commissioning of the new Noarlunga hospital (\$1.55 million)'. Let us not ignore the fact that, in this press release of 23 August, the amount quoted is \$1.55 million and that, in the ministerial statement issued a mere 12 days later, the amount quoted is \$1.8 million.

Let us not ignore that \$250 000 difference, because I tell members opposite that this is a rate of inflation of 37.5 per cent in 12 days. I believe that the only rate of inflation that could be regarded as being in any way similar to that is the rate below which the Premier promised all rises in charges within South Australia would be held.

This type of economic inconsistency or, indeed, misinformation is typical of a Government wishing to cloud issues, to make it difficult for the public to know exactly where it stands, to provide misinformation for the Opposition and, in the health area, to put sugar coating on a bitter pill. However, having pointed out that the rate of inflation in the Minister's two releases equals 37.5 per cent in a 12-day period, I will deal with the real issue in the Minister's press release. In his news release dated 23 August 1990, the Minister of Health is telling the South Australian public that one of the highlights—I reiterate, highlights—of his health budget is that a much needed hospital in an under-bedded area will start doing its job at least six months after the originally quoted starting date. Not only will this much needed hospital start six months late: it will commence operating with only one-third of its beds, with no firm dates provided for the rest of the beds to operate. Some highlight! In my view, the Minister ought to be ashamed of such blatant attempts to mislead the public over such an important issue.

I recall in my university physics days, when I was never 100 per cent certain of what I was doing, that I used to study Hooke's law. Experiments to verify Hooke's law

entailed putting progressive amounts of weight onto a spring. Eventually, the spring gave up its elasticity and it would not go back to its previous form.

I put to members that examples such as those I have just quoted, where the Government has been attempting to stretch the truth, have forced the credibility coefficient of the public to be exceeded, and Hooke's law would see the credibility no longer coming back to its normal form. In answer to my first question as the shadow Minister of Health, the Minister began with words to the effect of, 'I see, the intern has found his stethoscope at last.' I understand only too well the fairly pathetic reasons why the Minister indulges in this type of invective. I inform him that it does not fess me at all. It is water off a duck's back. I understand he is trying to deflect the argument from the issue and I also understand that he is involved in personality politics. That is fine. I inform him that my shoulders are very broad.

I also inform the Minister that I applied my intern's stethoscope to his credibility levels and found that the respirations have ceased and the pulses are absent, which is synonymous with the cessation of life. South Australia, in my view, deserves more honesty rather than the sugar-coated bitter pills of the Minister of Health. I raise these issues because I believe that the health budget—in fact, the whole budget—is full of these public relations inconsistencies, and in the long term they will be to the detriment of all South Australians.

I would like to turn briefly to the much vaunted social justice strategy. I quote from The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy 1990-91, circulated by the Premier and Treasurer of South Australia for the information of honourable members on the occasion of the budget. As I was reading this document to see where, in fact, the social justice lay, my copy fell open at page 23. This section, headed 'Vulnerable children and their families', begins with the words:

Support to families as a basic social unit . . .

I agree with that. The document indicates that further measures in the budget provided direct financial support to families. So far so good. Warm fuzzy stuff.

These further measures included 'the introduction of free travel for school students, providing a significant financial boost to all families with children.' I ask the Premier, whilst he is circulating this warm fuzzy public relations document, how many families in the country have benefited from the introduction of free student travel which operates in the metropolitan area? I put it to the Premier that the answer is absolutely zero. If this is the type of fact with which we are presented as an Opposition, what credibility do we give to the rest of the budget documents? Absolutely zero; exactly the same benefit as families in the country have received from free student travel. I quote again:

. . . the introduction of free travel for school students, providing a significant financial boost to all families with children.

That is simply incorrect. This is a public relations document only. As a new member in this House, I am amazed at the lack of intellectual purity in the most important document presented in the House. Indeed, it is obvious that there has been minimal attention to detail.

Page 17 of the social justice strategy states that, on advice from the Social Justice Advisory Committee, continuing emphasis has been placed on the needs of families. I presume that, because families in the country do not receive free student travel, greater emphasis has been placed on them. We learn also that continuing emphasis has been placed on 'developing and supporting models of activity impacting at local and regional levels'. With the winding down of acute care medical centres in the country, where

are the 'supporting models of activity impacting at local and regional levels'?

I can tell members opposite that their plans to decimate acute care in the country certainly impact at local and regional levels. There is absolutely no doubt about it. It has one of the most major negative impacts on a community that can possibly be seen. However, we read that this is social justice. Great stuff and just as inconsistent as all the other details. At page 18 we see that considerations for the provision of social justice in the budget are said to address 'unintended inequities in the way services are delivered'. Presumably this means that, because the Government is happy to cut country health acute services, it is not an unintended inequity; it is, indeed, intended.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I am pleased to be speaking to my first Appropriation Bill. I am also pleased that you, Mr Acting Speaker, are in the Chair because I realise that you will understand a lot of what I have to say. I would also like to comment on the member for Adelaide's remarks about country services, particularly in relation to country health. The Government is certainly not doing as it says it is. As is obvious, I am the new boy of this House and, as such, am still fresh from the outside. I feel that my view is not yet cloistered by being in this hallowed place.

I am amazed at the Government's weakness three years from an election. I thought that this would be a time when the Government could make some pretty tough decisions and get away with it. However, the Government has chosen to put out a wimpish document, a document that has no teeth. Tough decisions are needed.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: As the member for Spence said, we are quite happy to take the cuts as long as they are fair right across the board—we will accept them all in the State's good. However, we have a serious problem. Successive Governments—State and Federal—have taken wrong directions ever since the late 1960s. It is a disgrace. Australia is among the top 10 wealthiest countries, and it is a land of great natural wealth, opportunity and plenty. I am sure that the two members left opposite both agree that Australia is in a mess. I invite them to interject if they believe that I am wrong. The country is in a mess.

Successive bad Governments over the past 30 years have brought this country to where it is today. I hope members opposite agree when I say that we have problems. This budget is just more socialism, albeit in a softer form. I believe that socialism will and is destroying itself, as it has here. People have become disinterested and self-centred. Compare us with the Japanese. The big difference is that we now think as individuals; the Japanese think collectively as a community. Our anti-social statistics are alarming. We are looking for leadership and tough decisions must be made, particularly in the budget. I will draw many analogies in my speech and compare things that happen in the world with sheep and dogs.

Mr Atkinson: Allegories or analogies?

Mr VENNING: Whatever. I will use them to illustrate my point. Without meaning any disrespect to members opposite, I will use the analogy of sheep and the sheep dog. I class the population of the country as the sheep and the Government as the dog. As members would be aware, the dog likes to push the sheep around and show his authority. In this case, what is happening is that the sheep have become disinterested in the dog. They are going their own

way and the dog is following the sheep. I will be using many of these analogies in future.

I call this dog the Rover from Ross Smith. He is tired and I think he learned his habits from the old dog, the old dog Don, many years ago. I live in hope but it appears that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks.

Why tax the productive sector and cushion the unproductive? This is a serious problem and members opposite must be aware of it. I believe that members opposite have talents and I realise that the member who interjected has a reputation for being an intelligent man. He knows that all is not well in this State and it is all very well for him to laugh and make a mockery of this, but things are not too good. Many members on the other side have a lot of talent but I feel that they are hogtied. In brief terms, the way out for this country is to produce, to provide incentive and to give reward.

I am the newest member of Parliament, fresh from the real world. Some members have been here almost longer than they have not been here. It is easy to be insular and unimaginative and to be a professional politician. This budget should have been a tough one, tough for us all. It should have been tough for us as politicians to implement and tough for the community to accept. But this budget is a pathetic document.

Mr Atkinson: So you would like higher taxes?

Mr VENNING: I will take a higher tax as long as it is consistent. If the Government had the political fortitude to bite the bullet, I would have supported it. As the member asked by way of interjection, yes, I would support higher taxes. We have higher taxes for some sections of the community but not for everyone. It is high time a bipartisan approach was used for the common good. I speak for myself, as I can over here, in saying that I am prepared to support any option, as tough as it may be, for the common good and the future of South Australia, but I will not support a prolonged disaster, a steady as she sinks syndrome.

I have always feared for this country that a situation would develop of continuing soaring costs, particularly interest rates, coupled with a fall in our commodity prices. Well, this year we have all three. That has not happened for many years. All members know what is the outlook for wool. The wheat outlook gets poorer by the day and fuel costs have gone through the roof, which was not forecast. Even members opposite would realise what that will do, not only for rural people but for the economy of South Australia. How confident do they think the average primary producer is right now? How much business do they think rural traders are doing? What is confidence like in country towns? Yet, the Government has massaged them with a budget like this. The Government sees only half the problem. In his budget speech the Treasurer stated:

Rural production and incomes in the State were boosted by a doubling in the size of the wheat crop from 1988-89's weak level and by a large increase in barley production.

On the next page, the Treasurer stated:

The rural outlook is much less buoyant with wheat and barley production certain to decline from the near record levels of last year, and the prices for wheat and wool are also likely to be weaker.

That is an absolute certainty and, coupled with the huge increases in costs, especially fuel, the future looks gloomy. High transport costs will affect all those living outside Adelaide. Weetbix will be dearer on the shelves in Port Pirie. I reiterate: farmers buy retail, sell wholesale and pay the freight both ways. I am not merely whingeing.

Mr Atkinson: Much.

Mr VENNING: I am not. Members opposite have heard this before but I am just wondering whether they really understand or want to understand.

Mr Meier: I don't think they do.

Mr VENNING: No, but they will realise in the next financial year what has happened to the financial position of this State. The people who have been carrying the State for the past 20 years are hurting, and they will not be able to deliver the goods to the same extent. The member opposite nods; he agrees, and I am pleased. We must take a wider approach to the State's problems. Many farmers will go over the edge this year. Production in this State is being left to fewer and fewer people. Approximately 7 per cent of the population produce 60 per cent of the State's output, and it gets worse daily.

What has the Government decided to do about these problems? It has hit with a clenched fist. It will increase producers' costs by taking away the primary producer registration concession, which will mean about \$50 per vehicle. That is a very tangible cost to all producers. I ask members opposite to understand that no-one is asking for a handout but it must be appreciated that many of these vehicles do not see the road. They may be driven on the road for only two or three months a year, and that is very easy to substantiate. The vehicles cannot be registered for only two or three months because the high cost of cancellation does not make it feasible. These vehicles will be fully registered for a very minor use.

One of these days, there will be a revolt. The Government makes rural communities pay maximum tax but provides less in the way of services. They are already paying a disproportionate share of fuel tax. A 1c increase in the cost of fuel means \$150 million from the rural economy. Increased registration fees on heavy vehicles is another bitter pill to swallow. I agree with members opposite that heavy vehicles should be levied to the extent of cost recovery, because we know what they do to our roads. Members opposite nod. It must be realised that 90 per cent of these vehicles do not come out of the shed until halfway through November and they are back in the shed just after Christmas. That situation is very hard to solve but I envisage that registration on these vehicles will go up 200 or 300 per cent, and that will not be acceptable. The Government stated:

The additional revenue will add \$8 million and will be applied toward the Department of Road Transport roadworks program.

I would prefer that statement to read that it will be spent on roads in the district from which the tax is collected. The rise in FID will further increase costs to all those in the productive sector. With respect to taxes and charges by regulation, I point out that search fees under the Crown Lands Act have increased by 150 per cent. Payroll tax is up and the exemption is gone. All these costs are passed on to you know who: the man on the end, the one who cannot pass it on, the man who is producing.

Mr Atkinson: And woman.

Mr VENNING: And woman, I stand corrected. As members know, WorkCover has increased from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent. The rural sector receives 1.6 per cent of the State budget, yet it delivers over half of the State's income—that is hardly equitable. I ask members to think ahead: after this budget has run its course, this time next year, what will be the scenario? There can be no other result than higher production costs and higher Government expenditure in the unproductive sector with larger deficits and the economy of the State still slowing—none of today's problems will be solved. The Premier says there is a need to further increase taxes to keep us afloat. This time next year the situation will be worse than it is today. The 'good news' Premier has

three years in which to make tough decisions. He has not done it yet. People expect and are receptive to tough decisions.

In relation to the Department of Agriculture, I am very concerned with the staff cut-backs of 70 positions out of 350. I pay tribute to the department's belt tightening, but I say with great concern: this is contrary to the ideals of increased production. The increased State taxes need to be considered in conjunction with Federal budget impositions, especially Austudy concessions and the lowering of the threshold to \$200 000. I give credit to the Government's commitment on page 9 of the budget speech where it is stated:

... it will fund the continuing implementation of the curriculum guarantee package and allow the department to proceed with stage two of the 'immediate post-compulsory education' initiative for years 11 and 12 of secondary schooling.

I am very aware of the problem in education, particularly in rural education, and I give credit to the Government for attempting to bite the bullet. But why then does the Federal Government come up with this new Austudy charge by dropping the threshold (the value of the asset) to \$200 000? An amount of \$200 000 would not buy a hobby farm. Country students have a pretty hard row to hoe. Not only is curriculum choice in years 11 and 12 difficult, but when they reach the tertiary years they must come to Adelaide to attend university and must be boarded at great cost. That figure of \$200 000 arrived at by the Federal Treasurer means that every rural person will pay the whole hog for all the costs of rural students boarding in Adelaide. I notice that the honourable member nods.

Mr Atkinson: Tell us what the unproductive sector is.

Mr VENNING: I will come to that later. Another problem that has been spoken about already is the increased cost of all services to country students. Free travel for city children sticks in the gut of many rural people. To transport children anywhere in the country is a great cost, but in the city they can be moved around free of charge.

This budget should have hit hard everywhere. People need to see that this Government means business. People need to be reminded of the parlous state that we are in. Everyone should be asked to share the burden, to act responsibly and accept tough times, to tighten the belt, to work harder and wiser, and to get out of the Government's pocket. They need to be encouraged to realise that this is for the common good.

Our present lifestyle cannot be maintained at this level. We are living in a fool's paradise if we think otherwise. The only increases should have been in respect of production in all areas and value-adding. One example is the cost cutting in the Department of Agriculture. I notice in the budget papers that the department received an increase, so why should it have to cut back 70 staff? Agronomists can do the most in this State to lift production. There are so many farmers out there and, as members know, the average age of farmers is growing. It is alarmingly high and we are not making the full use of modern technology to get the most out of production. One way out is to utilise the department's agronomists, but we have only three north of Adelaide on this side of the gulf, and this figure is decreasing. I will take great interest in the Estimates Committees to see where, how and why these cuts have been made. This budget will be judged as a sheep with flies: we will not realise how bad it is until it has gone past.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I take the opportunity to refer to a matter that is not traditionally referred to in this debate, and I hope that no-one will object if I refer to a man named Bert Pollard who recently passed away. He had

passed his three score years and 10 and had served as acting secretary to a former Leader of the Opposition. Subsequently, he became an active field worker for the Liberal Party. I am grateful that, at a time when I did not wish to become a member of Parliament, he was the person who convinced me that I should run. I pass on to his family and those people close to him my and my family's deep regrets at his passing in the past few days.

I wish to refer to several matters. Many of my colleagues have used the figures that relate to small business being pushed further into the background, whether it be through payroll tax or the tax that is applied when money is transferred from one account to another or for payments to employees or the people with whom they deal.

There is no doubt that, in the vast majority of areas, small business has been ignored by this Government. I give the Government credit for attempting—mainly through the member for Hartley—to attack the area of leases for small retail operators in this State. That positive move is recognised. It is something that my Party would have put in in a similar way—not the same way—if it had been in Government. It would have done this now when it deserved to be in Government, when the vast majority of people in this State voted for the Liberal Party to govern.

I suppose one has to give credit to people such as Mr Justice King, the Chief Justice, when he was a member of Parliament, and the Hon. Hugh Hudson and others who put together a package that was sold even to this Party as being fair and just and, more particularly, to the so-called intellectuals in the universities and around the traps, including the media. However, it was totally unjust.

I want to say that, without small business, in many towns and suburbs unemployment becomes greater, but an even greater problem is the use of fuel. If ever a society should look at its fuel usage, it is this society. I cannot understand why the Government does not work with the insurance council to make it acceptable for individuals, who wish to use their car to transport fellow workers to their workplace—whether it be in the suburbs or the city centre—to make a charge for the use of the car without affecting their comprehensive insurance policy. I am sure that, as far as the occupants are concerned, the third party situation could be covered, also. It is the third party situation that really prevails, so it seems ludicrous that we do not encourage this. If a person stood on a street corner and counted the number of cars going in and out of a particular area in any one day with only one occupant or perhaps two, the figure would be about five to one; in other words, five cars out of six carrying nowhere near their full capacity.

It would make for a better use of the resources overall. Because the STA is in an impossible situation, unable to give the service that is needed, that alternative should be looked at, but this Government will do nothing in that area. It is an area of small business, if you like. The Minister tried to do something with small buses and then tried other devious means with taxi licences. In relation to small business, rents are high, and how in the world anyone expects to make money in a small business in the new Remm centre while paying up to \$300 000 a year for a small shop I do not know. It leaves me cold; \$3 000 per square metre per year is ludicrous.

If we have forced ourselves into that position by electing socialist Governments both State and federally, that is the cost of erecting a building and fitting out, so that the occupier has to pay and, consequently, consumers pay an appropriate price to maintain it, the socialists should be condemned. They should be condemned for not thinking of their fellow man—the very thing that is part of their

platform. They do not think of their fellow man: they deal in platitudes. Every time another tax or charge for a licence or registration is imposed, the consumer pays. The people it will affect more than any others are those who cannot afford to pay. There are two groups: those who are consumers in the community at the lower end of the scale as far as income or physical health goes, and those in small business.

Quite often, those people have been retrenched in recent years, being of an age at which neither business nor Government will contemplate employing them—unless they happen to be Party hacks. They have gone into small business but Governments keep on increasing the taxes and charges. If they want a break for a couple of days and need to employ someone else, there is a problem with meeting the commitments to WorkCover.

Reams and reams of paperwork a year humbug people in small business. There are many types of registrations in some businesses. In the computer world in which we live, we could have one form for all types of businesses a person operates and run it through a computer by one operator. But we do not do that: we have pages and pages that people must fill out at night and on weekends—if they are in a trade in which they can have a Sunday off. But no-one in the Government cares. The Labor Party has governed since 1965 for all but five years, and members laugh about that; Sometimes boundaries are rigged, but they laugh about that; it is a joke. But are they really concerned about what is happening to the State? I say that they are not; they will do whatever they can to retain power.

Where is the concern for people as people? Is their concern only that of trying to win the next election? With this budget we have a document called 'The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy 1989-90.' It runs to over 33 pages. Being fair about it, it refers to adults, to youths and to Aborigines. I do not know why there is a difference there, because Aborigines are either adults, youths or children, but the document refers to these categories: adults, youth, children and Aborigines.

I do not have any real complaints about that: that is the Government putting its point of view and trying to explain what it sees as social justice. But then we have another document entitled 'The Budget and Its Impact on Women 1989-90.' There are many parts of that I do agree with, but I want to draw some comparisons. In part of one of the paragraphs on page 1, the document states:

Nearly all the States are progressively implementing policies to advance the status of women.

I agree with that; I think it is great. There is no complaint from me about that. Further down the page it states:

The Bannon Government's approach recognises the diversity of roles women play in the economic, social, intellectual and cultural life of the State; women working in the home, women in business and industry, women as carers and mothers, young women, older women, women as volunteers, migrant women, Aboriginal women, women in cities, women in the country. Women's contribution is fundamental to the prosperity and well-being of South Australia.

I do not have any complaints about that: that is true. I make one comment: men are denied the privilege, the honour and the glory, as some see it, while others see it as a horrible, painful experience and something to be feared at all times, that is, being able to give birth to a child. Perhaps some of the scientists will have fixed that in a few years and we will no longer have the discrimination. Page 2 states:

If a program is aimed at the whole community, as most programs are, then to be effective and fair it must be designed to reach the 51 per cent of the population that is female with redistribution of resources where appropriate, and efforts made to bridge gaps of disadvantage.

That is fair comment. We have to reach out and pick up that 51 per cent, and there is no doubt that that should be the case. The document goes on to make the point that breast cancer is one of the targets of the Government this year, with resources being made available for that purpose.

That is an important area and needs to be looked at. I am sure that there will be no complaint from anyone in the State, especially from country women who have not had the opportunity of the services required to keep watch on such a dreaded disease and to catch it in its early stages. That is a good example of a Government looking at a particular area, but the document goes on for pages and pages about that topic.

However, 49 per cent of the public are not recognised in any way at all. They are not all perfect: some of them would be considered by society as nigh animals, as would some of the women. Some of them are considered to be very good living, highly intellectual and highly successful, as are many of the women. But find anywhere in this city where men under stress can go; find anywhere for them, other than, perhaps, the Salvation Army or community welfare. I see them as being professional people wanting to maintain their clientele while not necessarily wanting to solve problems, and not very many in that service being males who can counsel men who may suffer.

So, where do they go? I will tell you where some of them go: four times as many men commit suicide as women. Not one Government in this country is prepared to pick up the challenge when the roles have changed—and I think that they should have changed.

I believe that women needed the opportunity to progress into the work force, into the professional fields and to be recognised, where they had been pushed aside by the male dominated Parliaments on Public Service in the past. I do not disagree with that. We have a society that is influenced by films, plays and books displaying a role model for men as the aggressor, the attacker and the user of guns and knives at times in order to destroy their own loved ones—women and children.

That role model has developed over the centuries. Those who write the articles, films or plays that are shown in the vast majority of homes—although some people choose not to have television and I think that they may be wise, especially if they have young children—present them as entertainment, and they portray the male role as aggressive. We then complain because one or two men in each hundred or thousand does not have the mental capacity to see that they do not depict the real world, that it is fiction, and that it is not accepted behaviour. They crack and destroy others. Do we have anywhere that they can go to get help? Is there anywhere they can go before they crack? We know that over many years it has been traditional for men not to confide in others, even in their own male friends, when women have had the capacity through the ages to communicate with each other and to talk about their problems quite often. Through that process they get help and counselling, even from friends if not from agencies involved in providing help, and that can keep them on a stable trail.

Let us all think about it quite sincerely. Do men, in the vast majority of cases, confide in a mate, other than to brag about some achievement? Can they confide some personal matter, even a health matter? They cannot. Very often they cannot confide even in their own doctor, lawyer or bank manager. Women have the characteristic, and it is to their credit, but it was developed through role modelling over the centuries. And, at this time, when we have picked up on women's problems reasonably well—and there still may be a great distance to go—we ignore the plight of men all

around us, sometimes even those close to us. We do not recognise the situation. There is no agency to which they can go. Why do we not pick up the challenge? Why can the centres not be crisis centres for people—just people?

In our society there are about 2 per cent more women than men. In the middle-age group there are more women without partners and, perhaps, some might laugh at this, but I believe many are lonely and seek companionship from their own sex. That is an ability that men do not have: women are able to achieve in that sort of companionship. However, the rate of male suicide is four times that of female suicide. I have raised this topic before and I will say it again: while this society is prepared to accept violence, on television in particular (and we can sit down and watch it any night of the week), while the role model for men is maintained, and while women are presented as the schemers, negotiators, planners and consolers behind the scenes—while we continue that and accept it within society as entertainment—the problem will be perpetuated. We see men bash up others, mutilate them or, as we saw in Queensland, a man called Evans was belted to pieces with a tyre lever; we should not complain about it because we have condoned it as entertainment within our society, to the detriment of police officers and others at times.

We should have the courage, as parliamentarians, to say that it is a matter that we should pick up. We should ensure that there are places for men to go to and encourage them to come forward, because I do not believe we can afford to lose anyone to suicide or other forms of tragedy at the present rate in relation to both sexes. We should look at the male role in society.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The State Government has failed to meet the requirements of the Federal Government in practising good sound economics. The call from the financial world and from Canberra is for cuts in costs and reduction of the enormous debt that this country is living with, but again the State Government has not acceded to that request. In 1986-87 the receipts of the State on the Current Account were \$3.2 billion and the payments were exactly the same amount. In 1987-88 the receipts totalled \$4.2 billion and the payments were, again, the same amount. In 1988-89, the Government raised through receipts \$4 206 million and paid out \$4 123 million. In 1989-90 the total receipts were \$4 554 million and the payments were \$4 483 million. Now, in 1991, we find that the State Government intends to raise \$4 616 million and payments will total some \$4 654 million. That means that in the past five years there has been an increase of \$1 400 million in receipts and a similar increase in payments.

We know very well that the ALP policy is to increase taxes and charges rather than to cut costs or programs. The fact of life is that, while the State Government and other State Governments continue to practise this type of economics, those who can least afford it will bear the brunt of their actions. It is fair to say that when we assess this State budget and the Federal budget, we see that it is the pensioners who cop the belting. They are copping a decent old belting. The pensioners have been absolutely mauled under the Federal budget. They will receive \$2.50 a week to help them pay for pharmaceuticals—a miserable \$2.50. And the Federal Government will charge pensioners \$2.50 every time they take a prescription to the local chemist or an outpatient clinic at a hospital. It is disgraceful. If there is over-prescription in the medical area, let the Federal Government, through the Department of Health, audit what is

happening. The burden should not be placed on the pensioners, because pensioners must pay this money up-front to a total of \$130. When they have spent \$130 they pay no more. This is cruel. Some pensioners are on two or three different types of medication a day. They will not benefit as a result of this scheme. It is worrying them; it is frightening them.

Of course, the Federal Government says that it practises social justice. It is not doing anything for pensioners at all. When we look at the Commonwealth-State housing agreement—and it is an agreement to which the Government was a party and to which it will be a party for the next 10 years—we find that the South Australian Housing Trust must assess all the income of the apparent tenant of the household. Clause 26 (2) of the agreement provides:

In determining capacity to pay rent, a State shall:

- (a) have regard to the level of income, including income from assets of the tenant and other household members;
- (b) take into account the number of dependent children in the tenant's household;
- (c) ensure that tenants with similar capacity to pay, pay similar rents;
- (d) ensure that work disincentives are minimised; and
- (e) have regard, as agreed between the Minister and State Minister, to the receipt by any member of the tenant's household of Family Allowance Supplement.

About 18 months or two years ago, I campaigned on behalf of war veterans to have their disability allowance excluded from the assessment for Housing Trust rent. Of course, it takes a run up to a State election to get that type of policy implemented. Those people who approached me and I knew that. We worked with petitions and we were quite confident. When the Government announced, prior to the State election, that it would not take in this amount of money for the assessment of war veterans' incomes, the veterans knew who got the benefit for them. It just proves that, if you want to ask the Housing Trust to take into consideration certain aspects of its tenants' income, it can do it, as it did for the war veterans. I cannot see why the Housing Trust would not do the same for its other tenants, but the Minister advises us that this slug that has been put on the pensioners and the Housing Trust will cost about \$1.6 million. So, the Minister is looking for a way out, or some way to try to extract himself and the Federal Government from what is probably one of the worst bungled policy announcements about tax incentives to have been put forward by the Commonwealth Government.

We even had the mouth of the Labor Party in Canberra, Senator Richardson, speak on ABC radio to try to calm the waters of this issue. Senator Richardson can talk all night; he is all wind; he looks all wind and he achieves nothing, but causes a lot of unnecessary heartache for a lot of people. I suggest that the Minister look at Part XII 'Specific housing assistance', of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, as follows, under section 30:

The Minister may in writing authorise, subject to guidelines made consistently with this agreement and agreed between the Minister and a State Minister relating to the following programs including guidelines as to the provision of any funds by a State in relation to each program, grants to a State for expenditure on:

- (a) rental housing assistance for pensioners;
- (b) rental housing assistance for Aborigines;
- (c) mortgage and rent relief;
- (d) crisis accommodation;
- (e) local government and community housing; and
- (f) any other program determined by the Minister following consultation with a State.

So, in that area, the Commonwealth Government can, if it wants, provide assistance for the State and the Housing Trust to overcome this assessment problem of the pharmaceutical benefits and the \$2.50 a week pension increase. On the other hand, the Federal Government could swallow

a bit of pride; it could abolish the scheme altogether; it could stop the harassment of the aged; and it could ease the situation for the aged and not charge them the \$2.50 for prescriptions. It would then not have to increase the pension by that \$2.50.

The proposal is supposed to be cost neutral, because the Federal Government has given the pensioners another whammy, which will affect Housing Trust tenants as well, but we have not got around to this issue yet. Some smart alec in the Treasury and the Department of Social Security (and probably Mr Keating as well) has come up with the idea that all pensioners have sums of money socked away in non-interest bearing bank accounts and that any amount over \$2 000 will now be taxed at 10 per cent. Well, we can thank Mr Keating very much, because he has immediately created a situation where bank interest will not come down. If the Federal Treasurer says to the pensioners (the aged) 'You have worked hard; you have scrimped and scraped and saved a bit of money for your burial and you have it in a non-interest bearing account, because you qualify for all the benefits under the pension, and I am now going to rip you off 10 per cent for every dollar you have over \$2 000', this will put some pensioners in a situation where they will lose benefits and they will have to pay income tax. This means further worries; they can see their money being eroded; they can see their little nest-egg being eroded; and the first thing they will start to worry about is what will be left to handle their funeral arrangements.

Members can say what they like about the foolhardiness of the Federal Government, but if anything has caused a problem with our banks at the present moment, it is this issue because, unfortunately, pensioners have been withdrawing their money. I would advise them strongly not to do that but to leave their money in the bank and, for goodness sake, not to follow Fraser's advice and put it under the mattress. That is the silliest thing they could do. I would advise them to leave the money in the bank. If they go to the Commonwealth bank, it openly encourages customers to put their money in a non-interest bearing deposit account. The Commonwealth bank has been flouting this issue for years saying, 'Come and put your money under the Commonwealth Bank's bed in a non-interest bearing account.'

Mr Brindal interjecting.

Mr BECKER: The member for Hayward is correct; I would rather put my money under a bank's bed than under my own. That is the advice I would give to pensioners: 'Do not be bluffed by the present Government, because there are more ways than one to skin a cat, in relation to what the Federal Government wants you to do.' There is no doubt that there is a vested interest in Canberra to treat pensioners badly. Of course, it follows right through to all the agreements and to the Housing Trust. The pressure is on the State Government; the pressure is on this State to provide welfare housing, which has been done, be it by this Government or previous Liberal Governments; they have done it well, and everybody can be proud of the performance of the Housing Trust.

I do not believe that there is much fat to be trimmed from the Housing Trust. It is all very well to say, 'Cut down your costs and do this and do that', but there is not much room to move in the Housing Trust. When one looks at the large amount of borrowings and the amount of interest that must be paid, in excess of \$105 million a year, one can see that some of those low interest loans are starting to mature and will have to be rolled over into higher interest rates and that the Housing Trust faces enormous financial problems. About \$88 million in concessional rents are provided by the Housing Trust to disadvantaged tenants and

about 68 per cent of Housing Trust tenants are dependent on those concessional rates. This places an enormous amount of pressure on the management of the Housing Trust to meet the obligations under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and provide housing for those who do not have the means to provide adequate or sufficient standards of housing.

There is also a further warning on page 100 of the Financial Statement 1990-91. Under 'Impact of the economy on the budget: outlays', it states:

Salary and wage costs account for about 48.5 per cent of gross recurrent outlays by budget sector agencies and the full year cost of an across-the-board increase in the salary and wage rates of 1 per cent represents approximately \$25 million. The movement in general price levels impacts on the State budget through increases in the cost of goods and services purchased by Government agencies. Goods and services operating costs together with grants to outside organisations (for operating costs) comprise 33.3 per cent of gross payments. The full year impact on agency operating costs of a one percentage point increase in general price levels is about \$8 million.

So, herein lies the trick and the secret, that nearly 82 per cent of the budget is locked in on wages and salaries and related payments and the goods that are necessary to operate the Government. So, there is a very small area of Government that can be cut down, and the warning from Canberra and from the Opposition is that the Government has to start becoming more and more efficient. As I said, there is not much room to do it, so it is not an easy period, but the simple answer is not just to increase taxes. That is not on, and it does not benefit anybody; it disadvantages more people than it assists, so the Government has to be very careful indeed.

The final warning we get in this document appears under the heading 'Impact on economic activity' and is as follows:

The major State taxes—payroll tax and stamp duties—are very much affected by the level of economic activity, particularly stamp duty receipts, which are susceptible to large fluctuations in accordance with movements in values and the level of business transacted in particular sectors of the economy (e.g. the real estate market and new and secondhand motor vehicle sales).

At present real estate values are down but those valuations have not been reduced. The level of rates and taxes (water and sewerage rates and other Government charges) are based on the Valuer-General's latest valuations, and those valuations increased. There is a tremendous amount of difficulty in trying to get them down. The value of a property is not realised until it is sold. However, the warning here is contained in the last sentence. Talking about the Government's debt, debt levels and interest paid, the Treasurer said:

In broad terms a one percentage point change in average interest rates, has an impact on recurrent outlays of about \$35 million in a full year.

The Government must practise efficiency, and it must help the Federal Government in managing the economy. We want interest rates to fall: we do not want interest rates to increase, because every one percentage point increase in interest rates will cost the State \$35 million. The budget has been set in such a way as to make it very difficult for the Government to provide the level of services that the people expect.

So we are heading into a period of marking time. I think we would be better if we marked time for a while rather than try to keep pace with the Joneses or any other country. I found great delight, as usual, in perusing the documents, and I have had a good look at the Auditor-General's Report. However, I was very surprised to receive a letter from a constituent, who has been very critical of the Government's pre-election promise of providing free public transport for schoolchildren. Having asked me to raise this matter in Parliament, the constituent states:

If ever there was a misguided, shortsighted and obviously a cynical vote-catching exercise this is the one! Quite simply I am fed up to my back teeth with the unsocial and inconsiderate behaviour of a large proportion of the students who misuse this privilege. I am sure you would find 100 per cent of paying customers agreeing with this summation. I feel I am in the position to judge these adolescents' behaviour as I am a teacher and deal with these sorts of people every day. These are just some of the incidents I have either directly experienced or witnessed:

- (1) paying patrons standing while students sit (I realise there is a \$20 fine for this offence, but the drivers are either too busy or are not prepared to enforce this);
- (2) buses whiz by a stop of waiting adults, as the bus is already full of students;
- (3) fares have increased—surprise, surprise!
- (4) elderly citizens visibly upset by the crescendo of noise;
- (5) drivers having to stop the bus for some time to maintain control;
- (6) drivers becoming greatly distracted from their responsible duties;
- (7) a high proportion of these students are travelling to high fee schools or are State high school kids who have made the choice to by-pass their closest school;

And on a final note isn't it interesting that in the time this policy has been in operation there has been more vandalism on our buses and more crimes committed by juveniles in the readily accessible CBD. I feel I am subsidising an ill conceived policy which sometimes means an extra wait in the rain or an uncomfortable noisy ride to and from work. I would love to see the Premier test his policy by travelling on the bus at these times.

I quite agree with my constituent from Henley Beach South. I think he is correct in bringing these problems to Parliament's attention. I thought I would look at the estimates of payments to find out just how much concessions for students cost.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): We had an indication of the arrogance and the inequity that the taxpayers of this State could expect when the Federal budget set the scene for this follow-up State budget. Both Federal and State Labor Governments have promoted and initiated what has been termed 'social justice strategies', interpreted as 'Government's role to alleviate disadvantage throughout the populace in all aspects of society'. Some of those schemes, strategies and programs have, indeed, alleviated disadvantage to a cross-section which includes the aged, pensioners, youth and families although a counter effect has been to increase the number of our citizens who have become totally reliant upon Government.

This is social justice, Labor style. We now see the effects of Labor policies which have failed miserably, both State and federally. The major effect of these failed policies means that the people of this nation have become the victims rather than the beneficiaries. To that end, social justice policies have been torn up and tossed into the political shredder.

To recoup lost finances through wastage, mismanaged accounts and increasing Government debt through borrowing to service that debt, we have all become victims, and the cruellest blow to any victim has been directed at the elderly. The elderly have been told that they must invest what savings they may have at 10 per cent because they will be taxed on it, anyway. They have been told that they must have a tax file number. The anxieties perpetrated upon our senior citizens by Labor policy and this latest budget are appalling, to say the least.

Many of our elderly are already fearful of the array of letters received from the Department of Social Security continually advising them of the myriad range of changes that occur far too regularly for administrative efficiency. I know of pensioners who are so fearful of what may be

contained in those letters that they leave them unopened believing that what they do not know cannot hurt them; and, if they do not know, they will not have to cope with the latest changes. They have every reason to be fearful. After this latest budget I have been asked by several aged pensioners, 'Will we die with all our savings gone? Will we die short of the medicines we need to sustain a reasonable quality of life?' Under the heading 'Pensioners—Nothing left to tax', a recent letter to the editor states:

No pensioner will be paying tax by 1995, simply because they won't have anything left that's taxable. The Hawke Government has done nothing but hit pensioners in its eight years of office. Now pensioners will have to pay \$2.50 for a prescription, and will get only one script a week. Many pensioners have to take medication for a variety of ailments—diabetes, blood pressure, heart, emphysema, etc.

Mr Keating is giving us nothing. He tells us to reform on bananas, but what about Mr Keating and members of the Government reforming by cutting their perks, salaries and partying, etc. Senator Richardson has the cheek to ask chemists to give pensioners credit. Pensioners don't want credit, but a fair deal.

That was written by a Mrs Newstead of Elizabeth Vale and I suggest that it reflects the feelings of the pensioners in all our electorates. At the other end of the scale, it could be suggested that we have a clever country when we seek to hit tertiary students for extensive fees to pay for their education. This country is chronically ill and the medicine being handed out by Keating and the Premier of this State is designed to kill rather than cure.

The Federal Government coffers will also gain from the Iraqi crisis. For every \$1 rise in the barrel price of crude oil, Canberra gains a windfall of \$100 million. World oil prices have leapt from \$18 to \$29 a barrel, giving the Treasurer, Mr Keating, another \$1 100 million this year. But out of those outrageous profits not one cent will be returned to alleviate the burden of increased taxation. Instead, Australian families who continue to suffer under socialist Labor anti-family policies will suffer even more. They will have to find more money for petrol, mortgage repayments, and basic food, drink and clothing items. Families have already cut back on essential items such as groceries and clothing to find mortgage payments each month. More and more families have been effectively distanced from purchasing their own home because of high interest rates. This budget will reduce employment, and our Federal Treasurer admits that increased unemployment can be expected.

I turn now to the specifics of our State budget. The Minister of Finance, in a grandiose display of exuberant humour, stated to this House that FID tax is beautiful, a wonderful thing to behold. He also admitted that it was a socialist policy—not a social justice policy but a socialist policy. Let there be no mistake. People who believe there is social justice in socialist Labor policies need to rethink their ideologies or philosophies because they are being led up the proverbial garden path. Like the flowers in the Port Adelaide market garden, all they will find is debt and more debt.

The Minister's thoughts on FID are all the more incredible considering it is the Minister of Finance making these statements. I wonder whether the Minister considered the detrimental effect on the object of his ridicule—business and industry. I suggest that a Minister of Finance who considers the effects of FID on business in their State as beautiful has found the fairies at the bottom of the garden. Why should business and industry, which support this State's economy and provide the majority of employment, continue to support this State when its Finance Minister rubs his hands with such public glee at the further rip-off from private enterprise of millions of dollars to pay off this Government's debt ridden policies?

Why should business, whose use of the banking systems is paramount to efficient financing, leave funds in South Australian banks to be emaciated on a daily basis? Why should South Australian business, whose cash yearly turnover amounts to millions of dollars, continue to bank South Australian when they can transfer their operating capital to Queensland banks where there is no such FID tax? They can still administer efficient business practices at far less cost than by remaining in this State. Does this scenario still make the Minister of Finance feel gleefully jubilant? In the words of the Minister, this beautiful FID tax will increase not by the rate of inflation, not by the CPI, not by 50 per cent but by 122 per cent, increasing the revenue to the Treasurer by \$59.8 million.

Will business benefit from those amazing increases in one tax area? We can ask, but there is no relief in sight. In his speech, the member for Napier pleaded with members on this side of the Chamber to be kind to the budget and to make kind remarks where they were due. I am sure that the honourable member will concur when I say that, contrary to what is promoted outside this place, on many occasions the Opposition has given credit to the Government when credit has been due, and I am sure that it will continue to do so. In this instance, I am afraid that I cannot accommodate the honourable member's pleading to say nice things about this budget. It is obvious from the initial reaction from constituents that saying nice things would not represent their feelings.

As well as the massive increase in this insidious FID tax, business will again be hit by further increases in payroll tax, which has increased by 19 per cent, to add a further \$76.2 million to Government revenue. Land tax will increase by 12 per cent, and the Government will receive an extra \$8.1 million. When one includes other random tax hikes, the figures presented to Parliament do not appear to add up. If we take the added tax increase from gambling (\$16.6 million), liquor and petrol taxes increasing to \$6.7 million, stamp duties with a collection of \$24.7 million, and include the tobacco tax which should bring in \$28.3 million, there appears to be a total of \$220 million. Why have we been told that receipts will be up by only \$104 million? Surely this figure should be at least \$220 million.

An article in the *Sunday Mail* by Randall Ashbourne asked where the money has gone and suggested that there appears to be a \$116 million black hole. I spoke previously in this place of the illusion of perception created by this Government, the creation of illusion without substance. Where will this \$100-odd million appear? Has it disappeared into what Randall Ashbourne described as a black hole, to be resurrected in an election year to provide vote buying promises that amount to further illusion without definite and constructive, creative and enterprising solutions of vision for the future direction of this State?

In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition suggested a crucial point of reflection with these tax hikes. The percentage increase in total tax collections this financial year is as high as the figure for which the crisis-ridden Victorian Government has budgeted, yet Victoria is containing its growth in payroll tax receipts to a level below that of this State. Of course, the Minister and the State Treasurer, the architects of this revenue-raising, debt-inducing budget, consider these structures of the 1990-91 budget in such a whimsical way because they do not live in the real world.

The Government's attitude is to bury its failed attempts at business enterprises deep in Treasury records. How can the taxpayers of South Australia expect the Government to understand the financial hardship experienced by them when this Government happily wastes millions of dollars of tax-

payers' money writing it off in the books of account, forget that it ever happened and immediately borrow further funds to fill the gap?

I think we can be forgiven for coming to the conclusion that the Treasurer appears to think of a number, divides it by two and multiplies it by the next number that comes to mind, ready to gamble again with our State's finances. This is not a budget that is to be commended; this is a budget that I must condemn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The document before us at the present moment is a damning and very depressing one, and I want to relate it to the first one I saw when I came to this House when the total budget was presented under two heads: a loans budget for capital works followed by a budget for recurrent expenditure. In 1970-71, the total budget was \$485.68 million, whereas the one we are looking at today, 20 years later, is \$6.2 billion. That is more than a 12-fold increase in only 20 years. The damning part about this document is how little it will provide in respect of services for the community that we represent or even advances in services compared with that which was available in the first document to which I referred.

In 1970-71 the budget documents provided for a large number of new schools, advances in relation to hospitals and an increased number of hospitals. There was also provision for growth in Government services in areas where there had been no previous development. As an example, I refer to the environment. It was after the 1970-71 budget that we obtained the Department for Environment and Conservation and the Department for Community Welfare. From that time, we have developed a greater degree of sophistication in police services and the resources available to them, but this budget talks of a difficulty in obtaining or providing further resources to advance the cause of the Police Force.

We have a situation where we know full well that hospitals and hospital wards are not opening because there is no funding to allow them to open. That is the background against which I pinpoint why this is such a depressing document, a document that talks about reining back in vital areas but does nothing about reining back in those areas where the Government should not be operating. My colleagues have referred to the debacle of the South Australian Timber Corporation and other entrepreneurial activities. One could talk about the South Australian Clothing Corporation in the electorate of the Minister of Transport. It was demonstrated yesterday that the Clothing Corporation had tremendous losses amounting to \$1.7 million over a period of about six years. My colleague, the member for Kavel, raised this particular issue, which is just one of the entrepreneurial activities which are dragging down the opportunities for the Government to put funds where they are really needed.

Many vital areas of activity in the community—and I refer again to the Police Force—are under stress. The Police Force is under-resourced and under stress and, therefore, it is unable to respond to the demands made upon it by the community in which we live. Last Friday I had the opportunity to attend a meeting in the Brin Whiting Hall in that part of the electorate shared by the member for Elizabeth and yourself, Mr Acting Speaker. At that meeting we were all invited to look at the crime prevention program and what had taken place in the 10 months since it was first announced. A number of resource groups indicated that, whilst advances had been made and new techniques produced, there was still a long way to go.

There was a great feeling in the community that people were prisoners in their own home and did not want to go out at night—even young people—for fear of the consequences. We cannot open a newspaper on any day of the week, or a local newspaper in any week, without seeing further indication of difficulties that people in the community are meeting. On page 3 of tonight's *News* an article describes how a South Australian was severely bashed in Queensland and lost the sight of both eyes. I have already related to the House the story of a 17-year-old youth from Nuriootpa who was bashed while sleeping in his pup tent at Edithburgh. I could go on and on.

Mr Hamilton: But how do you stop it?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: You stop it by winding back the amount of waste that this Government has allowed to continue and you put the resources where they will be of greatest value. You put officers out on the streets so that community policing really means that and not just community policing while there is a body in a car to move but, if there are no bodies to go out, there is no policing whatsoever. Come to Gawler. On occasions—

Mr Hamilton: Come down to Port Adelaide.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am glad that the honourable member is joining in with me. He has on several occasions. I ask him what he and his colleagues are doing in relation to their control over this Government to pull back this down-the-gurgler attitude that so many members opposite have—

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It does not take very long to get the crabs biting, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: We suddenly have some animation in the House—people who have come to life. I have touched a raw point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Let us analyse for a few moments why we are in this position and not in a forward development phase as we were in 1970-71. We have the same form of State Government. Very soon after 1970-71 a Federal Government of the same persuasion as that which exists at present was elected. That Government did not know how to control its activities, either. One can look at the movement between 1973 and 1975 when the Whitlam Labor Government went out of office. Over a five-year period the cost of building, be it for schools or hospitals or any other activities, increased by over 100 per cent. The cost of building in that 4½ to five-year period increased by over 100 per cent—and it has escalated ever since, but fortunately not to the same degree as it did in those years. The pattern set in those times has not been reined in completely.

At the present moment, regardless of successive Federal budgets which have claimed that the inflation rate would be reduced, we find that we are still going over the top of that expectation. This is reflected in the kind of money flowing to the States and in the additional workload that the State Government is placing on local government. It is reflected also in the amount that local government is having to charge to make up the shortfall of a Government that cannot control its expenditure in vital areas. I will quote briefly from the latest Commonwealth Bank of Australia Economic Newsletter of August 1990. I will cite only two or three short extracts from that document. Under the heading of 'Australia's escalating foreign debt: stabilisation a long way off' it states:

The continuing poor current account performance and consequent increases in net foreign debt have provided no grounds for any diminution in concern about the size of the debt burden.

I acknowledge that this has no direct reflection upon the Government of South Australia, but it affects the Government of South Australia as it affects every Government across the Commonwealth, because the failure to perform at Commonwealth level is reflected in the inability of the States to obtain as much funding as is the right of the people they represent to be put into bricks and mortar in the community. The same document states:

Net foreign debt has risen from 3 per cent of gross domestic product at the end of June 1976 to 34 per cent of gross domestic product at the end of March 1990.

More damning than that is the statement that this is likely to increase further, possibly to around 40 per cent, over the next few years before it starts to stabilise, 'provided the appropriate set of economic policies are followed'. Our colleagues in the Federal scene recently have been addressing (and will over the next few weeks address) the Federal budget, which did not rein in as is necessary so many of the Federal activities. So, the chances of that 40 per cent coming down in the next five or 10 years is questionable because of the failure of the Federal Government to perform.

Who comprise the Federal Government? People of the same ilk as members of the Government of this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly! They like to isolate themselves from the Federal Government. How they think they can do that when the Premier happens to be the Federal President is beyond me. More and more people are fully appreciating that members opposite speak with a forked tongue when they say that all is well and they are doing what is necessary, yet they are out there supporting for reelection the people who are fleecing the Australian public in the manner alluded to in that document.

It is money down the gurgler when 40 per cent of gross domestic product is necessary to look after foreign debt. Pertinent to what money flows back to this State and the inability of this Government to perform on behalf of its public is the comment made further on in the document, as follows:

While Australia's gross debt to GDP ratio is not particularly high by international standards, its debt servicing obligation is the highest among the OECD countries (with the exception of New Zealand). As a percentage of exports of goods and services, the debt servicing ratio reached over 20 per cent in 1988-89 and is likely to have accelerated in 1989-90 in the light of the sharp deterioration in the balance of payments and the resulting rise in external debt.

This is not an economist from some university or organisation speaking: this is the Commonwealth Bank, which the Government is pleased to embrace as another means of income when it is privatised. There is nothing wrong with privatisation, even though members opposite and their colleagues in other places have screamed and made loud noises, only to fall in a heap like a pack of cards when the crunch came in their Party Caucuses. Further, under the heading 'Outlook for Australia's external position in the 1990s' it is stated:

The most important influence on the future level of debt and the debt burden is the Current Account deficit. Over the past decade, domestic demand has been growing more rapidly than production.

And here is the critical point:

Imports of goods and services grew at an average annual rate of 8 per cent in volume terms while exports managed a growth rate of under 5 per cent.

The other rather unfortunate aspect of that is that we suddenly find ourselves with certain commodities which have

helped to keep the rate up at 5 per cent and which, previously, were of great value in bringing funds into this country. Wheat, wool and other agricultural products are now suspect as trading commodities compared with what was obtained in the not so distant past. One has to look only at the live sheep market to see that \$34 million for this State alone is likely to be forgone, and to see the effect that that will have on a wide section of the community.

It is my experience that, when the agricultural community starts to feel the bite (whether it be in viticulture, horticulture, range lands or in cropping), it starts to reflect and bite others in the manufacturing area and in commerce generally. I could always tell when there was a breakdown in the purchasing power of the rural community by the effect that had on General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth and the ability of those workers to pick up overtime or to meet their accounts in a veterinary surgery.

That is a fact of life. I can take members back to a series of figures which show that, five to nine months after the bite on the country people and their subsequent inability to purchase because of demands being made of them, or lack of income from their products, the community which was associated with manufacturing or with servicing those people, whether with electrical goods, with building supplies or services with gardening or with other ancillary services went down the gurgler—and it will happen again. That is already reflected in a number of aspects of community activity.

What has been offered to us at present is not as good as it should be in vital areas, because the Government continues to prop up those areas which should not be propped up. Statements made by the Government in relation to additional funding for health, the police and education are illusory—they just do not add up. This is putting grave stress on those areas that need to provide service for the community, at the same time as pouring it down the sink in another direction.

One might say that that is the third time I have said that in the almost 20 minutes during which I have been on my feet. If it needs to be said 20 times, I will continue to say it. The Government has not reflected in this budget nor in a number of other public announcements that it has yet learned the fact that you have to cut your suit according to your cloth, and it is absolutely essential that the attitude of the State Government change considerably in providing vital services and funds in areas where they are required.

One can look at the parlous state of the Housing Trust at present. I was more than delighted this morning to hear it reported that the Housing Trust does not have as many people on the waiting list as in the past. However, there are still far too many people out there in that situation, and every member in this House who wants to be truthful knows that there are more and more people in desperate circumstances coming through the doors of their electorate offices looking for assistance or emergency housing. The Government, through the Housing Trust and the Minister's standing up in this House this week, indicated that it is quite impossible to fulfil the demands that have been made—again, because the Government is siphoning off vital funds into the wrong areas.

While I support the consideration of the document before us, I certainly do not agree with the direction in which the Government is travelling. I suspect that I will despair, but I hope that the action taken by the Minister of Finance will be positive and will not, as so often happens in these matters, be covered by what he is told from South Terrace can be done and what he is told may not and will not be done. There is evidence of that on a daily basis in the way

in which this Government falls over at the demands and directions of South Terrace. I support the Bill to this stage.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In addressing this budget I refer, first, to the rapier wit of the member for Napier as an indication of the panic that is engulfing the Bannon Labor Government. While the members of the press fell over themselves recently in reporting the scintillating wit of the honourable member, what they failed to report was my observation of some weeks earlier in the Address in Reply debate, that this Government represented the Marie Antionettes of North Terrace. So, the true intent of the member for Napier becomes clear. If one looks at the original story, one can see that the Scarlet Pimpernel was, in fact, as the member for Napier said, underneath it all a fine and outstanding character, one who deliberately disguised himself as a fop and a dandy in order to be a French revolution Robin Hood.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know, and I acknowledge what you said. If he had any fault at all it was but one and that fault was that he rescued aristocrats from a clamorous and turbulent people, a people who had been subjugated and humiliated and largely ignored through the arrogance and self-opinionation of their rulers, a people who were justly seething for what they believed to be justice. Thus, the member for Napier does as the other Government members do: he seeks vainly on this side of the House for a rescuer to deliver this Government from the legitimate anger of the people of South Australia. As usual, members opposite read our speeches, they adopt our policies and they look to us for ideas. However, the time is coming, and it is not far hence, when the people will wake up to this Government and its budget strategies and tricks.

It is interesting to note the recent comments of Randal Ashbourne and his analysis of the Bannon Labor budget. Many of the important issues in this budget have been already canvassed more than worthily by my colleagues. So, I will touch on just a few, and those which directly impinge on my electorate. First, I would like to follow the member for Light in raising the matter of the police and police resourcing. It is said constantly and this Government quite rightly points out that per capita we have more police than any other State in Australia. However, what is not pointed out and what is often ignored by this Government, is the use to which the police are put. One can have many hundreds of police officers but, if they are not doing the job of policing in South Australia, they are not adequately used. I, for one, am often worried when I pass a breath analysis unit and see eight to 10 uniformed, highly trained police officers doing nothing more than collecting revenue for this Government, for that is what I believe they do. I see no reason why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I seek no reason why a breath analysis unit must be manned by eight to 10 highly trained, highly competent police officers to do a job that could be done by others under the supervision of a trained police officer. Similarly, whenever we see a radar detector we see a minimum of three uniformed, trained police officers in attendance. I do not think that is necessary and I do not think it is necessary when the number of primary patrols in any police area is not what the public deem to be sufficient. If any honourable member in this House doubts that, I doubt whether he or she attends to electorate inquiries or even reads their press.

I draw to the attention of members an article in the *News* of 30 August 1990, in which a deli owner is reported as complaining that she had been hit or robbed, nine times in the past 11 months. She had contacted my office and I had had ongoing discussions with the Glenelg police, but the vandalism, break-ins and enterings, and general harassment had continued. While I was in hospital, this frustrated woman contacted my office and my secretary suggested that she contact the Premier's office directly. She did that; in fact, she spoke to the Premier's senior information officer, who is the former member for Hayward, Mrs June Appleby. The article states:

A representative from his office, former member for Hayward, June Appleby, was incredulous at the number of break-ins at the store.

I support her in that; she is quite right. A senior police officer at Glenelg told me today that I could quote him; he was most disappointed in the article because the *News* did not bother to contact the Glenelg police for a balanced appraisal of the situation. They are doing their best, and they continue to do their best with the resources that they have available. In my electorate there are other deli proprietors in a similar situation. The member for Napier may laugh and think that this is particularly funny, but the fact remains that this small business has been broken into nine times in a limited number of months, and the proprietor is at her wits' end. The police are doing all that they can to help within the limits of their resources and they are able to do no more. In the meantime, this budget recorded—and recorded quite clearly—that it was estimated that the revenue gained from expiation and similar fees last year would be \$10.59 million. However, the actual collection was \$11.772 million and it is estimated that actual collections will jump from \$11.772 million to \$24.694 million in the next financial year.

Members opposite can say it is for the police to set their own priorities. But, I would ask, in the context of a Government budget, whether a Government budget can confidently predict a jump in revenue from \$11.772 million to \$24.694 million, whether that does not somehow limit the capacity of the Police Commissioner? Also, if he has a revenue target to meet, would that would force him to devote a greater proportion of his police services than he would otherwise care to devote to the collection of revenue for this Government? I would be very interested to hear the answer of any Government member to that question, because I believe those figures stand quite clearly in the budget papers. There is very little else in the budget papers that is clear, but those figures do seem to be.

From the matter of the police, we should turn briefly to the new property tax that Mr Hudson is bringing in under a review of the water rates. I have said in this House before, and I will continue to say, that this tax is unfair and it has nothing to do with social justice. I have heard members opposite argue the contrary, but I put the following to them and allow them to judge. Many electors in my electorate—and in the electorate of many members opposite—live in Housing Trust homes and have, in the course of their life, bought those homes and paid for them because of the particularly advantageous arrangements that this Government quite rightly arranged with the Housing Trust to allow people to do just that. Because those homes are in areas in which other people now seek to live, the value has escalated and each year those people are asked to pay a rate based not on the purchase price of their home, but on what the Government estimates to be the current resale value.

I do not know about you, Mr Speaker, but the house I live in is actually worth nothing to me until I sell it; it is an unrealised asset, and the income I am earning is com-

pletely independent of that house. That is the truth for most of my electors: their income is independent of the house they may be fortunate enough to occupy. Yet the water rates and council rates they have to pay are not based on their income, nor on their capacity to pay: they are based on the price of an unrealised asset, their home. I can say quite honestly and sincerely that many of my electors are not in a position to pay ever escalating water and council rates, which are really unfair wealth taxes, because they are based not on the value of the house but on its value as a potential asset. They are forced to pay this, year in and year out, and we on this side of the House are forced to listen to a Government that tells us that that is social justice.

Perhaps, what the Government really means is that those people who are disadvantaged have no right to own homes. Perhaps they all have to be renting Housing Trust homes; perhaps they should all be on the streets or homeless. Just because a person owns a home is no particular advantage, and this is something that the Government can and must take on board. If it does not think it will be sitting on the Opposition benches after the next election, the Government is fooling itself.

As I have said previously, this Government does not want to listen; it does not pay it to listen. Members of the Government do not want to hear what members on this side of the House say and I suspect that they do not want to hear what the people of South Australia are saying, because they have their own ideas on Government. I wish to read part of a letter that I wrote to the Premier recently, because it affects an elector of mine, and I would like it placed on the public record. The letter reads:

My Dear Premier—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: 'My Dear Premier', because that is the correct way to address the Premier, in case the member for Napier does not know. I will give the correct salutation:

My Dear Premier,

I have recently received an inquiry from an elector whose name and address I am prepared to supply should you require it and should she give me permission. The lady concerned is currently living in a single person household and is receiving unemployment benefits. Since she has informed me that she has worked continually for the past 26 years, I would suggest that she would be in approximately her mid-40s.

According to the information which she supplies, she currently receives \$130 per week clear on unemployment benefits. Her mortgage repayments are currently \$108 per week. She does not qualify for the Homesure scheme because she bought her house in January 1985. Her mortgage repayments are through the State Bank at an interest rate of 16.5 per cent (as of 1 May this year). It is not a concessional loan and she has never received help from any Government re a loan. Of course, in January 1990 she was paying 17 per cent interest.

The only bright point in this lady's financial situation is that she has a home loan set-off account... However, you would appreciate that this is of little help and that she faces the very bleak prospect of eroding the only financial buffer that she has because of the circumstances in which she now finds herself.

I will not quote any more of the letter, because it concerns the CES, and I have every confidence that the Premier will attend to the matter. However, I read it here to point out the facts as they have been related to me. The facts are that that woman is receiving \$130 a week and she has to pay \$108 of that on a mortgage. On my calculation, that leaves her \$22 a week to live on. I could not live on \$22 a week and I doubt whether anybody else could.

That letter represents a genuine constituent inquiry and a genuine constituent plea for help. I recite it here because I have no doubt that that woman is not alone in her plight. Plights of this sort are belittled, and we are derided for bringing them up on this side of the House, but we will continue to do so, because it is this sort of person that this budget should be about. Now I would like to deal briefly with constructive comments as to ways in which the Government could perhaps improve this budget and, in that connection, I have a statistical table which, with your leave and the concurrence of the House, I would like inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

VEHICLES

Department	1986-87		1987-88		1988-89		1989-90		1990-91
	voted	actual	voted	actual	voted	actual	voted	actual	proposed
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Treasury			0	0	2 933 000	2 672 993	3 155 000	2 828 718	3 156 000
Court Services					245 000	241 423	205 000	142 458	286 000
Industry, Trade and Technology					0	0	102 000	81 143	0
Agriculture	857 000	886 828	1 250 000	1 553 485	2 515 000	2 183 089	2 425 000	2 517 591	2 720 000
Fisheries	127 000	127 382	175 000	232 750	317 000	269 639	195 000	222 134	334 000
Education	854 000	801 349	680 000	1 242 967	1 530 000	1 090 229	1 040 000	1 005 648	1 280 000
CSO	250 000	202 856	126 000	182 885	310 000	382 248	440 000	407 118	570 000
Transport Policy and Planning			138 000	207 542	220 000	281 599	20 000	18 912	0
Road Transport	3 699 000	2 069 506			0	0	220 000	178 932	0
E&WS	4 070 000	4 634 514	3 498 000	3 825 919	2 850 000	3 073 404	4 639 000	5 305 110	4 200 000
Lands	540 000	582 574	320 000	511 936	819 000	777 823	733 000	630 346	956 000
Police	6 727 000	5 867 052	5 800 000	5 823 592	8 700 000	8 705 442	10 063 000	10 063 812	10 641 000
Fire Service					93 000	133 000	62 000	14 875	92 000
Mines and Energy	452 000	464 380	627 000	850 087	681 000	666 025	482 000	618 492	1 020 000
Woods and Forests	572 000	522 865	922 000	860 160	641 000	706 170	842 000	482 816	764 000
Marine and Harbors	265 000	265 061	360 000	428 434	710 000	750 640	560 000	561 146	550 000
Local Government	18 000	19 058	28 000	71 666	80 000	79 910	75 000	71 270	0
Arts	59 000	60 292	91 000	92 985	50 000	48 446	105 000	117 043	135 000
State Services					539 078	5 655 000	8 412 464	8 956 000	12 764 535
Further Education	299 000	298 361	379 000	486 790	637 000	504 079	957 000	774 677	1 194 000
Tourism South Australia	37 000	36 086	19 000	45 742	90 000	89 193			
Housing and Construction	1 290 000	1 267 887	1 793 000	2 579 228					
Environment and Planning	383 000	464 427							
Total	18 789 000	16 802 078	15 077 000	16 910 276	28 986 000	30 978 623	35 276 000	38 806 776	39 698 000

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Government members, if they wish to contribute to this debate, may put their names on the list.

Mr BRINDAL: The statistical table is taken from previous Government budget papers and concerns the amount which the Government has progressively been spending on

motor vehicles. If we look at this year's budget papers, we find that the Government proposes to spend \$39 million—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, with regard to the statistical figures that the member for Hayward has tabled with the concurrence of the House, could I ask, through you, that the source of that statistical table be given?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member has been asked whether it is purely statistical, which is all that is covered by Standing Orders. There is no requirement that the source be revealed to the House.

Mr BRINDAL: I am happy to reveal to the House that all the information contained in the statistical table comes from this year's and previous years' budget papers, which may be found in the Parliamentary Library. The expenditure on vehicles in the financial year 1987-88 was voted at \$15.077 million. Expenditure for next financial year (1990-91) is proposed at \$39.698 million. I do not pretend that those amounts are definitive, since there are many departments, including the Health Commission, for which no apparent vehicle purchases are made and for which statistical information does not appear to be available. Statistically, from the Government's own papers, it acknowledges a commitment of \$39.698 million towards motor vehicles this financial year, and that has grown from a commitment of \$15.077 million in 1987-88.

That represents a very dramatic increase, and I believe that, at not much less than 1 per cent of the budget, this Parliament deserves better accounting and accountability for that very large set of vehicles. For instance, I would like to know how many vehicles the Government now possesses which do not have Government plates and which are driven by senior public servants, what is the use of those vehicles and to how many public servants they are given. I would also like to know why the Government does not place the name of the department neatly on the door of Government vehicles so that, when vehicles are at places where members of the public perhaps think they should not be, they are identified.

I am not saying that in every case the public servant is in the wrong, but every member of this House would get inquiries about people seeing such and such a vehicle at such and such a place at such and such a time. Sometimes it is justified and sometimes it is not. In view of the vast amounts that the Government is now spending on vehicles, not only on their purchase but also on their maintenance, for which there are no figures in the budget (they are ongoing costs, and maintenance is not separately listed), if we are spending that sort of money, I believe that the people and we in this Parliament deserve a better accounting for \$40 million.

In conclusion, I believe that this budget is really very much a case of the Emperor's new clothes. We would all remember that story. Those clothes were largely mythical and fabricated. They served but one person, and that was the Emperor, and they fooled some of the people for a lot of the time but eventually they found—

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

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Albert Park is on the list.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to address some remarks to this debate in view of the difficult economic situation which this State and nation are facing. I think that we should all bear in mind that South Australia and Australia have been governed by the Labor Party for almost the last eight years

and together they have created an economic climate which has reduced the standard of living of its citizens, which has taken away hope for their future, and which has failed properly to address the issues involved so that we can create more export income, so that more people can have jobs and so that the underprivileged in the community can have something to look forward to in the future.

We listened at some length to two members opposite, the member for Henley Beach and the member for Napier, who indicated to the House that they were the only ones who had any concern or compassion for or knowledge of the underprivileged. Unfortunately, that is the sort of nonsense that they continue to peddle around the country. However, during the time that they and their colleagues have had control of the country, we have had a massive rise in unemployment and interest rates which has had a devastating effect on the underprivileged.

Anyone trying to buy a home, or establish a business or trying to do something to improve the economic welfare of this country has been penalised. We have had an excessively high taxation system and, putting all those things together, we have forced the dollar higher and made it difficult for ourselves to export on the international market. Bear in mind that in this country the two industries which have built this nation and which, if given a fair go, will continue to do that are the mining industry and the agricultural sector, and they have been badly affected by the high dollar. Together with all those things we have now reached a sorry state of affairs.

The Government should do a number of things immediately in this country. The time to allow political philosophy, rhetoric and nonsense has come to an end. Some cold, hard decisions must be taken. The Government can no longer run away behind the problems; it has to take the lead. The role of Government is to lead and to create the economic conditions so that people have the incentive and the ability to produce. We must export more and, indeed, export on a more competitive basis. The high dollar is making that difficult because we are competing with a system overseas of massive subsidies.

The rural sector in the United States and the EEC are massively subsidised, yet this Government will not put in place taxation measures or spend the taxpayers' money in areas where we can make it easier to export. That, in itself, is a very sorry state of affairs. The Government, unfortunately, must believe that if it continues to pour money into the social welfare sector and appease a few radical greenies it will solve the problem. Of course all it will do is create more problems.

In this country and in this State the Government should immediately examine all its assets. There is no purpose in this Government's holding any assets or providing any service that could be better provided by the private sector. It is not a matter of having an argument about whether or not we will interfere with the underprivileged. The Government must release resources which are tied up but which it no longer needs so that the funds they generate can be put into urgently required capital projects such as more houses, better port facilities, better roads and better hospitals, or used to maintain and upgrade services that only Government can provide.

I am not, and never have been, one of those people who believes that private enterprise can do everything for all people. However, I believe that the overwhelming majority of facilities in the community can best be provided by the private sector in cooperation with Government. I have always believed that. The Government, in my view, must immediately look very closely at privatising at least 49 per cent

of the State Bank, because, under this whiz kid Administration, it is for the first time going to make a loss. That in itself is a most unfortunate set of circumstances which should be thoroughly examined before the matter gets completely out of control.

Regarding port facilities, the unloading facilities owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors should immediately be sold to the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. Many of those facilities need upgrading and can be improved. Therefore, there is only one organisation that should own the port facilities, namely, the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company, it is a public company and is not owned by one individual. Indeed, it was set up by a Statute of this Parliament. This should happen very quickly and the money obtained therefrom should be released to the Government. In that way it could be directed into upgrading other areas of the port facilities so that we can make it more attractive to export.

Mr Ferguson: What about orderly marketing?

Mr GUNN: I have made many speeches on orderly marketing, and it is a subject that is very dear to my heart. I will not speak on that today because there are a number of other things that I want to talk about. The Government should be completely out of the woods and forests area, where it has failed dismally. Reading the Auditor-General's Report, one can see that it is a litany of absolute mismanagement and gross incompetence.

When one considers all the good that could have been done for the people in this State, one realises that the \$50 million that was spent on one of those projects could have been properly invested and used to build houses and other things that are so urgently required. I cannot for the life of me understand why any Government would be involved for one more day in this sort of activity. It is not a program which will provide anything to the underprivileged. In my view, it really impedes their progress, because the Government had wasted \$50 million. If the Government had put that \$50 million into better pre-schools, into child-care or into all sorts of things for which there is a tremendous demand, it would have been doing something constructive. However, the Government has done absolutely nothing. Reading the Auditor-General's Report and looking at the assets of the Government, one can see that there are many areas that the Government should get out of altogether, so that those funds can be employed for the benefit of all South Australian citizens. The role of Government is to create the conditions under which the community can prosper and benefit.

It has to create those conditions carefully and responsibly because there must be incentive. Some of us on this side of the House have had a long involvement in primary industry and we are particularly concerned at what is happening. The taxation system penalises exporters and makes it difficult to accumulate capital. The system is difficult to understand, it is cumbersome, and people spend a great deal of time complying with Government requests and regulations, filling out forms, obtaining licences, getting permits and generally being involved in an unproductive bureaucratic maze.

The Government has gone down the crazy track of creating further huge bureaucracies such as WorkCover. It is absolutely essential for the welfare of the citizens of the State that something is done to WorkCover before it gets out of control, otherwise we will have another albatross and more and more Government resources will go into non-productive measures, and urgently required capital projects in which the Government should be involved will not eventuate.

When Margaret Thatcher took over the United Kingdom in 1979, it was on the verge of chaos because the former Government had spent all its resources in non-productive areas, propping up inefficiencies, organisations and groups that did not make any contribution. The underprivileged were worse off. She has turned it around, given some incentive and hope and got the country moving again. This country must get moving again, too.

The member for Hartley and the member for Henley Beach spoke about a consumption tax. We have a consumption tax in this country and it is a mishmash of unfair and unreasonable charges which penalise the export industry. Sales tax applies to motor cars and many essential items. If we had a sensible, fair and reasonable form of consumption tax, it would benefit all citizens. Recently, members opposite have tried to twist on this issue because the Government has not had the political guts or courage to come forward with a fair and reasonable taxation system. The Commonwealth Government is based on doing sleazy deals behind closed doors and, as a result, we end up with chaos.

So that members opposite will not be in a position to attempt to frighten the rural community, I will quote what the National Farmers Federation has to say about the consumption tax debate. An article headed 'Tax proposal favours farmers' in the *Australian Rural Times* of 30 August to 5 September states:

The farming sector, as well as exporters, would be the big winners out of the National Farmers Federation (NFF) consumption tax proposal, according to new costings issued this week. The proposal—which has largely been made policy by the Federal Opposition—involves replacing all existing wholesale taxes with a single rate 10 per cent goods and services tax (GST). New research from the NFF shows the GST package would decrease the average grain grower's farm cost bill by \$15 000 annually, and increase returns by \$4 000. For a typical merino wool enterprise the farm costs savings would be \$10 243, and for beef producers, the savings would be \$17 000.

The figures had genuinely shocked NFF officials last month when they first sighted them. They insisted that the figures be double checked before being released. NFF vice-president, Mr Peter Lee, said the savings identified the 'massive indirect tax burden faced by Australia's primary producers'. The farming and export sectors would pay virtually no GST under the NFF proposal, because only products sold for the last time to domestic consumers would pay the tax. Possibly the most important impost lifted would be the tax component of the fuel excise.

Mr Lee said the indirect savings to farmers could be much higher from a GST when the positive effects on the economy—including downward pressure on the exchange rate—were taken into account. Earlier work . . . indicated that business transport costs would fall by about 16 per cent under our tax reform proposal. Figures issued earlier this month by the NFF also showed there would be net savings to average households across Australia of about \$14.02 a week through better consumer prices. The proposal is designed to be revenue neutral.

That article clearly puts paid to the nonsense that the Labor Party has been attempting to peddle around the country, because it has not had the courage to implement such a system itself.

This budget contains a consumption tax element anyway. It increases FID so every time someone undertakes a financial transaction the tax dollars roll into the Treasury. That is a consumption tax, but that is all right according to the gurus, the financial wizards, in the Premier's Department who have, for the first time, made a loss for the State Bank. They have a fine record and few Governments will be able to match it, if they are allowed to see out their term.

What the Government fails to understand is that it cannot continue to spend more money than it earns. Some years ago an interesting character lived in my district. He was having trouble with his bank manager who told him that he had to do something about his overdraft. He replied, 'I'll write you out a cheque.' That is the same sort of philosophy that this Government has adopted because it has borrowed

more and then says that it has balanced the budget and that it has a surplus. It is a peculiar economic system.

I have never seen bank managers accept that particular philosophy but, at the end of the day, it catches up with people who continue to borrow money. In this case, it has caught up with the taxpayers and every South Australian citizen. Members on this side of the House have been roundly criticised because they have carried out their responsibilities and made submissions to the Government in relation to where money should be spent.

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

Mr GUNN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I outlined to the House my desire to see the Government release large amounts of capital to bring about necessary improvements to the myriad of facilities operating in South Australia. Unfortunately, the Government has not seen its way clear to spend money in those areas where it will do the most good. Recently, the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies issued a report entitled 'The Impact of the Port of Thevenard on Regional Income in the West Coast Regional Economy'. This document indicates the importance of that facility to the residents and the economy of South Australia and it states:

Trends in international shipping are causing the Port of Thevenard to be increasingly under threat of closure. The port cannot handle larger ships which are preferred by customers for the two major exports, grain and gypsum. Inadequacies in the port mean that ships are frequently forced to leave the wharf only partially loaded, and to top up at Port Lincoln which is a costly exercise. The restriction on ship size also adds to the cost of coastal shipping.

Closure of the port would affect the local economy because of higher costs of grain transport to Port Lincoln, loss of wages and salaries paid to residents employed in the current transport mode, and an entire shutdown of the gypsum output. Higher costs of grain transport would reduce the profitability of grain production and some reduction in grain output could be expected. The direct effects of these events on the local West Coast economy are summarised as follows:

	\$ m
Reduced wages and salaries	2 512
Reduced local purchases	1 469
Reduced grain production	10 536
Total	14 517

The above changes are all measured with respect to a 'typical year'. Such a concept has a meaning which is perhaps obscure, given the great variability of local grain production due to seasonal effects. Nevertheless, in most cases, a typical year was measured as an average of the past 10 years for grain and give years elsewhere. An economic model of the region was developed in order to estimate the flow-on or multiplier effects of the above direct impacts.

The total loss in regional income, including the direct and flow-on effect is as follows:

	\$ m
Wages and salaries	3 674
Purchasing	1 392
Grain output	8 924

This port is essential to the welfare of the area, and the money requested will have a long-term lasting beneficial effect on the region. It is essential that the Government provides the funds not only to upgrade the wharf facilities but to deepen the channel so that larger vessels of up to at least 45 000 tonnes can use the port.

When one considers that the Government has almost \$50 million to spend on the entertainment centre, \$12 million or \$13 million on the tank trap on the Festival Plaza, and millions of dollars on other non-productive areas, I believe there is no excuse for not upgrading these and other grain handling facilities throughout South Australia. All it has to do is put into effect some sensible asset reduction policies and this will be carried into effect.

The Premier has accepted some of the Liberal Party policies that were announced in 1985, and we all recall the scare tactics which emanated from the Government benches when the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Olsen) indicated that we should allow Housing Trust tenants to purchase their rented trust homes. At that stage it was described by members opposite as an act of lunacy. They said it was illegal and improper, and they attempted to create fear in the minds of those people. However, only a week or so ago the Premier was out at Elizabeth with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, encouraging people to buy their Housing Trust homes.

The Government has gone the whole circle. The Government having partially accepted one of those policies, in the interests of good government, common sense and the people of this State, it should proceed more rapidly. It has taken five years for the Government to accept it was wrong on that policy; let us hope that it takes only five months to make up its mind on this matter, because there are many activities in which the Government is involved and which it ought to allow the private sector to take over, thus releasing all that money to help pay off some of the debt and create new public works across the State. The Government would then not have to be talking about closing down schools in my electorate, or closing down hospitals; nor would it have the road system deteriorating. It could spend more money managing national parks, so that they could be enjoyed by the general community; it could also control vermin and other things, and so improve the general welfare of all citizens of South Australia.

In conclusion, I would like to say that this budget lacks vision. It has not been drafted in a manner which will optimise the benefits to the people of this State. Many questions remain unanswered. I sincerely hope that, during the budget Estimates Committees, we can have more detailed explanations of the Government's real intentions and what action it will take to solve the many problems that will be pointed out.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Each time the Government brings in a budget after a State election, I find it a fascinating exercise to analyse it. Last year the budget was written in the context of a lead-up to the State election and contained some very interesting figures to which I shall refer. Then we had the election, and many of the promises that were built into the 1989-90 budget disappeared by the time of this 1990-91 budget. It is typical of this Labor Government to build into a pre-election budget certain promises, particularly in relation to the capital works program, and then intentionally withdraw those promises and hope that they will be forgotten by the time of the next budget. At the time of the last budget, we had election promises of a build-up to \$55 million of tax cuts that were handed back but, 12 months later, we are talking in terms of a \$250 million massive increase in State taxation. If that was not blatant politicking, I do not know what is.

Several issues in the present budget are of concern to me. As members would know, I have an interest in welfare matters, to which I will refer. Other basic matters are included in the budget, and I will place on record those with which I am concerned. First, I refer to the interest on the State debt. Not a lot has been said this evening about the State debt but it will not hurt to remind members on both sides that the interest on new and past borrowings will consume \$689.5 million of the budget's spending. That means that 50c in every dollar that is allocated from taxpayers will go towards paying off the interest on the State debt. I do not know how a State such as ours can survive with those sorts

of figures. When it is compounded nationally, people wonder why the standard of living in this country is diminishing, despite the fact that taxpayers from all walks of life are hurting now because of the pressures being placed on them by both Federal and State Governments.

The Premier's 1989 Labor Party policy speech promised \$55 million in tax cuts, and the Government now is asking us to find \$250 million to prop up its overspending. In 1989 we were promised relief from high interest rates; in the present budget and the discussion papers around it, I notice that it has fallen off the agenda and is not talked about. In 1989 we were promised more jobs so, less unemployment, and 12 months later the situation in this country has become worse and the Government has chosen not to talk about it because it is embarrassing.

In 1989 we were promised a massive capital works program; in 1990 the bulk of that program has been withdrawn. What we have is a massive tax hike; interest rates still at a high level; a high level of inflation; and a fall in capital spending. When it is all put together, it means that the standard of living in this State is continuing to decline and, although the Government has over the past six or seven years absolutely bled the life out of the ordinary working man with taxation, and we have seen the cost of living decline, this Government has done nothing for the working man and woman in this country whom it seeks to represent. It has been a failure.

So, the economic outlook for this State is bleak. There is no doubt about that at all. We can look forward to a standard of living that will be further reduced, and increased poverty in the streets. We can look forward to more business failures and, flowing on from that, job losses with a further falling standard of living flowing from that. We can look forward to more people losing their homes and falling on the welfare housing sector. We can expect increased crime rates to flow from this, and we will see more people going on welfare.

That is the pattern that has developed: a pattern over which this Government should not be proud to preside. The only chink of light I saw in the whole budget was the statement that the Government would inject some money into community welfare (or Family and Community Services, as it is now called) to employ additional staff as social workers. I have said in this House before and will say again that I hope that the qualifications of those social workers involve at least four or five year degrees; and that those social workers are highly qualified, experienced people who can go into the department and do a very worthwhile job to try to reduce waiting lists. As we have had trouble in the Health Commission, so we have problems in the community welfare area, the Minister himself admitting to there being at least 400 unallocated cases of reported children who need assistance.

Indeed, the PSA says that the number of unallocated cases that are desperately in need of a social worker and departmental assistance has risen to the 1 000 mark. I always think that a good gauge of how a Government is going in the community is to look at some guidelines. This Government does not shape up well on a couple to which I will refer. The first is homelessness. In this State we have seen a slow but steady increase in homeless people in the city of Adelaide, presided over by a Labor socialist Government whose policies just do not work in this Australian context.

I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 5 June this year which was attributed to the Adelaide Central Mission and which states that the growing problem of homelessness has been reflected in a survey that revealed a 20 per cent increase in the number of people using Wright Court day centre for

homeless people. That survey found that 164 people used the centre on 1 June compared with 137 on the same day last year and 132 in 1988.

It is patently obvious that over those years there has been a steady increase in the number of homeless people on the streets of Adelaide who need assistance. This is happening because this Government has the philosophy that, if it has a problem, it raises taxes and throws a handful of money at organisations. It thinks that that is all it needs to do to rectify the problem, instead of looking at the policies and programs it has in place and analysing the root cause of homelessness, the loss of people's homes, and jobs, and the failure of businesses and of people who, in the past, have been successful in holding down a job or running a business. We have seen successful people in this State eventually becoming unemployed, much against their will, and seeking welfare from the State. No-one likes to do that.

Another interesting issue is the slow increase in the number of street kids in Adelaide. Two or three factors must be considered, first, the social problems which exist in homes and which are brought about by economic conditions affecting families. Those problems are compounded by other factors, such as philosophies in schools and the fact that, if children cannot be brought up in a firm, stable environment—where the parents are employed and have an income, when we have created a society which fosters stability—we will have street kids. It is an area of concern and I will certainly question the Minister of Family and Community Services on this topic. Once again, fistfuls of money are thrown out to community organisations to assist them in helping street kids, but there is no ongoing audit of those funds. I will give the House an example. In May of this year in an article in the *Sunday Mail* it was stated that more than \$1 million of taxpayers' money was being used to fund a host of South Australian youth projects. The article stated:

As the demand for street workers to combat juvenile crime intensifies, an investigation by the *Sunday Mail* this week revealed that some of the 30 youth agencies and projects which received more than \$1 million in grants last year have 'never been heard of' by youth workers.

That brings into question how the department and the Government choose to oversee how those grants are being allocated. I put to the Government that it is handing out grants to different organisations, but that it is not following up to see whether those moneys get to where they are intended to go. I doubt that on many occasions the Government is checking to see that the money is being spent wisely, or that it is being spent at all. When the *Sunday Mail* undertook a survey of 30 youth agencies and projects and found that in many cases the street workers have never heard of the organisation for which the money has been provided, one would have very grave reservations about the ability of this Government to hand out money to the welfare sector.

The other factor that I think should concern us is teenager suicide, which also is on the increase. This is a very serious problem and, once again, it reflects the society that is being created by our economic conditions. It is a society in which people are having difficulty coping and which I do not think any of us can tolerate. When the factors are put together, that is the decline in the standards of living, people's decreasing ability to hold a job and the loss of homes and jobs—and I am referring to people who were once in a stable situation—we see the inherent problem in our society. People are now drifting into the welfare sector. This Government has had six or seven years to correct the situation and every statistic one looks at indicates that this Government is taking us further and further down the path into

the welfare state, down a path where more and more people will become recipients of welfare funds. I will not refer to the mentally ill. I have quite a bit to say on that, but I will keep it for another night. However, it is an area of great concern.

The next area at which I want to look in the brief time available to me is the way that the Government in the 1989-90 budget made massive promises about capital works programs. That was fine for the Government and it took it through to the election. It went into the election and, immediately after the election, it chose to withdraw many of its promises. I will give the House some examples.

In the 1989-90 recreation and sport budget lines there was an allocation of \$1.45 million for a project which involved the upgrading of the Hindmarsh stadium. The work included an extension to the existing western grandstand, a new eastern grandstand and the upgrading of existing lighting. The total for the project was to be \$3.9 million, and the proposed expenditure that year was to be \$1.45 million. In the budget papers this year all we find is the upgrading of lighting. The other part of the project—the extension to the western grandstand and a new eastern grandstand—has been deleted. It will not hurt, although the Minister is in an embarrassing position over this at the moment, to put on record the sequence of events that led to that.

Just prior to the last State election, on an occasion when there was a large crowd at the soccer ground, the Minister chose to address the gathering and promised extensions to the stadium, for which I imagine he was roundly applauded. He then proceeded to write to all the Italian and Greek soccer clubs, and no doubt many other organisations, saying that he had made this promise to build the stadium.

An honourable member: A good vote catcher.

Mr OSWALD: A good vote catcher, and that was the intention and timing of it, and he went ahead. The election came along, and no doubt he received an extremely high vote from the Greek and Italian communities in his electorate, as no doubt the Minister of Education in Norwood did. When this budget came out with the capital works program for 1990-91, the sports administrators of soccer were summoned to the department and told that all bets were off. The Minister issued a statement, in the form of a press release, in which he said that he hoped that he could provide the money next year, but he could not even guarantee it next year.

The Soccer Federation had been building up to make a bid for the 1993 Youth World Cup. It had already applied on one occasion, and that application was rejected because it had insufficient facilities. A letter was received from the Australian Soccer Federation saying that the federation was prepared to reinspect the site in 1991 and if improvements had taken place and the building had started and it could see that everything would be fine for the international competition for the Youth World Cup, Hindmarsh would be reconsidered.

It was the most blatant piece of political chicanery that I have seen for many years. It was the most blatant piece of politicking. The Government went out and sold this stadium as a promise, and then pulled the rug on it. That was absolutely outrageous. I call on the Government to reinstate that money, because it has got it.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I have never said it was a waste of money. I totally support it. I have never varied from my support for the Soccer Federation and the need for a stadium there. I have some plans for this State for quite a lot of sporting stadiums in the area. That was political grandstanding if

ever I have seen it. The Minister has a problem with soccer, and I am sure that it will get worse for him, because there is no doubt that the ethnic community was betrayed. The Minister will have to wear the odium of that. It was not just the difficulty with the soccer stadium, because it also flowed down to the baseball diamond, where I understand there is also a problem. I am interested to know what is happening at the basketball stadium, which is another major issue.

Flowing down from there we also have the future of the netball stadium well down the track (I appreciate that). However, if we have rolled off the soccer stadium and there are problems with the basketball stadium, I would have the gravest reservations about how netball could ever hope to expect some sort of assistance from this Government in the future. Perhaps netball is willing to wait until the budget before the next State election, when the Government will do a rerun of what it did in 1989, and what it did three years earlier—run up a surplus and give a massive amount of tax back and increase promises in relation to the capital works program.

Another matter that I will raise on another evening concerns the massive amount of capital works that the Premier promised in Victoria Square. He promised to spend hundreds of millions of dollars over the next 10 years to reconstruct Victoria Square. That is the biggest piece of pie in the sky, quickly cobbled together electioneering we have heard. He was getting frantic at the last State election; he was going to spend \$200 million by the turn of the century.

If he was going to spend that money by the turn of the century, some of it had to appear in this year's budget, so some planning had to be done and money allocated. The Premier has not the slightest chance in the world of doing what he wants to do in Victoria Square by the turn of the century. All he has done is to make promises to large groups in the community and to renege all the way down the track.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This week we have been debating the eighth budget brought down by the Bannon Labor Government. It is remarkably similar to the first budget brought down in the winter of 1983. For those members who were here to witness the effort, the Premier embarked on a savage regime of taxation, after promising otherwise. It is not my intention to dwell on the past but to merely use it as an illustration of how little the thinking and the actions of this Government have changed in the space of eight years. This is at a time when there is an enormous dynamic in the wider world.

In 1982-83 State taxation receipts were \$545 million, compared with an expected level of \$1 516 million this year, almost a threefold increase. Back in 1983 the number of public sector employees per 1 000 of population was 73.3, but today it stands at 77.3. In other words, not only has the number of employees in the State sector increased by 12 000 but also there has been an increase per capita at the expense of the long-suffering taxpayer. This has occurred at the same time as almost every nation has been rationalising the public presence. From Moscow to Tokyo, from London to Hong Kong the world is throwing off the cloak of Government control of and active participation in the productive economic sector. There is a great awakening that the Government does not produce—it more often retards. The Government does not know best—the people in the market place know better. The Government is more preoccupied with its internal machinery, the status of its higher paid participants and the circumvention of the public will than

it is about meeting essential community needs in an effective manner. In eight years we have been nowhere, we have changed nothing, and we have failed to grasp the simple fact that the strictures of the body politic that governs the behaviour of ALP members acts as a dead hand against the wish of the people who crave for leadership.

If ever there was a moment in history to start afresh, now is the time. It is 1990—10 years to the turn of the century. The world is going through a vast period of rationalisation. The threat of communism is disappearing and the socialist ethic is in tatters. The European Economic Community is emerging as a major economic force, yet nothing has happened in the Australian economy or has been done by the Australian Government to effect the fundamental changes that are happening across the world. I would remind the members of this Parliament that we are, in the national and State sphere, in difficult times, and we have been in that situation for some years. However, let us get down to facts and figures.

The Treasurer, Mr Keating, said that the current account deficit was \$20.7 billion in 1989-90, and his best forecast for 1990-91 is \$18 billion. Of course, the prime driver of the economy is investment, as everybody in this House would appreciate, and it is not good news in that respect. For this coming year, the forecasts are: non-dwelling construction down 13.5 per cent, plant equipment and investment down 4 per cent and business investment down 7.25 per cent. One wonders how the Treasurer can be as precise as this, given that the outcomes are never the same as those predicted by the Treasurer of this country. There are some amazing export predictions, such as that of the Treasurer suggesting that the export of goods and services will increase by 7.5 per cent, at the same time as imports will decrease by 3 per cent. The economic background is simply that the nation is going through a highly difficult time, the standard of living is falling, but we have gained no benefit whatsoever from the strictures that are now being placed on the population.

When I consider the budget, I ask, 'What is the context of this budget? What are we trying to achieve?' Surely, any budget should determine future paths. Mr Speaker, I ask the Premier where we are going as a State. There is nothing in this budget paper to indicate where we are going. What type of economy best suits the physical structure and the demographic and intellectual dimensions of the State? How do we best use the talents of our population? What vision do we have for our people, and how do we share it? How will Mr Bannon's Ministry appropriately promote and provide the catalyst for change? Why are we determined to attach our flags to and rely on publicly funded initiatives such as submarines to get the State moving? I ask Mr Bannon whether he has ever asked himself why we only ever attract 4½ to 5 per cent of business migration; why we have only 3 to 4 per cent of investment capital and research activity; why we cannot construct a major development without crippling strikes; why our major talents, be they intellectual, innovative, business or artistic, inevitably migrate interstate or overseas; and why our head offices continue to decline. How can the people who would wish to extend and push back the barriers of the State survive and grow in an environment that is not conducive to their efforts?

What about exports? What about people who are trying to create something out there for this State on the world market scene and who have to grapple with the internal transport system and the problems on our wharves? What has the Premier done about removing impediments? Why has he protected the painters and dockers and those people

who would wish to see the economy in rack and ruin? Why, after a Royal Commission found that the painters and dockers were involved in criminal and other destructive activity, was he prepared to protect them from the full force of the law? What has the Premier done to attract investors to this State when important projects are being placed at risk by excesses of the building unions?

Mr Atkinson: Which ones?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The building unions are quite easy to identify and we would count the BLF and the BWIU as being in the forefront, whatever the names they are calling themselves; they keep changing names so their past sins do not catch up with them. What has the Premier done to assist the State's small business? What real consideration has he given to the impact of land tax in particular and the dead hand of regulation, which falls upon small business people?

What has the Premier done for our manufacturing industry, given his intention to increase payroll tax from 5 per cent to 6.25 per cent? What about the lower WorkCover rates which, since their introduction, have now escalated, and the advent of the highest rate of FID in the land? What is the Premier doing about these matters? What has the Premier done for tourism? Why has he not made a greater investment in tourism? Why has he not enabled the greater provision of quality tourist accommodation? We have heard a number of announcements, but very little has come to fruition.

What has the Premier done for the environment? These are the fundamental questions. Why have we lost the container deposit legislation? What about the national parks? We have excised large areas in South Australia, but what do we have in them—weeds and vermin, nothing of which we can be proud. That is what the Premier of this State has done for the environment. In terms of recycling we have advanced but zilch. What has the Premier done for personal safety? Can the Premier say why in this State there has been this huge escalation in serious crimes such as break-ins, rapes and serious assaults? What strategy has been put in place by the Premier to address the personal safety needs of the population?

After eight years, are we in a better condition than we were in 1982? Are we producing more and better products? Are we enjoying a better quality of life? The resounding answer to all those questions must be 'No'. The Bannon ALP Government has done little for this State except retard its progress and ensure that nothing changes for the better. These are some of the wider questions; they are the questions that are missing from the budget. We do not have a context for this budget. We only have the dictates of the Premier. What more incentives do we need for change? We have had a Premier who has worked on three dictums: if it moves, tax it; if it gets too hard, forget it; and if it is too complicated, entrust it to others.

It is about time that this State had some leadership. It is about time we had a context for our budget. It is time for the Premier to actually answer some of the questions we are asking. It is time the Premier produced some leadership. The Premier has provided us with no incentive to go forward as a State. Even if he cannot display all those elements of leadership to which I have referred, at least the Premier could show some elements of good management. The State at least deserves some good management. I now want to ask another series of questions relating to management.

An honourable member: Oh, no!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes! We might actually get these answered. If we could address but 10 per cent of these questions then perhaps as a State we might progress.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier please tell the people of South Australia why the Government overspent the 1989-90 budget allocation to the tune of \$76.1 million? Why did he promise more, prior to the most recent election, when he knew that less would be available? Homesure and the free student travel proposal are but two items. Why did he blame the Federal Government when the fault lies with the management of South Australian financial institutions directly in his hands. Please tell the people why the South Australian Government Financing Authority and the State Bank are contributing \$132 million less this year than they did last year?

Why is there a deficit of \$37.3 million on the recurrent account forecast for this year? That means that we are borrowing to meet our everyday needs. That is the bankcard mentality and that is what the Premier has indulged in. Why are we borrowing to run current expenditures? Why has the Premier deliberately misled everyone about the so-called \$10 million surplus? There is no surplus. All there is is an increased financing requirement from \$180 million to \$260 million this year. Why is the Government spending more each year on the recurrent side which is consumed and far less on the provision of infrastructure to the State—in other words, the State investment side? We know that in real terms capital investment will fall by 14 per cent this year.

Why does the Premier assume that the FID charge of 10c per \$100 will have no impact? What will happen if the Premier is wrong and firms move their financial headquarters to other States? How does that assist South Australia? Why does he assume that the larger enterprises can afford another \$75 million this year when he knows that most of those enterprises are in difficulty?

Why has the Premier not gone to General Motors-Holden's? Why has the Premier not gone down to Mitsubishi and looked at the cars that are currently cluttering up their sites because they cannot be sold? Why can he not go and talk to some of our major manufacturers and understand that exports are very difficult because the dollar is at extraordinarily high levels? Why has he not done his homework to understand that any increase in payroll tax will have a very damaging effect on those enterprises? Why can the Premier not at least do his homework before introducing a budget such as this?

Why does the Premier assume that Parliament will agree to passing the clauses of the taxing Bills which commence tax collections prior to approval by Parliament? It has never happened before and, in all likelihood, it will not happen this time. Why can the Premier not control the pouring of taxpayers' money down the drain on wasted and poorly managed projects, such as the South Australian Timber Corporation, Marineland and the Justice Information System? Why can't the Premier of this State provide some good management? Simply, why can we not get decent management for which the people of South Australia are paying?

Why is the system weighed down by second rate non-performing Government enterprises, such as the State Clothing Corporation, the Central Linen Service, Satco and a whole range of others? Anyone who did any assessment on the performance of those enterprises would come to the conclusion that the taxpayer's dollar is being destroyed. Why, when details of corrupt practices become known to the Government, are they either not investigated or deliberately covered up? I cite the Central Linen Service as an example, and we will hear more about that when the inves-

tigators have heard about it. Just by way of background, I have asked questions over a period of years about the Central Linen Service and all we have got back from the Minister is his saying that everything is all right. We presume that the other line he missed out was 'because the manager has told me so'. That is not good enough. When a Minister is asked a question I expect investigation.

It is the same with the prison service. When I was looking after some details from the Northfield Women's Prison, I found that the minute came down from the Minister to the Director to the person who was causing the problem in the prison system and that it then went back up the same system line. How can we expect to advance as a State with this corruption? Why would the Premier appoint a person of the capacity of Minister Blevins as head of his razor gang? How could anyone appoint Minister Blevins? I have said it before. How can a person with a record of this Minister actually cut expenditure in the Public Service? Today we heard Mr Blevins say with pride 'I don't care what the taxpayers pay. I don't give a damn as long as we can have as much free transport and as many buses running as possible.' How can we save money if we have a person of that capacity determining where changes can take place in performance and where we can actually improve on our performance?

How can we as a State possibly go forward? Why has the Premier not shown some leadership? I have asked a number of questions because I believe that tonight is a night of questions. It is 1990. The new decade is upon us, and we deserve a rethink. We deserve to have everything put on the table because we have but 10 years until the year 2000. If the Premier and Cabinet as the Executive Government of this State cannot perform, it is about time the Executive was removed. Unfortunately, that will not happen unless extraordinary events overtake us.

My plea is that we get some decent government for a change, that the Premier provides some leadership. We need decent budgets which do not tax people, but which actually look at the savings side. We must look at setting the budget in an overview situation where the people of South Australia know what we are trying to achieve and how we are going to achieve it. This budget is second rate and the leadership of this State is second rate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member, whilst on his feet speaking in this debate, is entitled to a certain amount of respect. The Premier is now about to speak and is entitled to respect as Premier and as a member of this House. There is far too much background noise and interjection. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is my task to close the debate and respond to some of the points that have been made in the course of the debate. I was hoping to deal more widely with material that had been brought up by members but much of that will be more appropriately dealt with in the Estimates Committee stage, and I will confine myself to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks and those of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Let me deal first with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Having done that, let me now turn to the Leader of the Opposition. Listening to his remarks, I was reminded of a saying by the French writer and philosopher Pascal who once wrote in a letter to a friend, 'I have made this letter longer than usual because I lack the time to make it shorter.' The Leader of the Opposition's response was very much along those lines. Instead of producing a considered and concise response to the key elements of the budget, what

we got was a monologue lasting two hours or so, which seemed to include everything that the Leader of the Opposition—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Two hours and 10 minutes, my colleagues, who are more long-suffering than I and perhaps stayed for the duration, have advised me. It included just about everything that the Leader wished to explore with enormous and tedious length. It is only reasonable, though, having made a substantive contribution in terms of time if not in substance that it be responded to, but I hope that I will not take the same sort of time.

The Leader of the Opposition's contribution to the debate certainly represented a subtle but, I suggest, very significant shift from the position that has been taken, not only by him but by his predecessor. It is certainly a further move away from the rhetoric that was used by the Liberal Opposition in the last election. I expect that it is the first instalment of what is no doubt going to be a long-running drama as the Leader of the Opposition works very hard at what he says is going to be his aim, and that is to define the Liberal Party differently, regardless of the political, social or financial cost or the commonsense in that approach. Nonetheless, he is going to make that difference very apparent, and I hope that his colleagues are very aware of that and comfortable with it, because, as his contribution to the budget debate suggested, it will produce some remarkable results.

There is no better demonstration of this shift in position than on the question of public sector employment. A little over a month ago, the Leader of the Opposition took part in an extended interview with a political correspondent of the *Advertiser* about various aspects of his philosophy. In describing the interview the journalist wrote:

He [the Leader of the Opposition] talks in sensitive terms about reductions by attrition—not replacing people who retire or resign—rather than sackings to create a leaner more efficient Public Service. Since he took the Liberal leadership six months ago, Mr Baker has mused how best to minimise the potential political flak from a policy of 'small-is-beautiful'.

They are splendid and noble sentiments. Indeed, we have seen them represented in an even more aggressive way in his reaction to the problems of restructuring and negotiating change on the waterfront, particularly in the marine and harbours area. In that regard, the Leader of the Opposition has gone through some quite extraordinary contortions. He professes to be, and struts the stage as, some sort of champion of the blue-collar workers. It would seem that he even supported the industrial action that took place. As I say, some of his colleagues may feel a little uncomfortable with that; in particular, some of his mentors, such as one of his closest political advisers and guides, the now Federal member for Barker (the Hon. Ian McLachlan), who has definite attitudes about waterfront restructuring and played some pretty leading roles in confrontation with those very same workers on other occasions.

Apparently, the idea now is to talk very softly and suggest some kind of sympathy or support for the blue-collar work force, saying that the Government's handling of this situation is completely wrong and that a Liberal Government would not do any of these things. That is all very well, that is what the workers are being told, but they have not heard him tell his State council that one of the prime platforms in his policy if elected to Government will be to sell off those very same ports. I am not quite sure where those workers will end up in that situation.

In his budget reply, only a few days ago, the Leader talked about the New South Wales Government's micro-economic reform. I suggest that every public sector blue or white-

collar worker in this State ought to listen very closely to what the Leader of the Opposition is saying when he praises the New South Wales Government, because certainly there has been micro-economic reform in the transport system in particular. It is boasted about by the Hon. Mr Greiner when pointing to the splendid record of his Government, but those changes were not achieved when the Leader talked in sensitive terms to the *Advertiser* reporter about reduction by attrition. They were not achieved by not replacing people who retired or resigned. In New South Wales, they did not muse how best to minimise the political flak. On the contrary, they sacked some 8 000 workers from the rail system and 1 500 from the bus operations. That was the approach taken in New South Wales.

The Leader of the Opposition says, on the one hand, 'Let's do what the New South Wales Government is doing. That is my aim. I am going to privatise, sell off and reduce numbers and use New South Wales as a prime example for doing this.' On the other hand, he pretends that this would be done sensitively and properly. It is about time the Leader said more directly to the people with whom he deals in other areas what he has said in this House in his budget reply. Perhaps the budget reply was delivered in a semi-euphoric frame of mind following the events at the Liberal Party annual meeting at the weekend where apparently there was a major conservative victory—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know whether Mr Ferguson would say that that was rubbish; certainly, Mr Dean Brown would be a little concerned if he heard cries of 'rubbish' when I said there had been a conservative victory. However, be that as it may, the fact is that that element or strand that is representative of the hardline approach to privatisation, tax policy and so on is very apparent in the current Opposition.

That is very different from the softly, softly language used by the Leader of the Opposition before the last election. One could argue that he had learnt his lesson in 1985 and was determined not to repeat it, and he did not. He did not use the word 'privatisation' in any one of his speeches or policies; it vanished from the lexicon. It was not apparent, but it is interesting that it has been resurrected by the current Leader and his Party, and has suddenly become very important again.

There were some vague references to private bus operators and something that might happen in ETSA, but that was it. Indeed, there was a guarantee to the Public Service Association that a Liberal Government would make no changes of that nature. Also, a promise was made that there would be no reduction in employment. At the same time, this was accompanied by policy statements that promised substantial increases in a variety of areas. That is splendid stuff. That was the rhetoric used by the Opposition before the last election. Within a mere 12 months, right here and now in his budget reply, the Leader of the Opposition has come out into the open. He has decided to spill the beans and tell the truth, but he does it here. I suspect that he does not do it in some other private gatherings or when he is talking to particular audiences of a different kind.

I am quite sure you would not hear a word about the sale of the ports, about the Greiner experiment whereby the public sector work force in New South Wales was reduced by 8 000 rail workers and 1 500 bus employees and the various other solutions that were praised so greatly in the budget context. I would hope those who listen to his blandishments about that look at his policies very carefully indeed, look at his words in his budget reply, look at his financial targets and look at the lessons from which he is

drawing in other jurisdictions. Enough of that: enough of the new direction.

I must say that I appreciate the frankness of the Leader of the Opposition in at least telling this House what is his agenda. He has not hidden it here. I just hope it will be more widely publicised in those quarters that are perhaps still under some illusions about what a good bloke he might be and how Ian McLachlan really is somebody that he has only nodded to once or twice in passing. In any case, when he and his friends were talking about the live sheep trade and what should be done to the unions, they were really only playing to their audience, their electorates of farmers. They did not really mean it. It was not in their heart.

We had a long dissertation on South Australia's economic record. It was a very thin dissertation indeed, badly researched and inaccurate. It was an attempt to compare us in the 1989-90 year with that of the 1982-83 period and suggest that various objectives and achievements had not taken place. Well, the facts are that, despite the recent economic downturn, South Australia's economy is still in far better shape than the one which we inherited from the Tonkin Liberal Government, and the figures are there for all to see. South Australia now has more jobs, lower unemployment, a lower cost of living, real increases in household income and fewer strikes and industrial disputes than in the 1982-83 period.

For instance, in employment, there are now over 120 000 more jobs in South Australia than there were as we swallowed the consequences of the Tonkin Government's three years in power. In the three months to June 1990, we saw record numbers employed—562 000 compared with the average level of 541 000 in the 1982-83 period. In terms of unemployment, about 18 000 have been removed from the unemployment tally. In the three months to June 1990, our unemployment rate was 7.1 per cent, 4 per cent less than the double digit level of 11.3 per cent that we inherited from the Tonkin Government—a 50 per cent reduction in unemployment. Let us remember that.

Mr S.J. Baker: This is eight years ago!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, this is eight years ago. This is what the Leader of the Opposition tried to tell me. We have reduced unemployment by 50 per cent but apparently, according to the Leader, we have gone nowhere in that period. I wonder whether honourable members recall the youth unemployment rate of 28.8 per cent? That was the peak it reached in the 1982-83 period and, of course, in the latest period it is 20 per cent—still unacceptably high but well below those record levels. Cost of living increases have been halved in that time.

In relation to housing, despite high interest rates there were still almost 3 000 more houses built in South Australia in 1989-90 than were built in 1982-83. In terms of household income—the honourable member opposite keeps interjecting about real levels of income—in South Australia it has risen by 12.4 per cent in real terms between 1982-83 and 1988-89, which is above the national average.

These were statistics we did not hear in the Leader of the Opposition's intervention. He then went on to talk about debt and, again, wanted to play around with the figures: the cost to the community, he said, of the rising interest bill on State debt. I might add that State debt is incurred, in broad terms, in order to fund the capital works program that is vital for this State in so many areas: in our roads, our harbours, our hospitals, our schools and so on. So, there is a very good reason why the State may occasionally borrow. However, the gross interest cost in the 1990-91 budget has fallen by 4.3 per cent in real terms. That is the figure. We have actually reduced it, yet the honourable member is

talking about rising debt bills. In fact, we have one of the lowest interest burdens of any State.

The ratio of total net interest to GSP for 1988-89 of 7.5 per cent is the second lowest of the six States. That is because the total level of State debt has been declining and, indeed, will continue to decline from 1989-90 to 1990-91 in real terms: 15.8 per cent of GSP in 1989-90 and 14.9 per cent in 1990-91. In 1982-83 the Tonkin budget outlays were 23.2 per cent. Compare the 22.3 per cent debt—the wasted money—we were paying then. One can interject about one or two minor expenditures, but in 1982-83 millions and millions of dollars were going uselessly into repaying debt for which we received no benefit, compared with what is happening now.

On the topic of interest costs on debt, the Leader of the Opposition says that over the past five budgets we have had \$3.097 billion in interest costs. What an inadequate attempt to inflate a figure, because he refuses to look at both sides of the balance sheet. The fact is that there are interest recoveries as well which must be put into the equation before one can arrive at a final figure. When taking this into account, in fact, we are talking about less than half the amount suggested by the Opposition. It is not \$3.1 billion: it is around \$1.4 billion—very containable and amongst the lowest in Australia.

In my budget speech I stressed that the Consolidated Account financing for 1990-91 of \$260 million should be seen against the background of the past eight budgets. Only two of the past eight years have seen a lower real terms financing requirement. It has been 24 per cent below the real terms financing requirement average of the past eight years, and the 1990-91 estimate follows a year in which the financing requirement was the lowest it had been for eight years.

We then had this furphy about the Commonwealth grants analysis. This is the Baker-Keating thesis. Paul Keating and the Leader of the Opposition are the only two in Australia who seem now to subscribe to the theory that the States actually received a good deal from the last Premiers Conference. That is a nice unity ticket in this area. It is similar to other unity tickets the Leader is probably also trying to develop, I suggest. Time and again, I believe, we have exploded the mythology of that.

The only person who gets any satisfaction from the use of shonky Federal Treasury figures by the Leader of the Opposition in this State is the Federal Treasury—because no-one else in Australia believes them. The financial journals do not believe them, and the other States do not believe them. Five Labor Premiers and one Liberal Premier think that they are a lot of nonsense—and they are, and we have established that they are.

The facts are that, regardless of the Opposition's claims about how this might be made up and whether or not that is valid to count in, we have something like \$235 million less to spend in this year's budget than we had last year. That is a stark fact; that is an inescapable fact; that is something which we have to deal with and which we are prepared to deal with centrally. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition wants to have it both ways. He says that one cannot deal with that by raising taxes: one should deal with it by cutting and gouging into the public sector and services. That is great news for all those people employed in the public sector. I hope he spreads the message wide and far.

I have been through the details of those Commonwealth grants and how they are made up. I think it would be tedious to the House to go through them again in the financial assistance grants. We have real term reductions.

Incidentally, the Leader of the Opposition tried to suggest that we were looking at a wrong indexing base: we were looking at a March to March index. We were looking at common figures. In fact, we started on a no real growth in the Commonwealth's forward estimates and then had \$400 million overall knocked off that starting point. The water assistance grant, which we have been receiving for four years and which has been of substantial benefit to us, is no longer available. Yes, following the Premiers' Conference, we did get assistance of \$12 million, which I hoped we could get in some form of housing assistance because of the problems with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. As it happened, it was provided on the same basis as the water quality schemes that we have had and, certainly, we will apply it there, but it will give us the opportunity to free up some funds that we can use on the housing scheme.

Thirdly, the financial statement refers to the capacity afforded to the State to reallocate State funds for housing as a result of that. I made it quite clear what we were doing with that money and where it went. It is in our calculations. In relation to the Grants Commission relativities, this is another extraordinary story. Again, the Leader of the Opposition and the Federal Government are about the only two groups—other than the Victorian and New South Wales Governments (the big States) which reckon that justice was done at the Premiers' Conference on that particular aspect. It is staggering that the Leader of the Opposition of one of the smaller States, which is very dependent on the fiscal equalisation proposed by the Grants Commission, should gang up with the Federal Government and the two biggest States to deny us effectively of the \$50 million that we should have received from the recommendations of the Grants Commission. Not only that, but also the Leader of the Opposition tried to make a case in support of it.

In the October 1989 report of the Grants Commission, it was made quite clear that the three-year basis would be used. It is certainly true that in the 1990 report the different methods of calculation were set out, but no particular recommendation was made because, like us, the commission assumed that the agreement which had been in place and which had two years to run would be honoured at that Premiers' Conference. Like us, the commission probably made note of the Prime Minister's letter of December 1989, in which he pointed out that, the Grants Commission having completed its review, having recommended the existing annual update process and that the three year review period should be retained, the Commonwealth considers 'that it would be appropriate to accept the commission's recommendation that the existing update arrangements and review period be retained.' It is all set out in that letter.

In relation to the debt repayment issue: yes, there will be more debt repayment under arrangements which are stated in Commonwealth budget paper No. 4, which provides compensation totalling \$3.3 million, of which our share is \$500 000; in other words, we are getting an immediate short-term recognition of the fact that that debt is retired as low interest debt and we will have to reborrow at higher interest rates. However, it has nothing to do with the voluntary debt retirement arrangements that we had undertaken, with mutual benefit to the State and the Commonwealth, where the Commonwealth was recognising the full benefit forgone by the State. It was worth \$58.8 million to us in 1989-90 through SAFA. In fact, the agreement was part of an ongoing program that we had been operating.

We understood that that program would continue, and we were encouraged to believe that that would be the case. It did continue, but on a completely different basis, without

the financial benefits which had already been factored into our budget.

I turn now to the Opposition Leader's comments on recurrent spending. He is claiming that our recurrent spending in 1989-90 blew out by more than \$76 million. What a blatant misuse of figures. If one is looking at the figures within any budget—the results as declared—one must look at those items which have had actual changes in terms of outgoings and at those items for which more money has been received and, therefore, more money has been spent by conscious or deliberate policy of a funding authority such as the Commonwealth Government. In fact, if during the course of the year increased amounts are provided for a particular program, we do not put them in the bank and earn interest on them or say, 'That is a good thing; we will keep them in our hip pocket.' We spend them, because that is what they have been provided for.

The increased expenditure—the column on which the Leader of the Opposition focuses—is matched by the increased income. The increased expenditure occurred only because the increased income was made available. The financial statement has made that patently clear and has adjusted for those offsetting variations of the type that I have described. When one does that exercise, one finds a net under-expenditure of \$9.6 million on recurrent operations, not this ludicrous figure of \$76.2 million that the Leader of the Opposition uses. There was an overall deterioration, which we have stated, of \$26.2 million in the financing requirement. That has an impact on the budget, of course. But it came about because we received less revenue than we expected—a decline in receipts of \$20.1 million.

Then we come to taxation. The Leader of the Opposition spent a lot of time on this. This is the Party that is going to ensure that we maintain and fund our services, that all sorts of requests, requirements and demands are met, but somehow the means to pay for it are conjured up from thin air. We have not attempted to hide the tax increases or their impact. On the contrary, they are spelt out in great detail in financial paper No. 1. The Leader of the Opposition implied that we had not spelt out these details. They are all there very precisely. There are tax measures which will total \$140 million in this financial year and \$211 million in a full year. These are estimates, and they will depend on economic and other activity and on variations between the various areas of taxation. They represent respectively 10.9 per cent and 16.4 per cent of tax collections in 1989-90.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about a 23 per cent increase in tax revenue. I presume he has arrived at that by combining natural growth in the tax base—the general activity level of 5.6 per cent—with a full year effect of the increases. That is a totally shonky figure with absolutely no relation to reality.

Let me look at some of those tax areas. On payroll tax, the member for Victoria points out that the growth in payroll tax receipts is higher in South Australia in 1990-91 than in Victoria. The reason for that is that our rate in previous years was very much lower. But the increase is not the chief point. It is the absolute rate which is important, the rate over time. Ask any employer whether he or she would prefer to be increasing from 5 per cent to 6.25 per cent or from 6 per cent to 7 per cent as the higher payrolls did in Victoria and New South Wales. Of course, others increased by more than 2 per cent. The fact is that 85 per cent of employment in South Australia which is subject to payroll tax occurs in firms which are better off as a result of our tax system than those in those rival States.

In addition, the threshold will be increased twice in the next 12 months. They will be higher than in Victoria for all but two months of 1990-91. As I highlighted in the budget speech, tax payable on payrolls up to \$2 million will remain unchanged as a result of those increases. If we look at the tax payable by companies in South Australia, with a payroll of \$1.25 million companies in our State will pay \$1 250 less than companies in New South Wales and \$7 500 less than companies in Victoria.

If it is \$4 million—it is \$20 000 less than in New South Wales and \$52 000 less than in Victoria. They are significant differences, and ones that we will maintain. I imagine, looking at the way payroll tax has developed in those States, our competitive advantage will be enhanced in the years to come. Land tax is another example. If, as the Opposition now urges (it waited to see which way we would jump before it decided what it would criticise), we had undertaken the comprehensive land tax reform, that would have been fine.

It would have meant an unprecedented increase in the number of small businesses paying land tax. Something like 90 000 taxpayers would be introduced into the system. I would be happy to introduce each and every one of those 90 000 taxpayers to members of the Opposition. Indeed, if they like, they can join with me in sending a letter setting out our respective policies. Members of the Opposition want them to pay land tax and the Government does not. That is the difference. The point about land tax is that we are reducing the rates of land tax to ensure that the collection does not exceed the estimated rate of inflation. That has been the main request of business and land tax payers in this State.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member should talk to his Leader and try to analyse the figures, because we also deferred payments last year. Some of those deferred payments will come in in the 1990-91 year, and they are included in our figures. It is suggested that they swell the figures to make the percentage increase greater, because the deferred payment policy has been allowed. Perhaps we ought to write to all those people as well and say that the Opposition believes that they should have been paying immediately.

We then have public sector employment. The Leader of the Opposition continually refers to the growth in public sector employment. He remains silent about what is the projection in this area because it suits him to do so. It is all very well to talk about 1989-90, but he does not look at the 1990-91 period and the outcome expected. Nor does he in any way attempt to analyse where the employment numbers fall, and why they fall in those areas. That suits him very well indeed. The Leader shifts his argument to suit his own convenience. At one point he is talking about the total number, and at another he chooses full-time equivalents. On another occasion he concentrates on administrative units, and then he will switch to the total public sector.

It is interesting to see how, by shifting, juggling and mixing up the figures, he can try to get the sort of result he wants. All the time he avoids the fundamental issue: in some areas there is increased demand and the Government is meeting that increased demand, and so it should.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Perhaps it is necessary for me to repeat last year's speech; the figures are there clearly in this year's budget, and I suggest that members who can remember that ought to refer the Leader of the Opposition to it so he does not waste the time of the House. He has certainly changed a lot of the rhetoric of last year, with his

talk about privatisation, reduction of the public sector, State income taxes and general consumption taxes. That is all changed, but he certainly has not paid attention to the figures here. Again, I am not going to go over too many years, but I refer to law and order, education and training. In the area of health units—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me cite a few figures: first, 125 extra police. Has the Leader of the Opposition been campaigning around the traps against that? Is he suggesting that that is inappropriate or wrong? No, he is not, and he shakes his head. Of course not; he wants them. He believes that our prisons should be properly staffed—there are 34 under the budget. He believes that we need more court services and law and order services. In education, 300 FTEs; in employment and further education, 186; in children's services, 53. Every member opposite at some stage has made requests for extra resources in those areas. Is the Leader attacking that? Not a bit; he is very silent about those things.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I could go on through the list. No decision is made for commercial entities which have commercial targets and which employ in consequence of those things, yet are summed up. One of the most outrageous and hypocritical areas is hospitals and health. We have just seen the Hon. Martin Cameron retire—and resign in despair—the man who last year generated almost single-handedly in the supine Opposition talks of hospital crises, who raised issues of hospital waiting lists and who demanded that there be vastly increased resources there. The Government responded to this in a measured way which in fact set in place a four year program and 441 extra employees. Is the Leader of the Opposition criticising them? He may be, and that is probably why the Hon. Martin Cameron left, disgusted with the hypocrisy. At least he was being fair dinkum. He knew that, by calling for waiting list reductions, he was calling for more numbers, and so it happened. When he found that his Party could not support that, he gave it away. The colleague, the old school friend from the south-east of the Leader of the Opposition, has given it away in disgust, because of the hypocrisy that is being demonstrated on that side of the House. There was no other conclusion to be drawn.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He was dropped from the leadership, dropped from the shadow Cabinet and banished to the back bench after masterminding the election; who was it, Mr Speaker, at six o'clock—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Hayward interjects. I suspect the honourable member who has just retired, Mr Cameron, had a lot to do with his being here, unfortunately. He was the person cracking the whip, calling the meetings at 6 o'clock in the morning; he was the one telling the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, not to speak too loudly and to keep out of the way of the press and the Liberal Party would do better. A number of members opposite are here by dint of that, but what was his reward? He was banished to the back bench and now he has left in disgust, because he has had enough. And his old school mate opposite loyally interjects to try to keep his morale up. I would say that, if someone who had made that sort of contribution was allowed to go in that way, it would be seen as a disgrace, and I hope the member for Hayward spoke up in the Caucus room about the disgraceful behav-

our towards a man who made a major contribution to his winning the seat. Certainly, the current Leader did not.

Rather than go through these figures in this long, drawn-out address made by the Leader of the Opposition, I have tried to deal with some of the salient points. A number of the other matters will be dealt with in the course of the Estimates Committees, but all I can say is that the budget, in terms of its various targets, achieves that very difficult balance. We are not embarking on massive sackings; we are not embarking on massive dislocation of services; but we are embarking on a long term strategic restructuring of the public sector. We are ensuring that we have a decent revenue base with which to do so. We are attempting to compensate for the rotten deal we have been given at the Federal level and, by so doing, to create a stability that the business sector and the community in this State will respect and be very grateful for indeed. I commend the budget to the House.

Bill read a second time.

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

That this Bill be referred to Estimates Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the House note grievances.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I inform the House that I am not the lead speaker in this debate. I will refer briefly to some of the tripe spoken by the Premier and the attitude he took a few moments ago. He began his reply by saying that he would confine his remarks to the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Then he said, 'Let me deal first with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition', and stopped. He then said, 'Having done that, let me now turn to the Leader of the Opposition.' One could accept that from a backbencher as being a bit of comedy at the time, but not from a Premier who is supposed to have better standards. He could have either totally ignored the Deputy Leader's contribution or given a reasonable response to it. Anyone who looked at the Premier's face tonight would have seen that he was under some strain to try to get over his message.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He had no message.

Mr S.G. EVANS: He had a message, but it was not the truth. Over the years we have learnt that when the Premier can stage perform and be on top he is a front runner, but he will not front up and admit that he has made some errors and broken some promises. At the time of the last election the Premier was very confident when he said that there would be no tax increases greater than the CPI figure. We only need one example to show that this is not so—FID, with a 150 per cent increase. That is a disgrace. And who does that increase affect? It not only affects a few business people; it affects every man and woman in the community who has to buy goods, and it affects them more than the Premier admits.

The increase in FID will result in people not sending goods from this State and not putting their money through the banks and other institutions of this State. The big boys will pick another State in which to do this, although the small businessman cannot afford to. If one wants to ship freight one is better to do it from another State. This will apply to all dealings throughout this State, right down to a pensioner who wants to invest, deposit or withdraw their money. They will be taxed on their pension. People paying off mortgages will be taxed on their debt. The Premier says that that is all right, that he can break that promise as he has broken many other promises.

I do not wish to spend my 10 minutes in this grievance debate commenting on the Premier's remarks, and will refer to only one other matter. The Premier tries to defend his Government's attitude towards employing people in the public sector. I ask him to be honest just once and tell us how many more white collar workers (and we always have an abundance of these people at the top—the non-producers) and how many more blue collar workers, who really do the work at the end of the line, he has employed.

Just come out with the figures and be honest about it in each area of government employment. Just tell us the decreases in some of those areas of blue collar workers as against the decreases in the area of white collar workers in any particular department.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: If there are any.

The Hon. S.G. EVANS: The member for Alexandra makes the point very well. I do not believe that there is any decrease—or if there is it is very small—in the white collar area. It is scurrilous that the Premier of this State should revert to tactics such as those he used tonight in an attempt to gloss over what has happened. As Premier, he led his Party to an election with boundaries which I said were shonky back in 1984. The Government received only about 47 per cent of the vote and nearly 53 per cent voted for the Liberal Party.

Yet, the Premier has the temerity, the cheek to infer that he had the support of the public of South Australia. He, like others, when he was at the university and just after condemned the electoral boundaries of the 1960s and I do not condone them but the ones that are in place now are just as shonky, as members opposite know. The smug looks on their faces do not do them any credit in that area.

I want to make some comment now about a matter in my own electorate. On Wednesday 30 May an article appeared in the *Hills and Valley Messenger*, part of which states:

Joggers and people using Belair National Park after hours will be prosecuted by National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) rangers in a new get-tough stand. The rangers have been concerned for some time by the increased number of people using the park after 6 p.m. But the rangers say they are taking action to protect these people.

NPWS publicity ranger Richard Coombe said people were disregarding the rangers' warning that they were trespassing by being in the park after hours. Mr Coombe said joggers were compounding the problem by wearing dark clothing which meant they were often at risk from cyclists and some motorists.

'There have been some near-misses reported recently involving joggers in dark clothing and cyclists without lights,' he said. . . 'I'm just concerned that they (joggers) could find themselves in trouble if they run into the vandals,' he said.

'No one is allowed to enter the park after dark without special permission from the district ranger.'

The first point I make is: pity help the poor kangaroos if the ranger is driving around and cannot see human beings running around in the park after dark because I do not think there would be much bright clothing on the kangaroos or the emus in the park. So I have a concern if the rangers drive around in that manner within the Belair National Park and I find it amazing that they will prosecute people, as stated in that article.

So I wrote to the Minister for Environment and Planning, who is in charge of national parks, and asked whether she was aware of the issue and what her reaction was. Other matters dealt with in the letter to which I will not refer related to fencing, vermin and trees that were being removed. I will read the last passage of the letter I received from the Minister dated 23 August. She was nice because she crossed out 'Mr Evans' and wrote 'Dear Stan' and that is nice. She said:

The park has been closed from sunset to sunrise periods for a very long period of time, long before the current entrance fee arrangements.

I made the point that the park had been open to the public for many years and the Minister tells me that that is not true. What the Minister does not know is that the gates used to be shut but there was no fence around the park to keep people out. As long as I can remember (and I have lived in the area all my life and did some of my primary school lessons in the park in a cave which the Aborigines used to use) there has been just a post and wire fence. That is the point I was making. The Minister went on to say:

However, I understand that many out of hours walkers and joggers do use the park, and that this informal use is accommodated by park staff.

Who is speaking the truth? In an article on the front page of the paper it states that the rangers will prosecute the public if they are in the park after hours. Many people use the park because it is safer to jog and walk in the park than it is on the roads. It is a sensible place to be. It is a recreation park and it has been available to people for 99 years—100 years next year.

The Minister wrote back, stating that the rangers accommodate those who wish to jog or walk in the park. We should get it straight. We should go back to the previous situation and let the rangers drive with care, if they are frightened of running over kangaroos or people after dark in the park. I hope that the Minister takes note.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Yesterday I did not conclude my remarks because I still had some things to say about this *Blue Hills* saga of Woods and Forests/Satco/Scrimber International. Yesterday, I referred to nine promises regarding the commencement of the scrimber manufacturing program which have been made over the past two years; none of them has been kept. Yesterday's *Border Watch* in Mount Gambier reported the Chairman (Mr Higginson) as saying that he would swear that he would keep the costs of manufacturing scrimber below \$50 million. In itself that is a quite remarkable commitment because, as I pointed out, in the Auditor-General's statement the cost is listed at \$50 million, at least. If Satco and SGIC have to each pay half the total cost, and as shown in the Auditor-General's report Satco has contributed \$28 million in costs, that makes my original forecast of about \$56 million for the final cost of the completion of the scrimber plant reasonably accurate.

In any case, the Chairman and the Minister will find it hard to keep costs down to \$50 million because interest at 10 per cent per annum will create at least \$5 million additional cost during the next 12 months while the product is being produced and sold. The product itself will have to return on full production of 45 000 cubic metres a year some 10 per cent to 20 per cent on capital simply in order to meet interest. Because the product is slowly going to come up to full productivity, I do not see how that can be achieved within the next 12 months.

In answer to a question today, the Minister declined to say when the scrimber product will come onto the market. It is hoped that it will be before the end of the year, but six months of productivity has already gone. The Minister did not deny in Question Time today that the cost was \$56 million—in itself another interesting feature. I believe that the Minister was too busy being smart to answer the question which just went unheeded. The Minister also said today that the scrimber product would be made of a log of a size that would normally be rejected or wasted on the forest floor. That is simply not true and I wonder why the Minister and his staff keep promulgating that myth.

The fact that scrimber utilises small logs in order to manufacture a very large beam should be adequate reason for promoting scrimber on the market without having to say that it uses waste timber. I say that it does not use waste timber because one only has to go to the scrimber plant to realise that, because the small logs must have a minimum taper from one end to the other (although the log size can be between 50 mm and 175 mm), a log with an uneven taper across the length of seven or eight feet will have less density at one end than at the other. The taper is to a very tight tolerance of about 10 mm. So, the process uses a log that is suitable for fence posts, vine posts and, generally, some form of manufacture and sale on the open market. It is not a waste log. In fact, logs with an excessive taper are scrapped and burned in the Woods and Forests boilers in Mount Gambier.

So, the Minister need not promulgate that myth when he has a perfectly good reason already for manufacturing scrimber. As I said before, scrimber is an excellent concept and we all want to see it succeed, but we are constantly worried about the continuing promises that are made and broken and the continuing delays. The locals in the South-East are also worried because engineers appear to have been hired, but they then resign or are dismissed. We do not know; they just seem to disappear and someone else comes along.

Recently, in the State media a very belated tender for design and supply of a coating process was advertised. One would imagine that it would have been advertised many months before in order to get the process ready for final manufacture. No reason was given. Public relations have been very poor throughout South Australia with regard to the manufacture of scrimber. No wonder people continue to ask questions.

The role of the South Australian Government Financing Authority in the timber/scrimber/Satco industry continues to be increasingly interesting. Satco, very quietly and unannounced, assumed equity control of \$347 million in Woods and Forests in addition to assuming responsibility for a \$60 million Woods and Forests debt—a total of \$407 million. So, to all intents and purposes, the South Australian Government Financing Authority now has control of Woods and Forests. Will it sell? Will it borrow against that equity? What control does the Minister have over these things? The Premier keeps saying that he has very little control over the State Bank, SAFA and statutory authorities, but surely someone must have some say in these things. Apparently, SAFA has a considerable controlling interest in the whole of Woods and Forests and the timber industry in the South-East.

I have noted additional problems in the Auditor-General's Report. The New South Wales outlet, which was opened in the past 12 months, has already closed at a loss of \$215 000 simply because of the delays in scrimber coming on to the market—another loss to add to the scrimber accounts.

The increase in the cost of selling Woods and Forests and Satco materials was \$4.7 million, and it makes one wonder how that can happen. That represents another \$4.7 million loss against sales. I simply ask, as I have for the past several years: do we need the interstate outlets, such as the huge building in Melbourne, when sales could be effected just as efficiently from the Woods and Forests Department in South Australia, with almost daily deliveries possible by road and rail transport using the huge road transport fleet based in Mount Gambier?

The \$51 million profit of Woods and Forests for the past 12 months included \$39.7 million worth of growing trees whose value will not be realised until the timber is milled.

So, the profits are artificially inflated, in defiance of Australian Accounting Standard No. 10, which I have informed the Minister of over the past several years and which the department continues to ignore.

In relation to the Shepherdson and Mewett mill sale, the Chairman of Satco and the Minister said that the mill equipment had not been wasted because it had been sold and they had realised \$1.4 million from the sale, which is roughly the cost of the machinery. This begs the question: have they given away the land and the buildings and are they simply claiming that they have sold the equipment which was brought in from Scandinavia and which has not been used for the past four years? It has been sitting idle, uninstalled, and probably for that reason has contributed to the downfall of the Shepherdson and Mewett Williams-town mill. But there has been no response from the Minister; nothing other than 'We have recouped at least the cost of the machinery.'

Woods and Forests, Satco and scrimber are far from out of the woods—and that is putting it mildly. I did not intend that as a pun—it has just occurred to me that it was—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: However, there was a loss of \$750 000 in addition to that sale price of \$1.4 million. I point out that the sale was effected at a loss of \$750 000 on the Shepherdson and Mewett transaction. That is far from an attractive piece of business, yet the Minister claims he has done it all in the name of good business management. We have been telling the Government to get rid of Shepherdson and Mewett for years. In fact, the offer to purchase the mill was made seven or eight years ago, but it was declined by this Government. Eight years down the track is a little belated in admitting that a mistake was made.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I received a letter from a constituent at Brooklyn Park a few days ago, and it sums up the attitude of many people in relation to the financial institutions duty. It was estimated that this insidious tax would bring in \$49 million to the Government in the past financial year. In actual fact, the Government raised \$49 385 452, according to page 10 of the Estimates of Receipts, 1990-91, Financial Paper No. 2. This financial year the Government hopes to receive \$109 100 000, and we are told that part of the reason is to establish a local government disaster fund. I am not very keen to support that type of fund because, once the principle is established that a Government will meet debts of certain disasters, many disasters seem to occur, whether they be man-made or not. The Government finds it very easy to tap into these sorts of resources. Once a tax is established for that reason, that tax is never reduced, of course.

I remember during the period 1979-82 when the then Leader of the Opposition, a young, cheeky individual who is now the Premier of South Australia, said that he would move to abolish payroll tax. It was estimated that payroll tax would bring in \$471 700 000 this financial year. So much in relation to assisting industry in South Australia and encouraging employment in South Australia. Businesses who employ people are being taxed to the tune of \$471 700 000. However, the financial institutions duty of \$109 million hits home harder than anything else. When I meet with chief executive officers from various companies, I am surprised when they say they are seriously thinking of transferring their banking arrangements to Queensland.

I would have never thought it possible that the cheques or deposits received in a day would be sent by courier to Queensland to have them banked up there. I understand that one of the larger credit unions in South Australia is

currently absorbing some \$600 000 per year in financial institutions duty, and this organisation has warned its members that it will not be able to continue to absorb that type of impact. A total of \$600 000 for a moderately sized credit union is a considerable amount of money.

It is almost its profit. To place that type of impost on that organisation does nothing to encourage the keeping of money in South Australia, and that is a tragedy. It would be an absolute tragedy if we saw big businesses—and there are not too many of them with their headquarters left in South Australia—taking their banking and financial arrangements out of this State. It is something that needs to be seriously looked at and the Government needs to reconsider its position in relation to the financial institutions duty.

The time has come when we must say to the Government: we have had enough; we expect you to start to live within the current budget restraints. The old myth that you can get away by saying to the taxpayers 'We will only increase taxes within the cost of living' is now gone. We expect the Government to live on what it is receiving now, and as I said earlier this evening, it is time the Government marked time in relation to its financial raisings. It must learn that it can no longer take from the people, because there is just no more money to take. Every dollar that is taken out of the community is taken out of circulation and is not returned. This State is paying almost \$700 million per year in interest, and much of that interest money goes overseas. That is what is crippling this country: the huge payments to foreign countries because some of the smart alics in our Treasury have been borrowing from overseas. It applies not only to State Governments but to certain sections of free enterprise as well.

My constituent's letter sets out the issue extremely well. It states:

I wish to register my strong protest at the increase in the FID tax which was announced in the recent State budget. Since its inception, this additional tax has always been a source of irritation to me. And now that it has been increased by 150 per cent I feel driven to object in the strongest possible terms.

I work. I am paid a wage. I pay 40c in the dollar by way of income tax. With what is left, after paying household expenses, I am fortunate enough to be able to put some money in the bank, hopefully to provide for my retirement years. I realise that there are many who are not in the position that I am in and who don't even have enough to pay household bills.

When the money I am able to save earns some interest, I pay tax on the interest earned. I do not see why the Government of the day should feel that they have yet a further claim on me just because I put money in the bank, and again if I withdraw it. I object even more strongly to paying the FID tax yet again on the very same money if I transfer money from a savings account to place it, for example, in a term deposit which enables me to earn a higher interest rate.

Whilst I object to the tax in every way, it would seem to me that, if anyone is going to make this charge at all, then it should be the financial institutions who complete the transactions of deposits, withdrawals or transfer of amounts from one account to another. I see no reason at all why the Government should benefit from my decision to put money in the bank or, having put it in the bank for safekeeping, why I should have to pay to get it out again.

Would we be better, as Mr Fraser once said, to keep our money under the mattress? In these difficult times when our Governments keep on telling us that there are harder times ahead and we can no longer rely on the Government to keep us in our old age by way of pensions, etc., it seems to me that they do very little to encourage people to provide for themselves. It's more of a little here, a little there; do it as quietly as possible and, hopefully, the worker won't realise he is being had.

In my opinion, it is an insidious, immoral tax, and I can only say once again that I protest in the strongest possible terms to this method of raising revenue to fund incompetent Governments. Yours sincerely,

Since I received that letter, several constituents have called in to my electorate office or telephoned expressing similar

sentiments: people who are forced to have their wages or salaries paid into a bank account because it suits the employer. One of the biggest employers in the State is local government, which insists on paying salaries into a bank account. If you then have to move some of that money to a savings account, or a loan account, you are charged the FID tax. Every time you deposit that money, the State benefits by the transaction.

If you have money invested and you roll that money over, again the Government steps in with its financial institutions duty. You cannot do anything with your money in the State if you have a bank account of some kind with a financial institution in South Australia. As I said, it is a terrible shame to think that we are now down to taking away the incentives of operating bank accounts in this State. Queensland is the only State in Australia that does not have the FID tax. You can imagine the pressure that is being placed on that State Government by the other Labor Governments in Australia. If Queensland continues to maintain the standard it has established there could, of course, be a huge swing away from people banking in South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Chaffey says, Brisbane could become the financial capital of Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Collins Street in Melbourne was but, as the member for Coles reminds me, Collins Street is no longer the financial headquarters of Australia; it has collapsed and is absolutely bankrupt. The State of Victoria is bankrupt and, of course, the financial headquarters have now moved to Sydney. If money goes to Queensland, it will be used by the banks in that State further to prop up development at the expense of this State.

We have the climate, the style of living and a wonderful opportunity to make this State the financial headquarters of Australia, yet, we blew it. We made a terrible mistake by imposing a huge increase in the FID tax. We should have done all that we could to encourage Adelaide as the headquarters—

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): As far as I can see, one of the State's most important industries has received absolutely no attention in this budget. I refer to the South Australian wine industry about which much is written and upon which so much reliance is placed when the Premier goes on his overseas trips. All of us are pleased to use the wine industry whenever we can for the sake of its prestige and the atmosphere and interest that it creates. One of the quickest people to take advantage of the industry is the Premier himself. However, having read the Premier's budget speech and having examined the various budget lines, I can find no reference to any indication of Government policy to support, encourage and promote the wine industry of South Australia. Indeed, the only fleeting, oblique reference I can see to the wine industry occurs on page 10 of the Estimates of Receipts, under the heading 'Business Franchises'.

Under 'liquor-publicans' and other licences' estimated income for 1989-90 is \$43.1 million and \$43.6 million in 1990-91. That is a significant figure and, of course, only a proportion of it can be attributed as a cost to the wine industry. Nevertheless, the industry is very much affected by those licence fees, just as it is affected by virtually all other taxes that the State Government levies: land taxes, motor vehicle registration fees, drivers licences and sun-

dries, payroll tax, stamp duties, financial institutions duty and, of course, business franchises.

The only possible passing reference—and that is deeply hidden—that could be attributed as in any way indicating even the most minor interest in the wine industry is on page 5 of the Premier's budget speech, in which he says that the State's tourism sector also showed strong growth during the year. Of course, we all know that the tourism industry and the wine industry of this State are inextricably linked. I must say that I would like to know with what that growth is compared in terms of the Premier's proud statement. Certainly, compared with the other States, our tourism growth has not been strong and, certainly, our proportion of growth in international visitor numbers to Australia definitely has been very weak indeed.

Let us examine what the wine industry means to South Australia. Approximately 40 per cent of Australia's vineyards are located in South Australia, and the bulk of our grapes are used for wine making. In fact, we produce 53 per cent of the nation's wine. Our production 30 years ago was over 70 per cent of the nation's wine. However, the efforts of other States, the decline in productivity in some areas, vine pull schemes and a whole range of other factors have meant that we have fallen behind our former pre-eminent position. Nevertheless, the fact is that South Australia is still the wine State; the Government still looks to the wine industry to give that prestigious atmosphere to important State events; and, of course, we all take for granted the beauty of the vineyards around Adelaide and in the wine growing regions of the State.

In fact, I cannot help but agree with Ms Kay Hannaford in her article in the current issue of the *Adelaide Review*, in which she says:

It's true. We don't know how lucky we are. How many people in the world live in a city of over a million people, yet within an hour and a half's drive can be in the cellar door of any one of over a hundred wineries, tasting some of the world's finest wines—free of charge, chatting to the winemakers and soaking up the hospitality?

Ms Hannaford goes on to say:

Pleasure aside, it's important to realise that, apart from a few large companies, our wine industry is largely made up of small businesses, many of them struggling, in times like these, to survive. If we don't support them, who will?

Kay Hannaford is referring to wine lovers and the population of South Australia in terms of patronising our own products. But my concern is what the Government is doing for the wine industry.

The Premier is Chairman of the Wine Industry Forum, a body that was set up as a result of an initiative in the Liberal Party's wine industry development and promotion policy which was presented at the 1985 election. That was the first coordinated policy put forward by any political Party in Australia to assist the wine industry in an integrated way. Some of the initiatives in that policy were so demonstrably worthy that they were picked up by the Government, and I am glad that they were, because it has been to the industry's benefit. However, it is no use having yet another committee unless the practical support that the industry needs is provided. This budget has certainly not provided that practical support to the industry.

I have looked very closely in what I consider to be the relevant budget lines for any reference to the wine industry and any funds that may have been allocated, principally through the Departments of Agriculture and Water Resources, to support services. In the Estimates of Payments, on page 61, program 4, the horticultural crop industries have been allocated \$3.9 million, broken down as \$2.5 million for salaries and wages, \$434 000 for administration

expenses, \$596 000 for export inspection of fruit and \$384 000 for rural industry research projects.

I would be interested, during the Estimates Committees, to find out from the Minister of Agriculture, through my colleagues, whether the extension services that the wine industry values are being maintained and, where appropriate, increased. I should also be interested, during the Water Resources Estimates Committee, to find out from the Minister whether the extension of availability and quality of water to vineyards, which is sought by the industry to increase yield and productivity, is being provided for. If not, we will gradually continue to slip back from our pre-eminent position as the wine State of Australia.

Kay Hannaford, in her article, makes the point:

The Western Australian Government, through its Tourist Commission, offers marketing sponsorship to its winemakers to help them find interstate buyers for their wines. They've recently held their third annual wine-show in Sydney, the nation's biggest market-place. Airlines assisted with fares and Sydney wine-drinkers paid a \$15 entrance fee to taste the Western Australian wines. The place was packed.

Ms Hannaford makes the point that the Italian Government, in the early 1980s, 'spent millions of dollars doing the groundwork for the promotion of Italian wines into America', and the result was a marketing sensation. She says:

Here, we expect our winemakers to build their own interstate and overseas markets, while the Government skims 20 per cent off their wholesale turnover in sales tax on the 20th of every month.

Ms Hannaford quotes Robert O'Callaghan, winemaker at Rockford who says:

We can certainly compete on the quality of our wines, and there's an international wine market crying out for our wines, but we get no marketing assistance. . . . All we get is someone to fly around the world having free lunches on our behalf.

I believe that the Government of the wine State should do a lot better than that. I certainly hope that we can find in the Estimates Committees evidence of it.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I have never seen the Premier so ill at ease, as he was this evening, in trying to justify what is a completely unjustifiable budget.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That could possibly be part of it. I realise that he is under considerable strain. He heads a minority Government and he realises that he should not be there as Premier. Any Party that can muster only a little over 47 per cent of the vote compared to the Opposition's 52 plus per cent of the vote really has no right to be in Government. I think that this is playing on the Premier's mind, and certainly the strain showed this evening.

The Premier came back with his normal approach by attacking the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He returned to the Leader's definite proposal that in stringent economic times the Government should be looking at the size of its own operation. The Premier immediately said, 'What do you want to do? Do you want to cut the size of the Police Force, or the number of teachers and nurses?' Of course, that is absolute rubbish.

During his time in office the Premier has increased the overall size of the Public Service by some 8 500 positions. No-one can convince me that 8 500 additional positions have gone to the police out in the field, to teachers in the classroom and to nurses in hospitals. However, there has been a massive buildup in various parts of the bureaucracy, and this is what the Leader was referring to. The number can be reduced. I gave an example yesterday of how some

years ago we reduced significantly by attrition the size of E&WS Department, and not one person was sacked. In fact, jobs in the department were reallocated amongst the remaining staff.

That has to be done in severe economic times, instead of just massively increasing the tax, as the Premier has done. It is his intention to bring in more than an additional \$200 million in taxes, a matter to which I referred yesterday at some length. Tonight, in the time that is available to me, I would like to comment on matters that were not contained in the budget speech.

First, I want to mention the Hudson package in respect of water rates and the Government's user-pays policy. Many reports and investigations have been carried out to determine the most feasible and rational way of levying water rates on consumers in this State. There have been various studies going back over many years. We have looked at virtually every State in Australia and many other countries to try to find the fairest method of water rating. The Hudson package is basically a user-pays package in respect of a house or property worth \$100 000 or less.

Once the value of the property exceeds \$100 000, it is the Government's intention to apply a surcharge. That is not user pays; that is a straight out wealth tax, and I believe it has the same effect as reintroducing land tax on the prime place of residence. That was removed some years ago by the Tonkin Government and this is a means of reinstating that tax on homes worth in excess of \$100 000. Of course, in this day and age, the average property in the metropolitan area is worth very close to \$100 000. So, I believe that this is a glorious example of what the Government is endeavouring to do, namely, reintroduce a form of land tax on possibly 50 per cent or more of the houses in metropolitan Adelaide, as well as on many in the country areas.

Another area on which I would like to comment this evening relates to a statement made by the Minister about houseboat sullage. The effluent disposal stations that have been put in place by successive Governments in South Australia are certainly a credit to this State, and those stations, which number 15, do an excellent job in receiving the sewage effluent and waste from houseboats on the Murray River. However, if the Minister is suggesting that holding tanks be built into those boats for sullage water and that that sullage water should also be disposed of into the existing waste disposal stations, then those stations will have to be increased in size many times over, because the amount of sullage water used every day on a houseboat for the 10 or 15 people on board would be quite enormous. Whereas a houseboat with an average occupancy on board needs to call at a waste disposal station once about every three or four days, if this proposal were brought into effect, the boat would have to call in at least once every day. Even now, with the number of houseboats on the Murray, there is a queue of houseboats at many of the waste disposal stations waiting to dispose of sewage waste.

I believe there is another alternative. I am not suggesting that the sullage waste from houseboats should continue to go directly into the river. However, I understand that units have been developed that can be built into houseboats. They have been developed for use on Sydney Harbour, on the Hawkesbury River and on the Pittwater, and it is for exactly the purpose that the Minister is talking about, namely, to neutralise the sullage water coming from the vessels, particularly recreational vessels, so that the pollution is virtually eliminated. That would be a practical way of approaching the problem. There would be no cost to the Government and as I understand it (and I have been approached on this matter and would be more than happy to put the Govern-

ment in touch with the person who believes that there is a system available) a system has been developed that would handle the waste about which the Minister is talking. So, rather than proceed in the direction that the Minister indicates, at enormous cost to the Government and massive inconvenience to the holiday makers and recreational users of the Murray River, I suggest that the Minister look very closely at what I am saying. I am more than happy to put her in touch with the person who can give her all the information on the system that is currently being installed in recreational vessels used on Sydney Harbour.

Speaking a few minutes ago, the member for Coles referred at length to the wine industry. I would like to support the comments that she made in her address to the House this evening. I would also like to indicate to the House my support for the representative that the Government decided to send to the recent meeting in Mildura of the three States combined wine grape pricing committee that has been established at the initiative of the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture. I trust that the Minister will supply a representative, as the South Australian Government boycotted the first meeting that was held at Griffith.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will deal with a subject that has received a lot of comment by members opposite.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting.

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

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra does not have the call or the right to speak at this time. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like to speak about a matter that has been exercising the minds of members opposite for some time, particularly a couple of members on that side. In the words of the member for Eyre, members opposite are the ones who continually 'pedal around the country' that they are the only ones who know anything about small business.

Members opposite, when referring to members on this side of the Chamber, have said: 'They don't live in the real world'; 'They don't know anything about small business'; and, 'They don't know anything.' Members opposite generalise too much; they should make sure of their facts before they make these sorts of comments. In fact, members on this side of the House do know something about small business. I can assure members opposite that they do not have a monopoly on knowledge of, or 'small' business concern for, the 'small' business community.

As a member of a partnership in a small business for eight years, I was responsible for the financial aspects, and I know only too well the many pitfalls and problems that can befall a small business. These days, one of the main problems that befalls small business is liquidity. Although it is about four years since we sold that business, I still involve myself in these issues in my electorate. While we were in business we involved ourselves in apprenticeship training, and I do not think that many small businesses are now doing the training that they should be involved in. They have a responsibility to do so. That is something we should address.

As a person with some accounting qualifications, I am very much aware of the need for business management skills, whether in a big or a small business. Those skills are a necessary part of the operation. As I mentioned, one main requirement of a small business is liquidity and also the ability to cope with the variables of the day-to-day operation. Unfortunately, many people who go into small businesses do not have those skills. That concerns me greatly, because I think it is very important to make sure that a person can manage a business before they set it up.

That is one of the reasons why I have applauded the Government's initiatives, through the Small Business Centre and the self-employment venture scheme, to encourage and assist people who are thinking about going into a small business or who are currently in small businesses and who may need some assistance in operating them.

As I said before, as a person who was involved in a small business I can assure members opposite that I do have a concern for and knowledge about that area, I will continue to follow up on that in this House when comments are made by members opposite, because they do not have the ability to promote all the interests of the small business community, I assure them. I wonder what they classify as 'small' business, because it appears to me that they seem to be more in the big business area rather than in the small business area. Contrary to what has been said by members opposite, this Government does care about small business.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: Most members opposite, from what I have heard in debates to date. This Government cares about small business and has shown a commitment towards assisting as much as possible through ongoing consultative processes in a number of areas. Even though members opposite interject, they cannot say that that is not correct. One of the things that this Government is currently looking at is the introduction of commercial tenancies legislation to protect small businesses. That is something that the Government of which members opposite probably were not—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The member for Alexandra might have been a member of the last Liberal Government, which did not address this matter at all. In fact, it left small business to the mercy of big business. This Government has not done that and, through the introduction of the commercial tenancies legislation, it will try to address a problem that the last Liberal Government did not address. In fact, it whitewashed the whole problem and just left small business at the mercy of big business. I find that very hypocritical indeed. Members opposite should be very careful about what they say with regard to small business. In truth, having listened to the comments made in the past two days—

An honourable member: Who wrote this?

Mrs HUTCHISON: I wrote it myself and that is something that some members opposite might not have done with theirs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address her remarks through the Chair and members opposite will refrain from interjecting.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will address my remarks through you. Having listened to comments from members opposite over the past few days, I would have to seriously question their all-round credibility as economic managers. Do they, in fact, present a viable alternative to the current economic management of this State? Members opposite may say what they like, but there is a credible economic management team on this side of the House and I hope, for the sake of the people of South

Australia, that that credible economic management team stays in place, because heaven help the people of South Australia if members opposite happen to get into government—and they could only happen to get into government.

In the few minutes that I have left I turn to another positive aspect of this current Government's proposals, and that is the crime prevention package put forward by the Attorney-General. That has had particular relevance to my electorate of Stuart and, given the climate of the time and the concentration on law and order, I am very pleased to say that the package that has been offered to my electorate of Stuart has been very positive in terms of security services for the Aboriginal reserve. There has been a continuation of funding for that, and that has been very positive in terms of reducing the number of offences occurring at the reserve. In fact, the police have been extremely gratified at the efforts of the Aboriginal people at that reserve to alleviate the large number of crimes committed there.

The other aspect is funding for Aboriginal aides. I am quite sure that the member for Eyre would be very pleased about that, because it is one of the things in which he has been particularly interested and which he has followed up over time. Not only that but the Aboriginal Community Affairs Panel in Port Augusta also put forward a project for funding through the crime prevention package. It, too, acquired funding for that package and it will be looking at methods to address the vandalism and so on which is occurring in the community of Port Augusta. I believe that the achievement of that package through this Government, which has a very real interest in combating the law and order problems which this State currently faces, has been very positive, and I applaud that initiative on behalf of the electors of Stuart.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Earlier today I asked a question of the Minister of Water Resources about the progress of the planning of the proposed sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln. I was delighted to hear, as I am sure my constituents will be, that the progress of the planning is well advanced and that the Minister has given a commitment to this House that construction time will be brought forward. I thank the Minister for the undertaking she gave some nine months ago in this House about the forward planning. I am also pleased that, through the environment levy, the construction of this extensive project will be brought forward.

I am sure that a large percentage of the people in my constituency will be very pleased about it. However, one or two will question the method that is to be adopted by the department, but that sort of questioning occurs all the time. I am concerned about the need for an overall waste management plan for Port Lincoln. A number of waste management issues are under discussion, including the treatment of sewage, the relocation of the rubbish dump, the construction of a meat and fishmeal plant, the disposal of stormwater from industrial areas and the disposal of effluent from fish factories, abattoirs and super works. The whole city of Port Lincoln is a prime target for an overall waste management program and I recommend to all authorities with influence—the E&WS, the Waste Management Commission, the city council and the district council—that a coordinated and cohesive plan be drawn up. The Minister's announcement today has set the stage for the treatment of sewage and that should be the first stage of an overall plan.

I am concerned in particular about the present rubbish dump site in Port Lincoln. The Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln is committed to the relocation of that dump site, which should have taken place two or so years ago. That commitment was given at the time a developer took

over the Government's share of the Lincoln Cove development. Unfortunately, the corporation has not been able to relocate that dump. When the council called tenders, a site was proposed in an area to the south of Lincoln. The corporation does not have any obvious sites for a landfill rubbish dump, so the site that was suggested by the developer of the waste station was subject to all sorts of appeals from the Planning Commission and local residents and, ultimately, it was rejected.

That has put things 18 months further down the track, with still no resolution. The corporation is looking at another site at Hassell Road, and that has attracted attention from the fish factories and the meatworks because of a potential health risk. Although the rubbish dump site will be covered every night, it is very close to the fish factories and the abattoirs. The fish factories have export licences and they are required to maintain the best sanitary conditions possible. My concern and that of the proprietors of those fish factories is that, with a rubbish tip within 150 metres of those factories, the seagulls will not be too concerned about where they drop any rubbish they pick up from the tip, and that is a potential problem.

This brings me to my next point: what options are available to the corporation? That is a decision that the corporation must make, but time is fast running out for the corporation and either it needs to make a decision now to relocate the rubbish dump from the present site or it needs to institute an interim measure, and I suggest in this instance a waste transfer station would enable the waste to be carted out of town daily or more regularly as the semitrailers are filled. That is one way in which the rubbish could be removed from the town. I suggest that the corporation look very seriously at the options available.

On Monday, I was privileged to attend a seminar entitled 'Rural Health Care—Crisis or Choice'. I regret that no Government Minister or senior Health Commission officer was present. One planning officer was present, but the real decision-makers—the Chairman of the Health Commission and the Director of the Country Health Services—were unable to be present. I accept that there were *bona fide* reasons for their not being present, but it is a pity because the debate was good.

Representatives from nursing staff, the union and the specialist medical sector were present. Views were expressed by the Australian Medical Students Association and the Australian Medical Association. A community viewpoint was put by the Director of Nursing of the Port Pirie Hospital. The South Australian Health Commission was represented, and the Director of Nursing of the Nursing Branch (Ms Carol Gaston) and the Nursing Educator at the Whyalla campus of the South Australian Institute of Technology School of Nursing gave a presentation. Had Government members been there perhaps a much stronger view would have been presented.

Perhaps the most telling tale at that conference was told by Dr Paul Rainsford when he quoted from the Social Health Atlas put out by the Health Commission and related the disadvantages of country health services. What astounded me was the percentage of disadvantaged sections of the community that are serviced by country health centres throughout the State.

I will endeavour to get the exact figures that were quoted but, for argument's sake, my recollection of the number of single parent families was 1½ times higher in the country than in the city. The country area has a quarter of the population of the State. So, when there are 1½ times as many single parent families in the country compared with

the city, surely those country health services require special consideration.

I have mentioned in other debates the fact that the Health Commission is endeavouring to change the role of some hospitals, ostensibly to contain costs. I point out that it is impracticable to move between some hospitals, such as, Wudinna and Elliston, because the roads are so poor and, in some cases, impassable. There have been many instances during this winter when it has been impossible to get through on those roads, and it is quite ludicrous to suggest that a joint CEO, a joint Director of Nursing or a joint doctor should be used for two hospitals 110 km apart on a dirt road which, for many parts of the year, is impassable. Unless this Government is prepared to recognise that movement between hospitals is possible, such a proposal will not succeed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Like all other members of the House, I receive a tremendous number of publications in the post seeking to inform me of various activities in the community. For example, in the past 24 hours, I have received the *News Bulletin* of the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the Jennings publication *The Leader*—relative to the activities of that group, a very good publication entitled '*Waste Management and the Environment*', the Angle Vale newsletter, the BHP Report to Shareholders 1990, and a document entitled 'Towards a Fair Australia. Social Justice Strategy Statement 1990-91.' Guess who sent me this? None other than Uncle Bob, the Prime Minister, the Hon. R.J.L. Hawke, and the Hon. Brian Howe, M.P., Minister for Community Services and Health and Minister assisting the Prime Minister for Social Justice. It was produced by the Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1990. What a load of doubletalk!

I would not dispute the validity of such a statement if it meant what it said, and if it was truly intended to benefit those towards whom it was directed. On the front page, under the heading 'Social Justice Measures: An Overview', the first paragraph of the introduction states:

The central objective of the Government's social justice strategy is to develop a fairer, more prosperous and more just society for every Australian. The strategy is directed at expanding choices and opportunities for people so that they are able to participate fully as citizens in economic, social and political life and are better able to determine the direction of their own lives.

A little further down it states:

Accordingly, the social justice strategy incorporates a mix of remedial and preventative measures that provide direct assistance to people experiencing disadvantage and assist them to escape that disadvantage.

Further on it refers to education, access to hospitalisation, access to transport, and a whole host of other initiatives, which many people in every electorate seek to obtain. In particular, I refer to the one that suggests there should be equity in relation to education. I will attempt to relate that to the position we have in South Australia which denies a large number of students access to the school of their choice on free transport.

Earlier this afternoon, the Minister of Transport indicated that he was proud of the free transport service that is being provided. I do not deny the value of that service to many people in the community. However, I question very seriously whether it is used for purposes other than going directly from home to school and home again. I am very critical of the doubletalk that takes place which suggests that everyone in the community with access to State transport is able to travel wherever they wish. That is truly not the situation. If you happen to live in the larger country towns like Port Augusta, Whyalla or Mount Gambier you have that benefit, but if you happen to live on the fringe of Adelaide such as Gawler and want to go, for example,

to the Nuriootpa High School (which is not as far as from Gawler to one of the Adelaide colleges or specialist schools), you suddenly find that you must pay to travel to that school.

A person who, for various reasons, wants to go to the Faith Lutheran Secondary School at Tanunda from the Gawler area, and from other areas, will find that they must pay to go to the school of their choice, the school which, in terms of this social justice document, will allow them better to determine the direction of their life. We have a situation where large numbers of families are penalised; large numbers of students denied the same opportunity as others in the community. Quite obviously, the Government continues to pander to some in the community whilst denying opportunity to a very large number of people who are also part of that conglomerate which is the South Australian population.

There is no difficulty in my mind with wanting to see an improvement in relation to hospitalisation for all the people who need it, but, for example, people in nursing homes in the past were able to benefit from a very high quality of attention and service, a service which has now been wound back because the Government wants us to go back to the lowest common denominator in the Commonwealth, rather than continuing with the highest common factor which was available and which has been utilised by South Australians for a long period of time. The aim ought to be to bring the services which are available up to a standard rather than taking people down to a standard. That is what is happening in this State, yet the Federal President of the ALP is doing nothing to assist the people in this State to gain what they want and partake of the type of protection that was available to them in the past.

It might be thought that I am talking about the past, because the early pages of this document talk about social justice in the 1980s. We then suddenly find that at page 5 of the document we are talking about 'Social Justice in the Nineties'. Here we learn that the momentum established in the 1980s is being carried forward into the new decade. The momentum which there might have been in the 1980s, as I have already illustrated, is going backwards in a number of areas. The protection of the community by the resources available to the Police Force is placing people in the quite untenable situation of feeling that they are prisoners in their own homes, unable to go out and unsure of their well-being if they utilise the Adelaide to Gawler railway service, for example, after 9 o'clock at night.

One has only to travel on that train to recognise the amount of vandalism and damage that has been done. One has only to talk to people who get off at Broadmeadows, Elizabeth, Evanston and even up into Gawler to discover the fear that they feel when using the subways that are a common feature of that line, where people are accosted and bashed; where they find that at the end of the line—particularly at the Gawler station—the motor vehicle they left there (because they live some distance from the rail head) has been tampered with or damaged. We are not going up into the 1990s as this book would have us believe.

Coming back to the theme of education that I spoke about before, we find in this document the following statement:

They have transformed the social security system from a passive system providing income support to an active system that is integrated with the education, employment, training, child care and rehabilitation systems to make social justice a reality for the long-term unemployed, sole parents and people with disabilities—three of the most disadvantaged groups in society.

Regrettably, there are those people in society, and they are not seeing what is being promised to them in glossy documents such as this. They are not receiving the benefit or being upgraded to a status improved from that which they

have enjoyed in the past, and I say to each and every member that, whilst this sort of document is being produced and distributed, obviously the Federal Government is talking with a forked tongue. They talk of locational difficulties; there are many locational difficulties.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Members will recall that last night in my reply to the budget I highlighted a multitude of factors, the first of which was that there was very little reference to agriculture in the budget and that in many ways it equated with the Federal budget, where it also received little more than one sentence. I went on to mention reference to land degradation and full tax deductibility for land degradation. What I omitted to mention was that, if a farmer wants to make a claim now, he will have to have a farm plan.

So, the socialist philosophy creeps further and further into the rural sector, and if the Government is giving any dollars to that sector it wants to know exactly what farmers are doing through a farm plan. It disturbs me greatly and many farmers who have contacted me are very upset that the Government offers something with one hand but virtually takes it away with the other hand, and if it does not take it away at least it has a nice, neat file for future reference.

I also referred to the cut in the budget, affecting some 70 people (which was not identified earlier in the budget paper itself); and I described how the motor registration fees for rural people will hit them hard and will increase costs in the rural sector; how payroll tax increases will have a negative effect on rural businesses, in particular; and how so much is not contained in the budget but, rather, the effect will be felt in increased taxes and charges. I referred to the fact that in several documents released during the last election campaign the statement was made that 'major Government charges will not rise above the rate of inflation'. Yet, we have seen that promise broken time and time again. When I took up that matter with the Minister of Labour in relation to an increased fee in his area of responsibility—where over past years the fees have been going up in line with the cost of living but are now going up under the Government's full cost recovery program—he made the following comments in a letter to me:

It would seem that you have misconstrued the Premier's commitment in relation to State Government charges. In his policy statement at the last election the Premier referred to increases in major domestic services such as water, electricity, gas and transport being left below CPI during the next term of the Government. The licence fee increases for keeping of dangerous substances are in line with the commitment to keep domestic and other charges to the general public to the CPI, but to seek cost recovery for specific services to industry.

So, when it suits the Government it makes up new rules. Well, if the Minister thinks that I have misconstrued the Premier's commitment, I would have him, the Premier and every other Government member know that the people of South Australia have been hoodwinked and now realise that they were sucked in to a commitment that the Premier had no intention of honouring.

Tonight I will consider further some of the aspects of the budget. As regards agriculture, referred to in the capital works program, it is interesting to see certain areas identified, and I compliment the Minister for allocating moneys to the Lenswood and Turretfield Research Centres. However, I notice that the largest single item in the capital works program is a figure of \$2.72 million. What is that for? It is for motor vehicles. I wonder where are the key priorities. If those motor vehicles are to be used to service rural areas,

I will acknowledge that that money needs to be spent, but it rather makes the other items of expenditure pale into insignificance.

Talking about motor vehicles, yesterday I was very disturbed at the way that the Minister, in response to the member for Playford and an interjection of mine, insinuated that I did not have the car industry at heart. He took issue with a comment that I made relating to the fact that, whereas he was saying we have one of the best car industries, I said that we hardly have an automotive industry. The Minister should appreciate that things are in a bad way. If he does not, he should open his eyes.

Only a few weeks ago, after having had years of the so-called Button plan to rescue the automotive industry, Ford Australia said that to keep going it needed a Government injection of \$150 million immediately or in the next few years. No-one can tell me that the motor vehicle industry is in good condition if one of the leading manufacturers has to say that virtually at the end of the period in which the Button plan was supposed to have solved all our ills. It looks as though our ills are only just beginning. The Minister cannot run away from it. He must recognise that a great deal of help is needed and that his fobbing around is not helping.

Of course, the Minister tried to throw it back on the Opposition. This is typical of the Government. It is not prepared to take the hard decisions and ask what our policy is in relation to tariffs. It is clear that our Federal Leader has said that it will be our aim to seek a reduction in tariffs, preferably to a zero level by the year 2000, but many conditions are attached to that. Unless those conditions are met, such as further deregulation in the labour market, restructuring on the wharves, and so on, it will not occur.

Yesterday the Minister said, 'The State Government does not say that there should be no reduction in tariffs. That is not the line we are taking.' The Minister acknowledges that his policy is to reduce tariffs. We will acknowledge that. However, I remind the Minister that, whilst seeking to criticise the Opposition, he seeks to do away with minimum pricing for the citrus industry, and he knows what that would do to so many growers: it would sink them overnight. So let us not have it both ways.

The rural industry is facing critical times in so many areas, and it is a shame that the budget has not addressed any of them. We appreciate that the wool price has dropped by 20 per cent and unfortunately sales are not going as they should be. The latest estimates from the Australian Wheat Board see a decline of 31 per cent in income. The Australian Wheat Board has confirmed that there could be a drop of between \$40 and \$45 per tonne leaving the farmers with a real \$100 per tonne on next season's wheat. That is more than a 30 per cent drop. It will have a disastrous effect on the rural industry.

The market for split peas is being affected by the problems in Iraq. Some \$2 million worth are in the balance at present. The pork row is continuing with the importation of meat from Canada, as is the proposed importation of chicken meat. The live sheep market is still far from any resolution. There are many problems facing the rural industry and this budget has done absolutely nothing for them. The Premier had the chance to take some tough decisions and get the manufacturing and rural sectors going. He has failed and South Australia is going to be the poorer for it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): The subject of my grievance tonight concerns some of the rather grubby and hypo-

critical responses to the 1990 budget from members of the Liberal Party. I would like to start off by talking about the comments of the Federal Liberal member for Hawker, Mrs Gallus, who in today's *Courier* newspaper has accused the State Government in its budget laid down last month of having 'hit pensioners hard and the changes were frightening them'. That is pretty incredible, coming from someone who belongs to a Party that is committed to cutting welfare spending. That is the Liberal policy, and that is what it advocated at the last election.

Mr Ferguson: And a broad-based consumption tax.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Yes, exactly. Mrs Gallus is a member of a Party that has promised to impose a consumption tax. Indeed, the shadow Treasurer, Mr Reith, has already conceded that, in the unfortunate event that his Party were elected to Government, he would seek to introduce a tax that does not compensate adequately those people who would be affected. He has already conceded that. In May this year he advocated a consumption tax that did not provide any additional compensation for future consumption out of current savings. This would mean that pensioners living off their life savings would find the purchasing power of their assets permanently reduced.

Mr Ferguson: And farmers, too.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Indeed. This is the Party to which that member belongs. These are the policies that Mrs Gallus is advocating, yet she has the gall to criticise this Government for making things tough for pensioners. Therefore, I would like to give some details about welfare spending in the Federal budget. In fact, welfare spending in the Federal budget was increased by 12.3 per cent, which is actually up 5.8 per cent after inflation.

What has happened to pensions is that they have increased by 9.9 per cent in real terms since March 1983, when the Hawke Government was elected. What did the Fraser Government do in a similar period of seven years in office? It cut pensions by 2.4 per cent in real terms. That is the record. If members want to judge what a Labor Government will do and what a Liberal Government will do, they could not get a better comparison than that. Here we have a Federal Liberal member with the gall to accuse the State and Federal Governments of making things tough for pensioners. The other point I would like to make concerns comments of the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Dr Hewson) in the *Advertiser* of 22 August, as follows:

Social security and welfare spending was 'rocketing ahead' and the Government needed to make tough decisions.

What sort of tough decisions? He stated:

... measures such as the coalition's plan to cut unemployment benefits were needed.

Dr Hewson just wants to cut benefits. That is what the Federal Liberal Party is proposing, yet we have members such as the member for Hawker and some members in this House who criticise the Government for cutting spending.

The second bit of gall and hypocrisy of members opposite that I want to talk about concerns some of their complaints about the Hudson review of water charges. The member for Fisher was one who has actually been on the radio trying to distort this. We have had the members for Heysen, Chaffey and Hayward who have all had a go at misrepresenting this new water charging scheme. They have been talking about it as a property and wealth tax. All I can say is that they have obviously not read the Hudson report, which was a detailed, reasoned and logical report on water charges. In fact, it is one of the best written reports on this sort of economic policy that I have seen in some time.

The fact is that we have had a property element in water charging in this State since the Waterworks Act was intro-

duced in 1882 (at least 108 years ago). In the early days the property component was the only component of water charges: it was totally a charge on property. The current system involves a charge on property, currently .188 per cent. This property charge, which applies to the whole value of the property, is then divided by 75c to give a water allowance in kilolitres. This minimum charge has to be paid whatever the property value. Once the allowance that is related to the property charge is exceeded, water costs 75c a kilolitre above that.

What is proposed by Hugh Hudson? There are two components to the water charge, the same as there always has been. As before, there is a property element. However, Hudson proposes that there be a minimum access charge of \$102 plus a property value rate of 0.078 per cent (and note that that compares with the existing property value rate of 0.188 per cent, which is less than half the rate). This charge applies not from zero but to the excess value above \$100 000. The other component price of the water charge is 75c per kilolitre for all water used per annum in excess of 136 kL.

I would like to give an example from the Hudson report which illustrates how these charges work. For a property that is valued at \$100 000, the water rate in 1988-89 would have been \$174, and that is based purely on property values. As I said, that is the way it has been since 1882. There is then an additional charge of 75c per kilolitre for water usage above 232 kL. The new charge would be \$102 plus 75c per kilolitre for water usage above 136 kL. So, the change means that, if a person with a property of that value were to use 136 kL, they would gain \$72, and if they used up to 232 kL that gain would be zero. Above that there would be no difference. So, for someone whose property is valued at \$100 000 there would be no difference.

Let us consider the case of a property valued at \$500 000. Under the current system the amount payable, based on the rate of .174 per cent, would be \$870, and that equates to water usage of 1 160 kL. In excess of that, the cost is 75c per kilolitre. Under the new rate the cost would be \$414 for the property component which is, in fact, less than half of what it was previously. So, this is the new wealth tax, this new property tax that members opposite are talking about—\$414 plus 75c per kilolitre for water consumption in excess of 136 kL. What this means is that, for a property valued at \$500 000, and provided the householder used less than 744 kL, he would actually save money.

The average consumption for a household in Adelaide is about 340 kL. So, in this property valued at \$500 000, you could use about double the water of the average household and pay less than under the existing system. This is the supposed property tax members opposite are talking about. What nonsense that is. Some members opposite have actually attacked the very reason for having a property component. Those who do that cannot have read properly the Hudson report. Indeed there are very good reasons why there should be a property component and that is why it has existed for 108 years at least. One reason is that it is necessary for fighting fires. Pipes not only deliver water to houses but also have excess capacity for firefighting for industries and the commercial sector. If it was not for that excess capacity, insurance premiums to cover damage caused by fire would be significantly higher than they are now.

The point is that extra capital cost is needed to supply water, and that includes extra maintenance and other running costs. We have to provide water over and above what is required for ordinary use. These costs relate to the additional costs of larger pipes and mains coupled with the

increased costs of installation and the additional costs of storage, particularly residential storage tanks.

It is reasonable to suggest that in residential areas some 40 per cent or more of costs are incurred by supplying the excess capacity that is needed for firefighting. What we should have—and of course this is what Hugh Hudson has drawn up—is a system that will recover that amount for water use. It is highly desirable that we should move towards a user-pays system. At the same time, it is appropriate that we should recover from the property a charge that relates to the cost of the property. Apart from the minor customer-related charges the costs are primarily related to property values because of this—

Mr S.J. Baker: That has nothing to do with the supply of water.

Mr HOLLOWAY: It does indeed. That is what honourable members cannot understand: you must have extra pipes. If you are going to be able to fight fires effectively you need additional capacity. The other element that comes into this—

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: This applies in the more salubrious suburbs—the sort of suburbs that the member for Mitcham represents. In my electorate, I do not have too many properties that are worth \$500 000 or more. However, in his electorate the cost of installation is greater because it has bigger street frontages.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I will direct my comments through you. In addition, I refer to the nature of the terrain in some electorates, such as Heysen, for example, where, constituents are being cross-subsidised by people in suburbs on the plains, as it costs more to provide the service because of the terrain and of the frontages. It is entirely appropriate that there be an element in that charge which reflects the higher property value. In short, the sort of attacks that we have had from the Liberal Party show that it either does not understand the new scheme or that it is deliberately misrepresenting it.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am very pleased indeed that the Minister now at the table is the Minister responsible for the planning portfolio, because I would like to discuss, in the short time that I have available to me, a couple of matters relating to that portfolio. The first thing that I would like to talk about is the release of the Mount Lofty Ranges review. I realise that the Minister is not in a position in the present circumstances to answer questions, but there is certainly a question as to when the release of the review is to occur. I am told that the Mount Lofty Ranges review submission is, and, indeed has been for some time, before Cabinet.

I do not know why there has been a delay in regard to the release, but all sorts of rumours have been going around for a while suggesting that it would be released the week before last, then last week, and then some time this week. I have no idea when we will see it. However, I have had the opportunity, as I understand have a large number of people, to see the report. We presume that it is the final report that has fallen off all sorts of trucks in recent times and, if that is the case (we will have to wait and see), I have some considerable concerns about the results of the review.

I would like to be constructive and optimistic about the results of the review. However, the ambiguity and shallowness of the document that I have seen makes that very

difficult indeed. The review has been a very costly and a very lengthy exercise which, regrettably, has done very little, it would seem, to solve the water quality problems. I have always believed that that was one of the main reasons for establishing the review, one of the other reasons being to provide a clear direction for the future of the Mount Lofty Ranges.

Over a very long period we have seen a considerable number of reports prepared about the future of the Mount Lofty Ranges. I have asked the library to carry out some research into that matter and, while that is not available at present, I would not be at all surprised if, over the past 15 or 20 years, some 10 or so major reports had been commissioned into the Mount Lofty Ranges.

One that comes to mind is the very detailed report that was carried out by the Monarto commission. That report into the future of the Mount Lofty Ranges contained many recommendations, and it was regarded as an excellent report when it was released publicly. I have no idea what has happened to that report. I guess it is with a lot of other reports, gathering dust somewhere in the department. I will be interested to see the information that is provided by the Library regarding the number of reports that have been prepared over time.

It seems to me that a first-class opportunity to set down appropriate goals and to attempt to come to terms with current issues relating to the management of the ranges has been lost. No major advancement has been made regarding controls over the watershed catchment area and, more importantly, the copy of the report that I have seen does not put forward any alternatives, as might have been expected. It makes commonsense that alternatives would be provided by the review team.

The concept of establishing a Mount Lofty Ranges authority is supported, as long as it does not mean a duplication of staffing needs, the establishment of another bureaucracy and unnecessary delays in decision making. I am not sure how this new authority will be administered, and all sorts of suggestions are floating around as to how it might be handled. But, I have some concerns on those three points. I am aware that local authorities throughout the Hills have called for such an authority to be established and, if that proposition comes forward in the final report, I will do everything I can to support the authority and make sure that it works effectively.

Considerable importance will rest on the selection of the most appropriate person to chair the new authority, and I am interested to know whether the Minister has anyone in mind for that position, but we will have to see. While a considerable amount of work has been carried out to determine growth rates for the metropolitan area, little guidance has been provided through the review to assist in areas identified for growth within the Mount Lofty Ranges. The report that I have seen does not contain any resolution on the determination of town boundaries. Regrettably, for some time the E&WS Department has stuck rigidly with the previous boundaries and has been reticent to consider current circumstances.

It seems that many of the issues raised during the consultation process have not been addressed, including the concerns of primary producers who, in many cases, are fighting to continue to be able to produce in the ranges. Anyone who knows anything about the conditions of producers in the near urban areas recognises the problems that they face as urban areas expand. It is essential that some guidance is provided in regard to boundaries of existing towns. It is absurd that, after such a major study, so many

towns in the catchment area do not have deep drainage or CED schemes, and I have argued that for a long time.

It seems quite crazy that the Government puts a high priority on the need for improved water quality in the metropolitan area (and I support that strongly) but fails to consider the priority of ensuring that built-up areas are provided with either sewer connections or CED schemes—and I could cite many examples.

So, where does the report leave us now? Obviously, there is a need for the State Government to make a commitment to ensure that the report does not rest with the others gathering dust. There is also a desperate need for answers to be provided to the many questions that have not been addressed during the review process. The establishment of the regional authority will not necessarily provide the answers. Therefore, it is important that we pick up the pieces and that everyone work together to ensure that this vitally important matter is treated with a lot of support. In the seconds remaining to me, it is important to put to the Minister the need to release this review.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I rise tonight initially to offer congratulations; in fact, I wish to commend the Government for finally approving expenditure for a new school at Hallett Cove. A sum of \$1.218 million of an estimated \$3.9 million total cost has been allocated this financial year to enable construction of the school to begin.

The plans for this school are something about which the Education Department and residents can justifiably feel proud. They are also a credit to the staff of Sacon. The plans show the site and buildings designed as a group of houses, and this project I believe is an important test of new methods of designing and building schools.

The school site and buildings have been designed as a group of houses minus some of their internal walls and fittings. The design is based on the expectation that the school will operate for at least 15 years and that the site and buildings will eventually be sold as houses and vacant allotments.

I believe that the design of the school can, in part, be attributed to the innovative ability of the Cove/Marino Baptist Church. When I first visited the worship centre of that church some three years ago, I could not help but be impressed. At that time, the worship centre was in a house on Zwerner Drive, Hallett Cove. The house had a double garage with no internal walls between the lounge and the double garage, and the lounge and the kitchen area. There were no fittings in the kitchen area and the absence of internal walls and fittings provided a large hall area for worship and community activities, while the bedrooms were used as offices and small meeting rooms for Sunday school teaching rooms. The bathroom and toilet facilities were used for what one might expect those facilities to be used, and the laundry was used as a kitchen. The church has since sold the building as a home and has built a magnificent new worship centre and community facility around the corner.

On my first visit to that Baptist worship centre some three years ago, my immediate reaction was: why can we not do this in our schools? So, I contacted the Education Department and informed it of this wonderful innovative facility developed by the Baptist Church. The Education Department looked at it and agreed. In fact, during the period of my candidacy as the Liberal candidate for Bright, I repeatedly called on the Government to build the school, and with the then Liberal Leader (John Olsen) I undertook

to build a school of the type that has now been approved by this Government.

The new school owes much to the efforts of the local community and, in particular, I would like to mention the Karrara Residents Association, the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association and the Hallett Cove School Council. I was pleased to have the opportunity to support the lobbying of these groups to assist them in obtaining the school that Hallett Cove so desperately needs.

The present Hallett Cove R-10 school has the second largest junior primary school component in South Australia, and by the end of this year there will be some 1 030 students at that school. The new school will help alleviate the pressures generated by high student numbers and will provide the flexibility for education to year 12 to become a reality at Hallett Cove. For a long time, I have been calling for the new school, when built, to operate as a campus of the nearby Hallett Cove R-10 school, and I am delighted once again to note that the budget papers state that this will happen.

I believe this will provide the principal of the existing R-10 school maximum flexibility to utilise the two school campuses to their full potential. As an example, I believe he could utilise the existing R-10 school as a 4-12 campus, with the new school becoming both the R-3 campus as well as providing education for years 4 to 7. I will continue to negotiate these different options with the Education Department to achieve education to year 12 at Hallett Cove.

I made a commitment with the then Liberal Leader (John Olsen) when we jointly announced on 23 August 1989 that a new Hallett Cove school would be built, to open in 1991, and that education would be extended to year 12 at the R-10 school. Some two weeks later, this Government announced that it, too, would build a new school at Hallett Cove to open in 1991. My only disappointment with the budget announcement with respect to this new school is that, unfortunately, the Government has reneged on its commitment to open that school in 1991. Regrettably, it will not now open until 1992. Additional difficulties will be experienced through pressure on education facilities in the next 12 months, but I am sure that the local residents are prepared to put up with that, knowing that their school is finally coming.

I have spent some time in this address so far talking about the school, and I will conclude that topic by handing out three more commendations. They all concern the same aspect of the school, that is, the pick-up and set-down facilities. Parking for parents at schools picking up or setting down their children has been recognised as a problem by members of both sides of this House for a long time. The problem is one that causes aggravation and concern for parents and has resulted in a protracted argument between local governments and the Education Department. I wish to commend the Marion council for sticking to its guns and—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW:—insisting that the Education Department provide pick-up and set-down facilities at the new Hallett Cove school. Further (and it is not just to make the member for Alexandra happy tonight) I also wish to commend the Public Works Standing Committee for strongly recommending—and, indeed, it did strongly recommend—that a Government policy be developed for car parking in new schools. Indeed, I have also passed on that commendation outside this place and it is very important that it be placed on the record here tonight.

Finally, I wish to commend the Minister for Environment and Planning (and I am pleased to see that she is here tonight) for directing Sacon and the Minister of Education

to provide a combined car park and pick-up/set-down bay at the school site. In fact, these milestone recommendations and directives, I believe, offer a refreshing promise of more logical approaches in the future to school parking problems. It is nice to be able to occasionally hand out some accolades and commendations in this place but, regrettably and unfortunately, I cannot do the same for the Minister of Health, even on the night of his birthday.

The Minister of Health has either unwittingly or perhaps deliberately misled the House by fudging hospital bed statistics in this place. On 16 August 1990, in reply to an obvious Dorothy Dix question from the member for Mitchell, the Minister stated:

In the south there are 4.11 beds per 1 000, not three as the honourable member stated.

The Minister was referring to a statement I made in this place on 9 August when I said there was a bed population ratio of approximately three beds per 1 000 people in the south. I stand by that statement and will elaborate a little more later.

In his answer to the question by the member for Mitchell, the Minister further stated that these southern hospital beds are 'made up of 834 public and 549 private hospital beds'. He also stated that, on the completion of the Noarlunga Hospital, a further 120 public beds would be available. I note that the Minister did not state when those beds would be available. Of course since that time, and to the embarrassment of members opposite, the Minister of Health has admitted that the hospital will not be ready for patients until late April 1991, and at that stage only 40 of the 120 beds will be available. In the meantime, some 20 administrative and financing staff are employed at that hospital, a new hospital with absolutely no patients at all—not one!

However, let us get back to the fudged figures on southern hospital beds that the Minister presented to this House. The figures were so over-stated that the member for Fisher was led to exclaim, 'He must be counting the beds at Le Cornu'. Well, close scrutiny of the Minister's figures will show that, while he did not count the beds at Le Cornu, he did count beds that should not have been counted. I stated in this place that there are 620 public beds for the south, and they include 516 beds at the Flinders Medical Centre, absolutely no beds at the Noarlunga Hospital, 39 beds at the Southern Districts Hospital, and 65 beds at the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital. That is a total of 620 in all for those members opposite who cannot add up, but the Minister claims that 834 beds are available to the public in the south.

In fact, the 214 bed difference between my figures and those of the Minister can be found by looking closely at the Repatriation Hospital. There is a total of 279 beds at that hospital but, as the Minister is well aware, only some 20 per cent are available to the general public. The Minister fudged his figures by adding in 279 beds to his total public bed availability figure. Perhaps I should not have mentioned the Le Cornu beds for, who knows, the Minister might add those into his figures next time.

Let us also look in detail at the private hospital figures. Blackwood Hospital has 61 beds, Fullarton has 44, Glenelg has 45, Griffith has 57, Hartley has 24, Holdfast has 27, the Pier has 17 and the Vale has 65. The Minister claimed there are 549 beds, but he has added the 209 beds from the Ashford Community Hospital to the southern bed figures. He has fudged it again, because Ashford Hospital is part of the western planning area as—and the member for Albert Park would be well aware of this—are four other private hospitals, that is, Hindmarsh, Le Fevre and Port Adelaide, South West Community and Western Community.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I want to congratulate the member for Stuart, because now we have one small business expert out of 22 on the other side. That is an excellent response! The only thing the member for Hartley has ever done is to screw up all of the small business in the land tax area—the other thing was in the leasing area. He is now getting plenty of help from this side to get that right, too. I congratulate the member for Stuart for putting her point of view on behalf of small business. It is nice, as I said, to see that one out of the 22 members on the other side will give us the opportunity of sharing her knowledge, and I am quite sure that in the future we will hear many things from her in that area.

The fascinating thing, however, is our Premier. The Premier stood up here tonight and talked about land tax. He said that he has done a wonderful job for small businesses in this State through land tax. What has he done? He had more complaints on one single issue than on any other in this place. He took a base level from the past year and increased it by over \$8 million and added another 6 000 people to those in small business who pay land tax, and said, 'Gee, I've done a wonderful job.' Six thousand more small businessmen and women are involved in land tax payments this year, yet the Premier says that he is doing a good job!

The other issue I should like to talk about was brought up in the Auditor-General's Report, and I refer to the Motor Vehicles Registration Division computer. In 1982, just before the Liberal Party went out of Government, the Hon. Dean Brown put forward a suggestion for an on-line computer system of motor vehicle registration.

Mr Groom: You've got his seat.

Mr INGERSON: No, I haven't, actually.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Did you vote for him as President?

Mr INGERSON: Yes, I did.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr INGERSON: I apologise for that, Mr Speaker. The Hon. Dean Brown introduced an on-line computer system in the Motor Vehicles Registration Division. It has taken nearly eight years and \$9.5 million for that to bear fruit. What we saw a couple of months ago was a total failure of the system when the computers in the Motor Vehicle Registration Division could not work. The reason why they could not work is very simple. There was a recommendation from two computer companies to put in a bigger computer. They had a recommendation to change the software, but they ignored all of that because of cost.

The Government went against the advice of the experts and the result was an absolute disaster when the system called 'drivers on line' was brought in about two months ago. I hear the comments of the member for Bright in the background. The honourable member has had a bit of experience with computers and he knows that the whole system—

An honourable member: A little bit! He's an expert.

Mr INGERSON: I apologise; he is an expert. The honourable member and others have told me that it was a first-class mix-up. Again, this is another example of what the Government has done in relation to computers. It has no idea of how to manage computers or how to manage services to the community. This is another example of a bungle. I was fascinated to see in the budget that the Technology Development Corporation has had its funds reduced. It is

fascinating that in a year in which we have had the MFP being promoted as the big panacea for the Labor Party, we also see that the Technology Development Corporation has had its funds reduced by \$116 000.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What was the question?

Mr INGERSON: The member for Napier knows full well that in my Address in Reply speech I supported in principle the development of the MFP. What I have said here is that it is fascinating that the Government, having proposed the MFP and the multi-million dollar expenditure that will be required to develop that very sophisticated project, has reduced the funding for the Technology Development Corporation by \$116 000. I do not think that the Government is fair dinkim about technology development in this State: it is just grandstanding on the part of the Government by putting the project to the State.

I notice that the Premier will visit the Nice development this year on his way through Europe but, at the same time that he is looking at that MFP development, he has decided to cut back the money available for Technology Park. That is ridiculous.

Mr Groom: Would you increase it?

Mr INGERSON: Of course it should be increased and, as the member for Hartley would know if he had a little bit of intelligence, one should increase development technology at Technology Park. If we cannot make Technology Park work how can we develop an MFP? The honourable member knows that we should be developing it and increasing the budget for that project. It is quite ridiculous for this Government to stand before the people of South Australia and say that we need to spend millions of dollars in research for the MFP and yet we cannot allocate \$116 000 to balance the budget at Technology Park.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House tonight the fact that the Residential Tenancies Fund balance at the start of the financial year was \$21 million and at the end of the year the balance was \$27.18 million. That is an increase in the fund of \$7 million. What is the reason for having \$27 million in a Residential Tenancies Fund? There is no justification for having that sort of bond money tied up in any fund in the difficult times that we are experiencing at the moment. Virtually no money is paid out of that fund and the \$27 million is hidden away and is unused. We have the Housing Trust calling out for money, yet we have \$27 million of private individuals' money tied up earning interest for the Government, but nothing goes back into the bonds money received. That is a disgrace.

Finally, I turn to Foundation South Australia. When Foundation South Australia was set up to raise money for sport and for the arts, we were told it would be the tightest administration that we could get. We were told it would be of the order of \$250 000. Last year the administration of Foundation South Australia cost \$862 000. We were told that it would be \$250 000, but \$862 000 has gone in grandstanding by Foundation South Australia. Looking further down, we see that \$229 000 has gone into promoting the foundation. That is a disgrace. That money should have gone to developing sport, culture and art for kids. There has been an increase in salaries from \$161 000 to \$298 000. We were told in this Parliament that it would be a lean and hungry organisation. The way it has been managed is an absolute disgrace. Also, \$63 000 has gone out in consultancy fees. It should have gone to our kids so that we could improve their techniques in sport and it should have gone towards the art and culture areas.

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

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Earlier this afternoon, during Question Time, I took a point of order on the Minister of Education, asserting that he had referred to an allegation against the Auditor-General. Later, in completing his answer, the Minister indicated—and I take this from the transcript—that he had not alluded to the Auditor-General in the manner which was stated. So that my own veracity is not in question, I draw attention to the fact that in response to the question from the member for Davenport, the Minister indicated:

... Yesterday a press release was issued by the Opposition which quoted almost word for word, as I understand it, the comments made in the Auditor-General's Report, which was released many hours after release of the press release. That, I believe, requires investigation of the Auditor-General.

Subsequently, the Minister, referring to the Auditor-General, implied two things: first, that the Auditor-General had allowed by some means the material from the Auditor-General's Report to escape and, secondly, that the Hon. Mr Lucas had used material which had been purloined.

The point was properly taken and upheld. I bear no malice against the Minister, who subsequently said that he believed it was possibly a misunderstanding of his vocabulary. However, I draw attention to the fact that the official report clearly indicates that the points claimed against the Minister were factual.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PAYNEHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GROOM: Today, the Liberal shadow Minister of Education, Mr Rob Lucas, MLC, issued a press release dealing with the proposed closure of Payneham Primary School. He said in the press release:

The State Opposition today slammed the Bannon Government for breaking a promise regarding Payneham Primary School's future. Liberal Shadow Minister of Education, Rob Lucas, said the Labor member for Hartley, Terry Groom, had assured the school and parents on good advice that Payneham would not close provided student enrolments did not fall below 100.

He went on to say:

The Education Minister, Mr Crafter, must explain who told Mr Groom that Payneham Primary would not close while it retained a minimum of 100 students.

He added:

That advice must have come from either the Minister or senior officers in his department. Mr Groom is a responsible member and would not mislead his electorate.

That last comment is the only accurate thing in this statement.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: time and again we are reminded that in a personal explanation we have to stick to the pertinent elements.

The SPEAKER: The point is taken. The member will not debate the issue but will be clear and concise.

Mr GROOM: In answer to that serious series of allegations, I indicate that in 1984 Payneham Primary School was earmarked for closure—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: There he goes again. It's not a debate.

Mr GROOM: I am not debating it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders are clear about personal explanations: the matter may not be debated. A personal explanation must be very precise.

Mr GROOM: With the leave of the House I am seeking to explain the way in which I have been grossly misrepresented by the shadow Minister of Education.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Now you are reflecting on someone from another place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has sought leave for a personal explanation and he has the right to explain the situation, as the previous member did. He wishes to explain the situation that brought about the need for the personal explanation. I have asked him to be very precise, but he has the right to explain the situation, as all members do, with a personal explanation.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My explanation is this: in 1984 the school was earmarked for closure when enrolments then stood at 196. At that time, I intervened in relation to the earmarking of the school for closure and the then Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold) indicated in general terms that if a primary school experienced consistent yearly intakes of below 100 enrolments it would have to be seriously looked at in relation to closure.

This has always been put by me since that time as a broad generalisation, and it is not to exclude any other factors. So, the shadow Minister's information is six years out of date and he has the wrong Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Just listen. The closure is a serious problem for the school. In 1976 enrolments stood at 637 students and in 1990 enrolments stood at 108. In 1991 there will be only five reception year students—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I am very reluctant to rise again on a point of order, but you know that this is going far and beyond what is a fair thing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not believe so. I believe that an explanation is needed.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is clarifying the position concerning a statement which has been made and which has been brought up after a time. I have asked the member not to debate the matter. He has not debated it since that caution and he is explaining the situation over some years that has brought about the need for a personal explanation. At this stage the Chair will accept the explanation, but I will listen carefully.

Mr GROOM: I will not be long, but I want to complete my explanation. Next year there will be only five reception year students enrolled at the school, seven students in year 6 and 12 students in year 7. When the facts have been assessed by the local community at a public meeting scheduled for tomorrow night I will, as I have always done, support the wishes of the local community. To finalise, the Hon. Mr Lucas's statement were made without checking his facts or the accuracy of his sources, and it is nothing more than a poor attempt to play politics with the school community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 6 September at 11 a.m.