

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 12 October 1982

The **PRESIDENT** (Hon. A.M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Prisoners (Interstate Transfer),
Royal Commissions Act Amendment,
Survival of Causes of Action Act Amendment.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin):

Pursuant to Statute—
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1981-82.
Racing Act, 1976-1981—Greyhound Racing Rules—
Trials.

Identification, Weights and Trials.
Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Declared
Hospitals for Blood Analysis.

By the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Minister of
Local Government (Hon. C.M. Hill):

Pursuant to Statute—
Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Book and
Materials Grant.
Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—

The Independent Order of Odd Fellows Grand Lodge
of South Australia—Alterations and Amendments
to the Constitution.

The South Australian Ancient Order of Foresters
Friendly Society; The South Australian District
No. 81, Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly
Society; Hibernian-Australasian Catholic Benefit
Society of S.A.; The South Australian United
Ancient Order of Druids Friendly Society—
Amendments to General Laws.

Australian Natives' Association; Independent Order
of Rechabites Albert District No. 83—Amend-
ments to General Laws.

Kindergarten Union of South Australia—Report, 1981.
Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.
Corporation of Thebarton—By-law No. 46—Lodging
Houses.

By the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Minister of
Arts (Hon. C.M. Hill):

Pursuant to Statute—
The Art Gallery Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Minister
Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs (Hon. C.M.
Hill):

Pursuant to Statute—
South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission—Report,
1982.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J.C.
Burdett):

Pursuant to Statute—
Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1981—Regula-
tions—Prescribed Hospitals for Abortions.
Health Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—Control of Chlo-
ropicrin.

QUESTIONS

FORESTRY CONSULTANCIES

The **Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON**: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community

Welfare, representing the Minister of Forests, a question about overseas forestry consultancies.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON**: In 1979 the Iraqi Government expressed considerable interest in South Australian forestry expertise, including the purchase of complete nurseries to produce tree seedlings. Unfortunately for South Australia, the State Government did not follow up these requests from the Iraqi Government, and nothing was developed in the way of an overseas project in forestry. Later, the Iraqi Minister of Agriculture, for the autonomous region in the north where the South Australian project is located, visited South Australia and again asked for expertise in the forestry area, and again the Government did nothing about it.

I now understand that the Iraqi Government has renewed its requests for expertise in forestry and has asked the South Australian Government to send a mission to northern Iraq to look at opportunities for South Australian forestry expertise. Will the Minister of Forests respond favourably to this request from the Iraqi Government and send a mission to Iraq to look at forestry opportunities in that country? If the Minister decides to send a mission, how many people will be involved, and for how long will they go to Iraq?

The **Hon. J.C. BURDETT**: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

REPETITION INJURIES

The **Hon. J.R. CORNWALL**: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about repetition injuries.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.R. CORNWALL**: On page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* an article headed 'Work hazard: firms warned' states:

A leading insurance company has warned employers to act to combat tenosynovitis in the work-place. Tenosynovitis, which is caused by repetitive manual work, is described as pain and swelling in the hand or forearm which can cause difficulty with even simple chores. The managing director of Edward Lumley (Brokers) Pty Ltd, Mr I. J. Williams, says companies need to act promptly to protect themselves against the serious financial and industrial consequences of tenosynovitis. He says this is reflected by the increases in workers compensation costs which, for some companies, have exceeded their profit.

The article goes on to report him as saying:

Poor work-place design with inappropriate work flow and bench height, improper upper limb and seating positioning are major factors. Early detection is essential to avoid extreme pain and long-term injury. Rest had been the only consistently effective treatment.

Mr Williams is then quoted as saying:

... there are important social and economic reasons for the employer to instil work practices which deter the growth of such a major disability.

Apparently, these very sensible sentiments are not shared by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry or the Tonkin Government. For the past six weeks the Working Womens Centre has been endeavouring to conduct a campaign on repetition injury. It is designed primarily to increase awareness of the problem amongst employees and employers, and to devise solutions.

It would be the understatement of the year to say that the Government has been less than enthusiastic in this matter. The Government seems to take the reprehensible view that, if it says nothing, it can suppress the problem.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! This is really not an explanation: it is only comment.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Mr President, it is really an explanation—I wish I could say more. It seems that the Government has a strange, very ill-informed, and short-sighted notion that, by doing nothing, it is protecting the interests of employers. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth, as exemplified by the recorded statements of Mr Williams.

Has the Government any programmes to collect comprehensive statistics and determine by survey the nature and extent of repetition injuries in the South Australian workforce? Has the Government any programme to educate employees, employers, and general medical practitioners about the problem? Has the Government any plans to involve the trade union movement and employer groups in a campaign to control the problem? Finally, does the occupational health branch of the South Australian Health Commission or the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment have programmes to assist in devising acceptable work speeds, patterns, and rosters to prevent the injuries?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N.K. FOSTER: Mr President, am I in order in asking a supplementary question, even though the Minister has said that he will refer the question to his colleague?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is in order, provided his question refers to the question that was asked previously.

The Hon. N.K. FOSTER: Yes, it does. Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, say what research has been undertaken in South Australia in respect of this disease? Is it not a fact that the problem has been known for the past eight to 10 years? What research has been undertaken in that time on the pressures on the keyboard operators in the day-to-day operations of these machines? If research has been undertaken, will the Minister give some detail when replying to this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

ELDERS SHARE TRANSACTIONS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I ask the Attorney-General the following questions regarding the von Doussa inquiry into Elders share transactions:

1. Has the special investigator, Mr J. von Doussa, Q.C., completed his inquiry and report into the Elders share transactions?

2. If not, when is it anticipated that the report will be handed to the Attorney-General?

3. Does the completion of the report depend on Mr von Doussa's obtaining answers from Mr Owens, or will the report be completed despite Mr Owens' failure to answer questions put by Mr von Doussa?

4. Will the report be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is 'No'. Regarding the second question, I am not aware when the report will be handed to me. That is a matter for the special investigator.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: When do you expect it?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is in the hands of the special investigator.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Do you expect it this year?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: With respect to the third question, again, that is a matter for decision by the special investigator. Regarding the Leader's fourth question, I am not in a position without seeing a report (and I have not yet been presented with one) to be able to indicate whether or not such a report will be tabled.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That answer is quite unsatisfactory. Has the Attorney-General no information from the special investigator as to when such report is likely to be completed? Does he believe that the report is likely to be presented within the next few months or the next few weeks? If the Attorney-General does not know when this report will be presented, will he ascertain from the special investigator when a report is likely to be handed to him?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I think that I have made quite clear publicly that I will be very interested to see the report as soon as it becomes available after the special investigator has completed his work. I certainly expect to receive that report this year. Within what time frame I will receive that report is really a matter for the special investigator. However, he knows that, as soon as he has completed his work, and indeed the report, I will be most interested to receive it.

NURSE EDUCATION

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, about nurse education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It has been brought to my attention that the Nurses Board of South Australia has advised the Port Lincoln Hospital Management Board that it is to cease intakes of student nurses in June 1983. I am informed that, although the Port Lincoln Hospital accepts that its school of nursing will be closed eventually, its representatives have been involved in discussions with the Whyalla and Port Augusta Hospitals with a view to having a joint Eyre Peninsula regional school of nursing established as a means of ensuring that some form of nurse education system remains in that country area.

It will take some time for this proposal to come to fruition, if it ever does, and certainly some time for it to be thoroughly examined. I understand that the Port Lincoln Hospital has asked the Nurses Board to postpone the closure of the Port Lincoln School of Nursing until its proposal in relation to the Whyalla and Port Augusta Hospitals is thoroughly investigated. It seems to me that this is an eminently reasonable request by the Port Lincoln Hospital Management Board. Most members would be aware of the necessity to retain maximum employment and training facilities in country areas of the State. It is most desirable and something that we would all wish to see.

Will the Minister ask the Nurses Board to retract the ultimatum that it gave to the Port Lincoln Hospital Board to cease its intake of student nurses as of June 1983? This will allow time for a proper evaluation of the proposal by the Port Lincoln Hospital for an Eyre Peninsula regional school of nursing which, if agreed to, would retain some form of nurse education in the region.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

RHEOBATRACHUS SILUS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to the question that I asked on 25 August regarding *Rheobatrachus silus*?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The State Government's support for the research work being undertaken at the University of Adelaide on the method of reproduction of the frog, *Rheobatrachus Silus*, is expressed through a State instrumentality, the Savings Bank, which is promoting the appeal, and is contributing \$4 000 to the appeal.

YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a reply to the question that I asked on 28 July about the Youth Advisory Panel?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Information provided by the Minister of Industrial Affairs confirms my understanding that members of the Youth Advisory Panel were selected on the basis of their personal qualities rather than their status representing any particular group. The Minister did not consult with the office of the Women's Adviser prior to making appointments to the panel, but sought the views and suggestions of individuals and organisations concerned with youth activities. Included on the panel are two competent and articulate young women who, together with other members, contribute to a committee whose range of expertise is considerable.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I ask a supplementary question. Is it not a fact that all Ministers were asked to consult with the office of the Women's Adviser prior to making appointments to any boards, panels, or committees, with a view to seeing whether there were suitably qualified women for the position? As the Minister did not follow this procedure, will he say why the recommended procedure was not followed?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer that question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

ABORTION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question I asked on 26 August about abortion?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: My colleague, the Minister of Health, has informed me that a meeting occurred between the authors of the report and officers of the South Australian Health Commission following receipt of a paper entitled 'An Examination of Services in South Australia for Therapeutic Termination of Pregnancy in the First Trimester 1980-81'. The submission was based on 'a survey of 240 women referred by the Family Planning Association and Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre for abortion between August 1980 and January 1981'. This represents 5.9 per cent of all abortions during the year, and a quarter of them (59 women) were private patient referrals.

As the content of this submission was not based on a representative sample of women requesting abortion at teaching hospital clinics in South Australia, and as it was already 12 months out of date, a survey was undertaken during March 1982 by the South Australian Health Commission in conjunction with the teaching hospitals which provide special services for hospital patients requesting termination of pregnancy under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The authors of the submission were advised by the Chairman of the commission that consideration of the paper would be deferred until the commission data had been analysed and studied.

The authors of the submission also wrote to my colleague, the Minister of Health, who requested that officers of the South Australian Health Commission should meet with them to discuss their submission. By arrangement, this was deferred until the draft survey conducted in March 1982 had been circulated to the participating hospitals for their comments, and until the final report was available.

As a result of consultations which have begun between the commission and the metropolitan recognised hospitals, it is anticipated that every effort will be made to reduce hospital delays as soon as possible. It should be noted,

however, that 'non-hospital' delays cannot be addressed by hospital services.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Health proposing at any time to see the authors of the submission who have written to request an interview with her?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer that question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question I asked on 18 August about abortion statistics?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The report of the Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia for 1981 was tabled in Parliament on 2 September 1982.

PROSTITUTION

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question concerning prostitution.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have been approached by a constituent who is concerned about information regarding the new Hilton Hotel that is currently circulating amongst women involved in prostitution in Adelaide. Apparently, the story that is currently going around town is that a contract for prostitution at the Hilton Hotel has been agreed to and that any prostitute who is not associated with the organisation that will be providing such services, or that has won the contract, will be unable to participate in the provision of such services in that establishment.

Apart from the fact that such an arrangement would contravene the Government's free enterprise principles, I am sure that the Attorney-General would agree that the prospect of such an activity getting under way at the new Hilton Hotel is a very serious matter. First, can the Attorney-General confirm whether this information is correct? Secondly, presuming that the Government does not condone such an activity, will the Attorney say what action his Government will take to prevent this occurring?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This is the first that I have heard about the matter. Certainly, I would not condone it, and I do not believe that the Government would, either. In any event, if it did occur, the contract would be illegal. I will have some inquiries made and bring back a reply if there is anything worthy of reporting.

TOMATOES

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question regarding tomatoes imported from Queensland.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: Representations have been made to me, and I believe that the people who made those representations have also been to see the Minister of Agriculture regarding the importing of tomatoes from Queensland. This group of people, who represent the glass-house industry in South Australia, are very concerned about the possible introduction of Queensland fruit fly in tomatoes that are imported from Queensland.

This group's major concern is that penalties for bringing fruit into the State illegally seem to be inadequate. When people are caught with large consignments of fruit, the fines imposed by the courts so far have been very small. The group quotes prosecutions in 1981 that resulted in fines and

costs of only \$53 and \$143, respectively, which figures are very small in relation to the value of some of the consignments of fruit that are being brought into the State.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Were those fines imposed on commercial operators?

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: I understand so, yet on occasions those semi-trailer loads of fruit would be worth tens of thousands of dollars. The people concerned with the introduction of illegal tomatoes in this State are asking the Government to amend the legislation to provide larger fines and a system whereby the fine is related to the value of the fruit that is being introduced. This system operates under the Fisheries Act, where frequently there is a fine and then a further fine, for example, for each illegal abalone caught, which is often more than the fine for the offence itself.

Has the Minister considered the representations made by this group representing tomato glasshouse growers? Will the Minister introduce amendments to the Act to increase the fines and relate them to the size of the consignment that is brought into the State illegally?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer that question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

TOW TRUCKS

The Hon. N.K. FOSTER: Will the Attorney-General request a report from his colleague, the Minister of Transport, regarding the recurrence, because of the reappearance of fear tactics again becoming evident at accident scenes, of incidents at motor vehicle crash scenes involving tow truck operators? Secondly, will the Minister inquire into false and provocative advertisements concerning the industry and report on that aspect, which is also recurring in the tow truck industry?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to my colleague and bring back a reply.

MARRIAGE GUIDANCE COUNSELLING

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question concerning the marriage guidance counselling service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It has been brought to my attention that the Port Lincoln Community Development Board made a submission to the Minister's department requesting a grant of \$4 960 to allow it to establish a marriage guidance counselling service on Lower Eyre Peninsula. Part of the submission refers to the present position, which is that the Port Lincoln Community Development Board has had a marriage guidance counsellor working on a voluntary basis since mid-May and that, without advertising, the counsellor conducts four consultations a week, with 10 being on the waiting list.

It is also stated in the submission that the Port Lincoln Community Development Board has spoken with the Minister's department, the Department for Community Welfare, the Women's Emergency Hostel, the Port Lincoln council, and members of the public, and that they all agree that there is an urgent need for this counselling. The proposal is that only one marriage guidance counsellor be employed, and then for only six hours a week. It is proposed to pay to the counsellor an honorarium of approximately \$2.25 per hour. I will not comment on the hourly rate of pay, as that is another argument.

At the moment, the Port Lincoln Community Development Board has no funds at all to pay a counsellor \$2.25

an hour, or any other sum. It seems that the request for \$4 960 is a very modest and eminently reasonable one for a service which I am sure the Government would agree is a most necessary and useful service in the community. Apart from the high cost to the community, as distinct from the high cost paid by individuals in the breakdown of marriage, anything that can be done within reason to prevent the breakdown of marriage must, in the long run, save the Government money. Is the Minister aware of the submission made by the Port Lincoln Community Development Board about the provision of funds to establish a marriage guidance counsellor at Port Lincoln? If he is, has the request been refused? If it has not, will the Minister give his personal attention to the request with a view to ensuring that this very desirable service is established?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Marriage Guidance Council is funded solely by the Federal Attorney-General: there is no State funding at all. Whether the counsellor referred to would most appropriately fit within that pattern, I do not know, but I make this point: the only funding for the Marriage Guidance Council comes from the Commonwealth Attorney-General, who administers the Act in question. COPE is another organisation which is now independent but which was originally an off-shoot of the Marriage Guidance Council. It deals with the educational aspects of marriage guidance and, until recently, was funded through the Department for Community Welfare but is now funded through the Health Commission.

If an application has been made (and I would not be aware whether or not it has), the only way in which it could be funded through my department would be from the Community Welfare Grants Fund. The Act provides for the Community Welfare Grants Fund Advisory Committee, and it has been the practice of the previous Government, and indeed of this Government, to continue in that manner. I think that usually, shortly before the beginning of the financial year, the Community Welfare Grants Fund Advisory Committee advertises and calls on people who wish to apply for grants to make their applications. There is a fixed form of application, and guidelines are issued regarding which bodies are likely to qualify for funding, if deemed to be suitable and if funds are available.

A finite sum is granted in each year's Budget for the Community Welfare Grants Fund. The task of the advisory committee (in my view it carries out a difficult task extremely well) is to cut up that fixed amount of money between the applicants. It may determine that some do not come within the guidelines or that for some other reason applicants are not worthy to have funding allocated to them. In relation to worthy applicants, the committee makes recommendations as to the amounts. It is a large and difficult task, with hundreds of applications and a sum of well over \$1 000 000 being involved.

Where appropriate, the committee goes to see the people in the organisations concerned to observe the functions being carried out. Sometimes one or two of the committee members will do that. They are assisted by departmental officers who, in a great number of cases, will look at the actual operation. Usually, recommendations come to me in November each year and, because of Budget needs (the State Budget being on a financial year basis), funding for the organisations is done on a calendar year basis. So, in about November or December organisations are advised of their allocations, and that is in respect of a calendar year.

As recently as last week I was in touch with the Chairman of the advisory committee, and I will see her again tomorrow. I am always most anxious that recommendations come to me as soon as possible but, nonetheless, they must be correct and well considered. The committee's Chairman has informed me that recommendations will come to me in

November. I might add that I have always accepted the final recommendation: in almost all cases, I accept the recommendations as they come to me.

There are a few cases where I see some reason to raise further issues and make a point to the committee, but I can say that I have always accepted the committee's final recommendations. If an application has been made to the Community Welfare Grants Fund Advisory Committee (and this is the only way in which it could be dealt with), that situation would apply in this case.

BARRAMUNDI

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about barramundi.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Recently, a constituent approached me suspecting that fish which he had been served in a restaurant was not barramundi, as was indicated on the menu. The person concerned said that he was well aware of the characteristics of barramundi, as he had lived in Northern Australia for a considerable time. He was sure that the fish served to him was not barramundi but, he suspected, flake, which is a synonym for shark. This raises the question how a consumer in a restaurant can test, or have tests undertaken, to determine whether the fish served is that which is described on the menu.

I know that it is possible to do tests of particular animal and fish species. An electrophoretic protein analysis is undertaken, but I am unsure whether or not such an analysis can yet be undertaken readily in South Australia or whether samples would have to be sent to New South Wales, where the routine for such tests has been set up. Also, I am not sure whether a test could be carried out on a cooked sample of fish, because I suspect that the coagulation of proteins that occurs in cooking would make electrophoresis rather difficult. I presume that in such situations it would be much easier for a consumer to ask for inspectors to carry out tests on the raw fish available in the restaurant to see whether it was the species indicated on the menu.

What should a consumer do if, as in this situation, he suspects that the fish he has been served is not of the species indicated? Where can a sample be taken in South Australia for analysis? Is it possible to analyse cooked as well as raw samples? Should a consumer ask an inspector, perhaps from the Health Commission (and in this case, obviously, the Minister will have to refer the question to his colleague), to check the fish at a particular restaurant? If that analysis was undertaken, after how long would results be available?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The honourable member has referred to a person in a restaurant served with fish that was stated to be barramundi, but the person suspected that it was another species. It would seem to me that there are two alternatives. First, if the person were game, he could wrap the fish in a serviette and take it away with him for inspection by an officer of the department.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Can cooked fish be tested?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I do not know: I was about to answer that. Secondly, and this is the obvious solution, as in regard to all other consumer complaints (and this is basically a consumer complaint) my department authorises inspections, and the proper thing for that person to do would be to approach the department and make a complaint. The officer who receives the complaint would give the correct advice on what was to be done and as to whether he would send out inspectors to check the raw fish, whether analysis could be done in South Australia, how long it would take, and so on. In regard to this particular aggrieved person,

he should approach an officer of my department who would give specialised advice. I will refer this question to my department and bring back the best sort of generalised reply I can.

WAR WIDOWS

The Hon. N.K. FOSTER: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, say whether the Premier and other Ministers have received a letter from the War Widows Guild seeking once again consideration of a longstanding request for certain concessions on behalf of the members of that organisation? If so, to what extent does the Government intend to respond to the members of that association? What is the 'cost' of providing to members of the guild those concessions that are the right of others of the community? What possible answer can be given for the continuation of this blatant discrimination? How many people would be affected by such discrimination? Is it not a fact that, if equality of concessions is granted, the cost would be reduced year by year? There are not many war widows left.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I certainly have no recollection of receiving the letter, but I will refer the questions generally to the Premier.

The Hon. N.K. Foster: The letter was written to the Premier.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the questions to the Premier and bring back a reply.

LANGUAGE RESOURCES CENTRE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Education a question about the Language Resources Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In the September/October/November 1982 edition of *Network*, the Railways of Australia publication, there was a very interesting article concerning a new project that has been established by the New South Wales State railway authority. Following an investigation last year by Arbitration Commissioner Graham Walker, it was suggested that English classes be provided for workers at the Eveleigh train depot. As a result, a language resources centre has been opened, which is being hailed as a model for other Government departments and private industry. The centre is staffed by teachers from the adult migrant education service and is open to the 300 carriage cleaners who are employed by the railways in New South Wales; about 96 per cent of these people are from non-English speaking backgrounds.

The centre consists of a room that is fitted with extensive equipment for teaching English, including an overhead projector, audio-visual unit, tape recorders, head phones, and so on. It cost about \$45 000 and can accommodate up to 20 students at any one time. Classes are held during working hours on both day and night shifts, and workers can have formal lessons or can use the material to teach themselves. This seems to me to be an excellent service that is being provided by a forward-looking Government in New South Wales, and one which could usefully be borrowed by a forward-looking Government in South Australia.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We will get one soon.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes. In fact, there are a number of work places in South Australia, apart from railway depots, where a high proportion of workers are from non-English speaking backgrounds, and I believe that public hospitals are an obvious example. Is the Minister aware of

the new service that is being provided in New South Wales? Does he agree that that service has considerable merit and has the potential to provide English language skills to a large number of people who would otherwise not have such an opportunity? Will the Minister consider introducing such a scheme in appropriate Government work places in South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the Minister of Education and bring back a reply.

HOME GARDENS ADVISORY SERVICE

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about the home gardens advisory service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: During the Estimates Committee debates, the Minister of Agriculture was asked about the rundown of the home gardens advisory service of the Department of Agriculture. The Minister denied that any rundown had occurred and claimed that there had been no changes at all in the staffing or the service provided by that unit.

Since the Estimates Committees hearings, I have been informed by a person in the Department of Agriculture that, in fact, the home gardens advisory service now operates only from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m., whereas staff previously provided advice to the public from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. That seems to be a very clear rundown in the service that is provided by the section. Will the Minister look into this matter and find out just what is happening within the department and why he has not been informed of the rundown of the service provided by the home gardens advisory unit?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about justices of the peace.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I understand that the Attorney-General's Department is conducting a major review of the register of justices of the peace in South Australia and that the department is contacting all justices of the peace and asking them questions, with the aim of removing from the list those people who are non-active. This will enable publication of lists of justices of the peace by district so that people who need a justice of the peace can, quite readily, locate one who is not too far away.

I understand that the people to whom a copy of the letter was sent were given a fortnight only to reply, and were told that if no reply was received they would be removed from the register of justices of the peace. Can the Attorney-General say how many justices of the peace were written to, how many replied within the stated time, how many justices of the peace there were prior to this exercise and how many now remain on the register? How many of these people are no longer justices of the peace either because they did not reply within the stated time or because they did reply and indicated that they were not interested in continuing in the position? Also, how many justices of the peace are now available for court service in South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I was asked questions about this matter during the Budget Estimates Committee hearings.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That was not in this Council.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am merely drawing this to the honourable member's attention so that, if she wants further background, she can look to *Hansard* for it. There has not been a comprehensive review of justices of the peace in South Australia in the past few decades. There is much information about justices of the peace which is outdated. I took the view that it was important to write to every justice of the peace whose name appeared in the records of the Attorney-General's office to inquire whether or not they wished to continue to be a justice of the peace, and to gather other relevant information. This was done so that more information could be made available to the public about the location of justices of the peace and, particularly, about their fluency in languages other than English.

There are approximately 7 500 justices of the peace. As at the beginning of October, letters had gone out progressively to some 5 200 justices of the peace. The letters are being sent out on a progressive basis because of the substantial workload involved for my office in handling so many letters and responses to those letters. At the beginning of October there had been responses from about 3 500 justices of the peace and 250 letters had been returned as unclaimed, which suggests either a change of address or that the person involved may now be dead.

There were other justices of the peace who notified a change of address. We have identified another 140 who are now dead and whose names have automatically been removed from the roll. The procedure that we are following is that when a letter is returned as unclaimed we check the alphabetical index with the Electoral Commissioner to ensure that there is no record of that person's location in South Australia or in another part of Australia. If there is no record, that name is removed from the register. Although we have set a 14-day time limit on replies, we have administered that limit flexibly realising that it might take longer for some people to reply than it does for others. However, we believe that 14 days is sufficient time to answer the nine questions asked in the questionnaire accompanying the letter.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The people might be on holidays.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There is that possibility. We are not being ruthless in the administration of the matter. In fact, the letter states not that a person's name will be removed from the register if they do not reply within 14 days, but that their name may be removed. Therefore, we have managed to retain some flexibility in our approach to the removal of names from the register. As I said earlier, we have also sought to identify those people fluent in languages other than English. This has been done for two reasons: first, so that we are able to make that information available to the wider community and, if a particular ethnic community is not adequately served with justices of the peace, to ensure that future appointments include people fluent in a particular language who can be commissioned as justices of the peace to serve a particular ethnic community; secondly, so that we will be able to identify whether or not the quota system is functioning effectively. This is a quota that has been established for a long time and has been carried on by successive Governments.

The present ratio is one justice of the peace for every 250 adult persons resident in a community. There is some suspicion that this may not be the case and this survey will help to gain factual information about this matter. When we have a new record, we will make that information available to local government offices, police stations and members of Parliament, among others, and will periodically publish lists in local newspapers showing the names and addresses of justices. This will ensure that that information is available to the wider community and that the justices' addresses are known so that they may perform the public responsibilities associated with the granting of a commission of the peace.

This survey was designed to update dramatically the information available, to enable my department to make information available to members of the public, and to ensure that there is an up-to-date register of justices of the peace available when granting future commissions in South Australia. The one part of the question I do not have detailed information about relates to how many justices of the peace are eligible to sit on courts. I will obtain that information and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

BUDGET PAPERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.T. Griffin:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, 1982-83.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 1221.)

The Hon. M.B. DAWKINS: I support the motion. I commend the responsible attitude of the present Government, which has constantly sought to improve the financial position of the economy of South Australia in each of its four Budgets. Before continuing I must refer to the regrettable passing of the late Hon. Gordon Gilfillan. I regret that I was unable to attend his funeral or to participate in the motion of condolence moved in this Chamber last week. However, I hasten to correct these omissions.

Gordon Gilfillan and I came into this Chamber on the same day, having been elected on 3 March 1962. A little later we moved and seconded the Address in Reply motion on the same day in that year. Although the Hon. Mr Gilfillan was a member of this place for the old District of Northern and I for Midland, we had much in common as country members and were closely associated over the whole 13 years of his membership of this Chamber. Gordon Gilfillan was a good legislator and a friend to all who knew him, regardless of Party affiliation. I hasten to pay a tribute to his memory and to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

I wish to commend the Government, particularly the Hon. Peter Arnold, Minister of Water Resources, for the progress made in conjunction with other Governments toward improving the water quality of the Murray River. All members will be aware of the high incidence of salt content contained from time to time in Murray water delivered to South Australia, and of other impurities as well. The progress of the Noora scheme and of the Rufus River project, which were dealt with in some detail recently by the Minister of Local Government, representing the Hon. P.B. Arnold, in response to a question which I had asked, and which were previously examined in detail by the Public Works Standing Committee, is encouraging. However, the general agreement by the four Governments concerned as to the control of water quality is of much greater and permanent importance.

The present position of South Australia as to Murray water availability is much better, so I understand, than we might be led to expect in view of the drought. I have been informed that, although the Hume dam is very low in storage quantity at present (and this is not surprising), Dartmouth dam holds about 70 per cent of capacity, whilst nearer to home the amount of water stored at Lake Victoria and in the Menindee Lakes is satisfactory in the circumstances. South Australia, therefore, is in no great danger from the point of view of receiving its statutory requirement in times of restriction. Furthermore, the salt content is not as serious as might be expected because of the absence of a recent high river and the consequent reduction of drainage

of salty water back into the river. However, we are encouraged by the all-too-recent recognition by Victoria and New South Wales of the need for restrictions, and those areas in those States which have been able to irrigate very large areas of broad acres with almost profligate abandon will have to bear restrictions—certainly, not before time.

Honourable members may be well aware that very large areas in Victoria and New South Wales have been irrigated on a broad acre basis as opposed to concentrated areas used for citrus, stone and vine fruits. I could give examples of areas in the Riverina and in the Goulburn Valley, where very large acreages are irrigated. Members would be well aware of the very serious drought in Victoria, for example, which is far more serious than it is in South Australia. Parts of Victoria are in a shocking condition, but one hears of people who say, 'I am in a very bad situation and, if it were not for 300 or 400 acres that I could irrigate, I do not know what I would do.' In this State, if we have 50 to 100 acres we can irrigate in concentrated fashion in regard to stone, vine and citrus fruits, we think we have a large area. When one considers that irrigation of this size has been going on in the Eastern States, it is time that they took stock and realised that in this country the water is a valuable commodity which must not be used in an irresponsible manner.

While I am on the matter of water resources and the improvement in the quality of water coming from the Eastern States, I must commend also the progress under the present and previous Governments of the water filtration programme in South Australia. The recent examinations by the Public Works Standing Committee of the projected Happy Valley and Morgan filtration plants point to the completion of filtration of all the main areas of population in this State, and of many country areas as well. This is a most desirable objective, having regard to the impracticable alternatives. Here again, one realises that it is regrettable—in fact, ridiculous in some ways—that a very large proportion of the water that has to be filtered is used for irrigation and for purposes other than human consumption. Consideration was given to the provision of a water softener or water cleanser for each house. This is impracticable because of the varying standards of maintenance, or lack of maintenance, which would obtain from house to house. Although it was considered that it would have been much better in one sense to be able to filter only the water that was used for human consumption rather than the very large proportion that is used for irrigation, it turned out to be impracticable, and we had to go ahead with the general filtration, which is the programme of both the present and previous Governments. One has to be satisfied and pleased with the progress that has been made and that has been continued, as I have instanced, with regard to the Happy Valley and Morgan filtration projects.

In my earlier years in this place I used to try to cover the field to some extent in both the Budget and the Address in Reply speeches. Honourable members will be relieved to know that I do not intend to do that today in what I intend to be a relatively brief speech. I will deal with only a relatively few points.

I turn now to education. I want to commend the Minister and the Government for the increase in spending on education to nearly \$600 000 000 this year. The increase of spending on education over the past three years has been of the order of over 34 per cent, although enrolments have decreased by over 7 per cent. Teacher/pupil ratios will continue to be maintained at better than the national average and better than in most States, despite the blatantly political misrepresentation by the South Australian Institute of Teachers under Miss Leonie Ebert. There was a time when the South Australian Institute of Teachers, in the days of the highly respected Wilf White, for example, could be

expected, and with good reason, to be both responsible and objective. Those days, alas, are gone, for the present at least. I condemn the irresponsible attitude of Miss Ebert and of her associates. I am glad to say that not all teachers support the institute in its present campaign and that many respected teachers of experience, albeit a minority, are very unhappy with the attitude of the Institute of Teachers at present. I commend the Minister for the increase in expenditure and for the coverage of the education programme in this State, which is far from being anything like the misrepresentation of the Institute of Teachers.

I also commend the Minister of Housing for his progressive housing policy. Building society interest rates are the lowest in Australia because of the strong action of this Government. I commend the intention to construct over 2 000 houses in 1982-83, which is more than double the number of the previous year, and I also commend the increase in spending by the Housing Trust of over 38 per cent.

I notice, also, the intentions of the Government to increase spending on capital works by 30 per cent, which will include buildings, roads and equipment and which will, no doubt, keep the Public Works Standing Committee busy in the future and increase employment in due course.

I commend the Government for its forward planning for our 150th anniversary in 1986. This is one area where both Government and Opposition can work together to ensure a worthy celebration that will not only bring great credit to South Australia but will also be a very great boost to industry in this State. I wish Mr Kym Bonython and his management committee, and also the various bodies and organisations working with him and involving themselves in detailed planning, every success in conducting this very important milestone in the State. We will undoubtedly attract very large numbers of visitors to South Australia, and I am pleased that the Government is giving the celebration such very strong support.

My support of this Government is vindicated, if indeed it needed to be justified, in various ways by the present state of investment in South Australia. In a State which has slightly less than 10 per cent of the population of Australia, and less than a tenth of the national work force, we are attracting nearly one-fifth of the total manufacturing investment in the country (and this represents about \$1.5 billion in manufacturing industry in this State). These figures are available from the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce which show that South Australia now has 19.5 per cent of total investment in this area and was the only State to increase investment when all other States showed a decline.

What a contrast this is with the situation that applied three years ago, when South Australia's investment in manufacturing and mining was only about one-fifth of the present figure for manufacturing, and less than one-tenth of the present combined manufacturing and mining investment. Again, those figures are available from the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce. The Labor Party has tried to crayfish out of this complete turn around in investment by drawing attention to the population trends.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. DAWKINS: Who started this trend? The Australian Labor Party, of course. When I came into Parliament, Western Australia had about four-fifths of the population, industry and annual Budget of South Australia. Today it has almost caught up in population and has surpassed us in the size of its Budget. Who started all this? In the nine years of Labor Government industry was stultified, private enterprise was discouraged, and investment fled. I have said before and I say again that Sir Thomas Playford brought industry and investment here and the Hon. Don

Dunstan will go down in history, if indeed he deserves to do so, as the person who drove it away. It ill becomes John Bannon, the Hon. Chris Sumner and company to cackle about population trends. Finally, I wish to commend the Government's policy—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about unemployment?

The Hon. M.B. DAWKINS: Unemployment escalated under the Federal Labor Government. Finally, I wish to commend the Government's policy on mining and energy and its support of exploration, which has escalated during its term of office as I have just indicated. I mentioned these matters in some detail during my Address in Reply speech recently and I do not propose to discuss them at length again. However, I note once more the stark contrast between the forward policies of this Government in this field and those of the previous Government (and, for that matter, the disastrous Federal Labor Government of 1972-75) regarding the disastrous across-the-board reduction of tariffs which started the great problem of unemployment in this country. I urge the people of this State to take due notice of these facts and not to pay attention to the ravings of Bill Hayden or the cacklings of John Bannon or the Hon. Chris Sumner. I support the motion.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was a very entertaining contribution from the Hon. Mr Dawkins. When he was making all those comparisons about South Australia's share of this and that, there was one significant omission—South Australia's share of Australia's unemployed. With something around 10 per cent of the population, its unemployment rate far exceeds that. The Hon. Mr Dawkins and other members can waffle on about rates of investment, etc., but what they cannot get away from is that in the three years of their Government, South Australia has gone from having the lowest rate of unemployment on the mainland to the highest. Those are devastating statistics which the Government fails to address itself to. However, I only want to keep the Council here for five minutes.

The Hon. M.B. Dawkins: Five minutes too long.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is most uncharitable: I was going to say some nice words about the Hon. Mr Dawkins as this is his last Budget speech. He has now incurred my wrath and I will not say what I had planned. I wish to briefly answer the ridiculous contribution made in this debate by the Hon. Mr Cameron. The Hon. Mr Cameron went on at some length about the disastrous way, according to him, in which the previous Labor Government made arrangements for the flow and distribution of natural gas from the Cooper Basin.

The Hon. Mr Cameron said that the two pieces of legislation that went through Parliament were an absolute disaster and resulted in dreadful things occurring to consumers of gas in South Australia. In his contribution he quoted briefly from a speech made by the Hon. Steele Hall, who was the Leader of the Opposition for part of that period. The quote given by the Hon. Mr Cameron was, I suspected on hearing it, highly selective and taken out of context. I went to the trouble of obtaining the House of Assembly *Hansard* of 31 March 1971 because I wished to look at what the Hon. Mr Hall actually said. Of course, he said considerably more than what was quoted by the Hon. Mr Cameron. In fact, the Hon. Mr Hall claimed total credit for the arrangements that were then being made for the delivery of gas to New South Wales and for the eventual liquids scheme, which I will come to in a moment. I wish to quote extensively from the speech made by the Hon. Mr Hall on 31 March 1971.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That is quite separate from 1975.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is in *Hansard* for 1971. The Hon. Mr Hall states:

When I took up this matter with the producers, [this was the question of delivery of gas to New South Wales] they considered it almost a hopeless task to head off Victoria in the sale of gas to New South Wales. I got the producers into the Premier's office, and we had a long discussion on this matter. From that conference began the real stimulation of activity in relation to the sale of gas to New South Wales . . . From the conference to which I have referred stemmed the real negotiations to obtain a contract for the sale of gas to New South Wales

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: On what terms and conditions?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Just a moment. The Hon. Mr Hall continues:

From then, the real substance of the agreement began to be worked out. However, it still depended on our obtaining a sufficient resource to enable us viably to pipe and sell it to New South Wales. When the present Premier came to office, the search for the resource was still proceeding, and the New South Wales interests had taken up farm-out arrangements: the producing group (Delhi-Santos) had also worked out exploration areas not far from a suggested pipeline route to Sydney. Therefore, it had a dual interest in relation to the supply of gas to Sydney from South Australia. These arrangements finally led to today's favourable situation, which the Premier inherited [Hon. D.A. Dunstan] . . . I compliment the Government [complimenting the Hon. D.A. Dunstan] on following up this matter. In this respect it has my complete support: indeed, I would have been disappointed had its attitude been different. I realise that such a valuable sale and contract for South Australia would obviously have been pursued, and the Premier did this State a great disservice when he gave the distinct impression today that the subject was completely dead when he came to office and that no real work had been done before then. That was a completely false impression to convey.

Any reasonable person reading that would agree that Mr Hall was happy with the way in which things were going with the New South Wales contract. Not only was he happy but also he was claiming credit.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: But the damage was done in 1975.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He was claiming credit.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: So he should—he did not know how stupid you would be.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Cameron refers to 1975 and the indenture that came before Parliament in 1975 setting out the terms of the various matters that were agreed between the producers and the Government. The Hon. Mr Cameron and Mr Goldsworthy were in Parliament then, and the Hon. Dean Brown claims some special position in his Party as a bright young thing—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: A rising star.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, a rising star, although I am not sure what right he has to claim that. He always seems to be a rather crass and oafish gentleman. On this occasion he had unusual but keen perception, because he was a member of the select committee that looked at the indenture. In the opening lines (*Hansard*, 29 October 1975) he stated:

The Liberal Party supports this Bill with pleasure. I believe that it will be in the long-term benefit of the whole State.

I do not want to read the rest of his speech, because we are modest on this side, and it is rather embarrassing. Dean Brown heaped praise on our head, quite rightly, but, just in case honourable members opposite did not catch what I said, I will repeat his opening comments as a member of the select committee that looked at the indenture. He stated:

The Liberal Party supports this Bill with pleasure. I believe that it will be in the long-term benefit of the whole State.

I put on record that I agree with what Dean Brown said. After honourable members learnt of the recent arbitrated increase in the price of gas, the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy said how astonished he was, when he came into office, to find out the terms of the agreement. What an admission of failure by the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy, who has been in Parliament since 1970, during which time all legislation

setting down all terms of the agreement has been passed by Parliament.

Both the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy and the Premier have been in Parliament during the passage of that legislation, as has the Hon. Mr Cameron, and no-one at that time did anything but praise the then agreement. Now, because the arbitrator has given an 80 per cent rise to producers (and I will come back to that point shortly), the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy has made an incredible statement that he was astonished when he became Minister and found out the terms of the agreement. If that is true, even giving the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy the benefit of the doubt (one would have to be generous to do that), what an indictment it is of the man as a legislator that so much important legislation could pass through Parliament and then seven or eight years later he can claim that he did not know (although I am not sure whether he was the shadow Minister at the time).

At best, one can say that the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy is quite stupid. What would other honourable members have done? We know what they did at that time: they praised the Labor Government and attempted to claim credit themselves. All honourable members know that unless there was a significant sale of gas in addition to what was coming to the metropolitan area the whole scheme might have foundered, and there is no doubt about that at all. That is absolutely certain and, without the volume of sales, the opportunity to do many things with the liquids from that scheme would have been denied to this State. At that time it was absolutely the proper thing to do and the Liberal Party agreed completely. Today, the Liberal Party is claiming some credit for the Stony Point project adjacent to Whyalla. I point out that the liquids scheme would never have got under way had it not been for the significant sale to New South Wales. There would not have been sufficient liquids to supply a project of that size, and those liquids would have been wasted and flared off. That is what would have happened, as every member in this Parliament knows.

Significantly, only the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy and the Hon. Martin Cameron have said anything of consequence on that matter. Regarding the gas price itself, it may be, although I do not know, that the 80 per cent is justified. I am willing to concede that that could be the case, because we live in a capitalist society and there is no doubt that, if there is not sufficient return on capital invested, capital will go elsewhere. There would not be that further exploration in the Cooper Basin. Investors would just not put their money there and, in the context of the capitalist society, who could blame them?

What is the alternative? If the Labor Government had said then that it would nationalise the Cooper Basin, that everything would be done by the State, and that the returns would be to the State, what would have happened in Parliament? Apart from the Labor Government's finding the money to buy out the existing companies, what would have been the position? I can imagine what would have happened in this Council. There would have been screams that this was the socialist octopus taking over, and that it was totally unnecessary.

The Hon. Dr Ritson was not a member then but, if he had been, he would have seen reds under the bed because he sees them everywhere. If the honourable member had seen such a Bill, it would have sent him off his head. His cry would have been of rampant socialism. It is easy to criticise an arbitrator's decision on the price of gas to be paid to producers, especially in 1982. It does the State no service at all to do that, particularly when the people who are criticising (I doubt that there is anything to criticise) are as much to blame as the then Government, because this legislation passed through both Houses of Parliament.

It may be that the Hon. Mr Cameron, because in Liberal circles he is sometimes regarded as a little pink—he wanted everyone to have a vote, which made him suspect for many years—supported wholeheartedly the nationalisation of this resource, as I would have done.

I can imagine what other members of this Council would have said, especially the Hon. Mr Burdett, who asks who spent the money. I can see that it is true that the people who put up the money and who took the risk in this venture, for example, the Bonythons, are entitled to a return. I am not sure that they have had a fair return, and that is why I do not say outright that the 80 per cent increase in gas prices is too large.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You'd better have a look at share prices.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I ask the honourable member to wait a moment. Quite frankly, I do not know. It is true that Santos has never paid a dividend, I believe, but, of course, some considerable profits have been made on share trading, and there is no doubt about that. Those who put in capital initially and still have the shares have, so far, received paper profits only. They have not received any real profit from their venture, but I am sure that they will receive a profit in the future.

I want to conclude by saying that there are certainly two sides to this question, and it ill behoves Mr Goldsworthy and Mr Cameron to start squealing now that the wrong action was taken. I would argue that nothing wrong was done, given the degree of knowledge of the Government and the Parliament at that time. It is very easy with hindsight to say that things should have been different. I am sure that, given a second chance, we would like to alter most situations in life.

Everything that the Labor Government did at the time was praised by the Liberal Party, and rightly so. Therefore, it makes me a bit cross to hear the whingeing that is going on now. I do not know what evidence was given to the arbitrator on the price rise or the reason why the arbitrator made that decision, and, until such time as that evidence is made available, I am prepared to withhold judgment on whether or not the price paid to the producers is too high. I do not intend to delay the Council further, but I believe that the rubbish spoken by the Hon. Martin Cameron deserved a brief reply.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purposes of this Bill are two-fold: to provide greater flexibility in setting the threshold interest rate for purposes of stamp duty on credit and rental business, and to foster the development of a secondary market in semi-government securities in this State. Since December 1980, the threshold interest rate above which loans become liable for stamp duty has been raised on four separate occasions, to take account of rising interest rates. The point has now been reached where a further increase is warranted to take account of movements since the last adjustment in February of this year.

However, not all rates of interest have moved uniformly, and an increase in the general threshold rate would deprive the Government of considerable revenue that it has traditionally received, notably from Bankcard transactions. It is

the Government's aim to preserve the *status quo*. Those transactions that have in the past attracted duty should continue to do so, while those that have not should continue to be free of duty. In order to achieve this aim, the Government is seeking the power to set different threshold rates for different classes of transaction. For most loans, it is our intention to raise the threshold, but for Bankcard a different and lower rate would be set in order to ensure that duty continued to be collected.

The proposed amendment would also enable the Government to make some concessions to building societies in recognition of their co-operation in foregoing interest rate increases on housing loans. A somewhat higher threshold for building societies would permit them to apply market rates to their commercial loans without attracting stamp duty. Loan Council recently agreed that member Governments should take steps to facilitate the development of a secondary market in securities issued by all semi-government authorities. Several States already have provisions that provide for exemptions from stamp duty on a comprehensive basis where securities issued by statutory authorities are traded on the secondary market, but the South Australian provision is more restrictive and requires that each such authority must be separately prescribed.

To bring about the freedom from duty for the statutory authorities of all States and to achieve, as nearly as possible, consistency with the other States, the Government has decided to alter the form of the exemption provision in this State. As a precautionary measure against an unintentionally broad interpretation of this exemption, provision has been made for particular bodies to be excluded from the exemption. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Under the clause, different provisions of the measure may be brought into operation at different times.

Clause 3 amends section 31b of the principal Act which sets out definitions of terms used in the part of the Act dealing with duty in respect of credit and rental business. Under the clause, 'prescribed rate' is now defined as being the rate for the time being fixed by regulation, or, where different rates are fixed by regulation for different classes of transactions, the rate for the time being fixed for the class of transactions to which the credit arrangement, discount transaction or loan belongs. The clause also empowers the making of regulations fixing a rate of not less than 9 per cent as the prescribed rate, or different rates of not less than 9 per cent as the prescribed rate for different classes of transactions. The effect of this amendment will be to authorise the fixing of different rates as the rates of interest that must be payable on different transactions before duty under the credit and rental business head of duty is payable on such transactions.

Clause 4 extends the present exemption for conveyances of securities issued by a South Australian statutory authority to any securities issued by a public statutory body constituted under a law of the Commonwealth or of this State or any other State or Territory. The clause provides for regulations to be made excluding any statutory body or class of statutory bodies from this exemption.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 October. Page 1281.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In this debate I wish to deal more extensively with the topic that was dealt with last year, namely, the transfer of moneys allocated or borrowed for capital works to recurrent operations. I will look at this matter in the context of the State Government's general economic policies, its handling of State Budgets over the past three years, and the so-called liabilities that were left by the previous Labor Government.

To do this, I have had a number of documents prepared by the Parliamentary Library research service. I will not seek to insert all this material in *Hansard*, as it is too lengthy; however, I will refer to certain conclusions in the documents, and I wish those documents to be on public record so that all honourable members and anyone else can openly peruse them. I believe that my conclusions are justified, but I would welcome any constructive comment on them or on these documents. Therefore, I seek leave to table the following documents: (1) analysis of the loss incurred by the South Australian Government in respect of the South Australian Land Commission; (2) schedule of payments made by the South Australian Government with respect to the Riverland cannery; (3) analysis of the loss incurred by the South Australian Government in respect of Monarto; (4) analysis of the transfers of funds from capital works to revenue in other States of Australia since 1979; and (5) forecast and actual South Australian Budget results for each of the past 25 years.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The State Government receives by way of grants from the Commonwealth and borrowed through the Loan Council funds that are to be used for capital works. That money is used to construct public assets such as schools, hospitals, water and sewerage works, wharves, art galleries, courts, or public recreation areas such as botanic gardens, zoos or national parks. Capital improvements are also funded in this way. The total State Government indebtedness in 1981 of \$2 661 000 000 is serviced by interest payments, and represents money borrowed by the State to enable the construction and maintenance of these assets.

It should be noted in passing that the total level of State Government indebtedness in real terms (that is, adjusted for inflation) has fallen considerably in the past decade, despite some suggestions to the contrary. That is clear from appendix IV of the Treasurer's financial statements made in the House of Assembly on 25 August 1982. The total cost to the State Government of servicing this debt in 1981-82 was \$239 500 000; which included servicing of the debt and repayments. Without the extensive public assets created by these borrowings, the South Australian community would be considerably poorer. These assets are owned by the people of South Australia in common.

One attribute of a civilised society with some pretensions to egalitarianism must be a stock of well-maintained public assets to which all citizens have access irrespective of means. It is to build up this stock of assets that moneys have been specifically granted or borrowed in the past for capital works. Because capital works moneys have been traditionally used to build assets, they have also had a significant economic impact on the State while the money is being spent. It is generally acknowledged that spending in the building industry has a large multiplier effect, so there is beneficial stimulus to the local economy and local employment in capital works programmes.

Most of the money is usually spent in the private sector. It is in this context that we must view the actions of the Tonkin Government for the third year in succession using capital works funds to prop up its recurrent expenditure to the tune of an incredible \$141 000 000. Until the advent of the Tonkin Government, it was virtually sacrosanct that capital works funds be used for that purpose, yet now, for what I suggest is the first time in South Australia's history, we have seen the use on a sustained basis of capital funds for recurrent expenditure. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it an up-to-date table showing since 1950 transfers from Loan Account to Revenue Account and vice versa, or from capital to revenue within the Consolidated Account, as it has been since 1980.

Leave granted.

Transfers Between Consolidated Revenue Account and Loan Account since 1950-51 (\$ million)

Year		From Revenue to Loan Account	From Loan Account to Revenue Account	Remarks
1958-59:	Est.	—	1.26	'Funding of deficits'.
	Act.	—	1.26	
1961-62:	Est.	1.75	—	Transferred 'in respect of past funded deficits, etc.'
	Act.	1.75	—	
1969-70:	Est.	—	—	Application 'towards unfunded deficits'.
	Act.	—	0.41	
1975-76:	Est.	—	—	Transfer 'to supplement capital programmes'.
	Act.	20.00	—	
1976-77:	Est.	15.00	—	Transfer 'to supplement capital programmes'.
	Act.	24.05	—	
1977-78:	Est.	12.00	—	The above forecast transfer plus transfer \$9.05 m 'to write off deficits accumulated to 30 June 1977'.
	Act.	3.42	—	
1978-79:	Est.	—	5.00	Transfer 'to supplement capital programmes'.
	Act.	—	5.66	
1979-80:	Est.	6.00	—	Transfer 'to supplement capital programmes'.
	Act.	15.54	—	
1980-81:	Est.	—	16.00	*Effectively a transfer: surplus of capital transactions used to offset recurrent spending deficit in Consolidated Account.
	Act.	—	37.27	
1981-82:	Est.	—	44.00*	*As for 1981-82.
	Act.	—	61.8*	
1982-83:	Est.	—	42.0	

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This table clearly indicates that it is only under the Tonkin Government that this practice has become the norm. Prior to 1980-81, this occurred only three times in the previous 30 years, and then only in a minor way. The first two transfers were by Liberal Governments, the first by Sir Thomas Playford in 1958-59 (involving \$1 260 000) and the other by Premier Hall in 1969-70 (involving \$410 000). In 1978-79, the Dunstan Government transferred \$5 600 000 but was able to transfer \$15 540 000 from Revenue Account to Capital Account in the following year.

In simple terms, this means that \$141 000 000 has not been spent in this State on capital works in the past three years. We have lost public assets to that value and, in addition, this money has not been available to the building industry, that is, it has not been available in general to the private sector in this State for construction work. The Government may respond by saying that in 1981-82 of the \$61 300 000 of capital funds used for recurrent expenditure \$3 100 000 was set aside to cover semi-government borrow-

ings on Monarto and \$13 500 000 to cover losses by the Riverland cannery.

Even deducting these amounts, the transfer from 1981-82 would have been \$44 800 000. That is a total of \$124 007 000 over the three-year period ending 30 June 1982. At this point it should be pointed out that the previous sharp distinction between capital and recurrent accounts is becoming blurred. For instance, the Financial Statement, in Appendices 4 and 9, will no longer show transfers from capital to revenue, although capital expenditure will be shown. The ostensible reason for this is that there is now only one Consolidated Account dealing with both recurrent and capital expenditure. The question remains whether or not the Government is attempting to make the distinction less clear to cover up the fact that it has significantly reduced spending on capital works by these transfers.

Some years ago the Dunstan Government started the practice of dealing with the Revenue and Loan Estimates in one Bill, that is, to have a debate on the whole Budget. That seemed a reasonable course, as it enabled Parliament to consider the State's overall financial position and to debate the issues together. However, the Tonkin Government, in December 1980, was responsible for consolidating the Loan Account and the Revenue Account, the rationale being to give 'further impetus to the Government's determination to make the financial affairs of the State more readily understandable'.

It is doubtful whether that has been achieved in this area. The Government should ensure that the Budget papers in each year make clear how much of capital funds has been used for recurrent expenditure. It should also clarify how much of the interest, if any, that services the money borrowed for capital works is used to service that part of the loan that has been used for recurrent expenditure. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table which was prepared by the Parliamentary Library research service and which shows the total amount of interest payable on capital funds used for recurrent purposes in the three years to 30 June 1983.

Leave granted.

Interest Payments on 'Unused' Capital Works Funds

The interest rates used in the following exercise are the weighted average of South Australia's Loan Borrowings from the Commonwealth. For the last few years these rates were:

	Per cent
1979-80	10.6
1980-81	12.2
1981-82	14.5

Source: S.A. Treasury.

As there is no rate for 1982-83 I have used the average rate for the past three years as 12.4 per cent. The amounts 'transferred' or to be 'transferred' from Loan to Revenue Account for the three years in question are:

	\$ million
1980-81	37.3
1981-82	61.3
1982-83	42.0

Interest payable for just one year on each amount is:

	\$
1980-81	4 500 600
1981-82	8 888 850
1982-83	5 208 000

Total end of 1983

\$18 647 450

If the interest is calculated for three years for the \$37 300 000 transferred in 1980-81, two years for the \$61 300 000 transferred in 1981-82 and one year for 1982-83 the amounts are:

	\$
1980-81	13 651 800
1981-82	17 777 700
1982-83	5 208 000
Total end of 1983	\$36 637 500
Total less capital grants	\$24 418 750

During the period 1980-81 to 1982-83, one-third of Commonwealth capital funds for South Australia have come in the form of capital grants. One-third could then be deducted from the above total to arrive at the debt burden to the State. However, there is no way of knowing whether capital grant funds or Loan Council borrowings were used to balance the deficit on revenue account.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On the most favourable estimate for the Government, \$24 400 000 will have been paid by the State Government to service this debt for which the State has received no tangible asset. Not only has the State lost \$141 000 000 worth of assets but also it has spent \$24 400 000 in servicing the debt incurred.

One asks what the position will be in 10 years. At an average of \$40 000 000 a year, \$400 000 000 will have been transferred in that time, and the servicing of that loan could cost \$40 000 000 a year. If inflation runs well ahead of interest rates, this may not be of any great consequence. It could be that this is what the Government is relying on. However, if interest rates remain high the question is what long-term effect this will have on the State's Budget. There is no answer to that question anywhere in the Budget Papers that have been tabled by the Premier. What is the Government's attitude to this practice that it has introduced as a regular feature of South Australian Budgets? What plans does it have for the future?

On 13 February 1979, the present Deputy Premier, Mr Goldsworthy, while in Opposition, and commenting on the modest transfer of \$5 660 000 by the Dunstan Government in 1978-79, described that transfer as 'poor economics'. Mr Goldsworthy quoted Sir Thomas Playford as describing such action as 'a very poor economic policy', and said, 'It will have another very adverse effect on the future of South Australia.' That was the present Deputy Premier, Mr Goldsworthy, commenting on the transfer in 1979 of a modest \$5 660 000 from capital works to recurrent expenditure. In the Estimates Committees last year the Premier said:

We cannot afford to continue to finance our recurrent operations from capital funds indefinitely. To continue to do so for a long period would be detrimental to the economy, particularly to the building and construction industry and to employment.

At least, here is an implied admission that the practice has had an adverse effect on jobs. This year, the Premier said that it 'is not an ideal solution' to transfer \$42 000 000 to supplement recurrent operations.

Last year, I attempted to ascertain what the Government's future intentions were with respect to this now regular practice. I asked the Attorney-General when this practice would stop, and his reply in *Hansard* on 11 February 1982 was as follows:

It is difficult to give a precise answer to the question as much will depend on:

- the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to general purpose tax-sharing grants provided to the States.
- the attitude of Loan Council to general purpose capital funds provided to the States.
- the final outcome of the Commonwealth Grants Commission review of relativities between the States.

Each of those factors could influence significantly the flow of funds between the State's recurrent and capital activities in future years.

Within those constraints, the emphasis will be to reverse the present trend, as far as it is practicable to do so, and to increase the funds available to capital works, particularly those which will

assist the building and construction industry and employment and which will have limited adverse effect on the State's recurrent activities. Two important ingredients in the achievement of that objective will be:

- (a) the containment of the Government's recurrent expenditures.
- (b) the expected increase in royalties arising from the development of the State's natural resources.
- (c) the containment of excessive and unreasonable wage claims.

As usual, this represented a non-answer from the Government. I will be pressing the Attorney-General for a further statement this year, as the attitudes of the Commonwealth Government, the Loan Council and the Grants Commission to the relativities mentioned in his response last year are known now. However, on the face of it, this practice will continue in the foreseeable future. There is no indication from this Government that it will not. I call on the Government, the Premier and the Attorney-General to indicate to the Parliament the Government's intention with respect to the practice developed over the past three years of transferring unprecedentedly high amounts of moneys allocated for capital works to prop up this Government's recurrent expenditure.

I wish now to examine how this withdrawal of \$141 000 000 from construction activity in the State's economy affected the Government's employment objectives at the last election. The promise to create jobs was central to the Government's economic policy, but unemployment is worse now than it was when the Government took office. Had the Government up to the end of June 1982 not had to withdraw \$99 000 000 from capital works construction in the preceding two years, it is likely that the employment position would have been considerably better. In terms of its own economic objectives, clearly stated at the last election, to 'stop the job rot', to create 17 000 jobs, the withdrawal of these construction capital funds was a disaster. Its youth unemployment scheme for 7 000 jobs created only 1 340 jobs up to November 1981. That proposal, that 'bold initiative', as it was described, was a failure.

In addition, the Government took action to depress the construction industry by using capital works money to fund recurrent expenditure. The Government boasts that Roxby Downs has more than 200 people employed on the site and a total of 1 000 reliant upon that development, and that \$60 000 000 has been spent to date at Roxby Downs. On that basis, \$141 000 000 would have been of considerable benefit to the State and would have employed many people, creating assets for community use. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party's proposals for tax cuts before the last election were badly costed. We now have a reduction in jobs and a reduction in South Australia's capital public assets. There is little doubt that this has resulted from serious miscalculations made by the Liberal Party before the last election. Its objectives were inconsistent: on the one hand it wanted to create employment, but, on the other, it cut taxes that would not necessarily stimulate employment. There is no evidence to suggest—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Do you criticise—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will deal with that in a moment, and the honourable member will be considerably embarrassed. There is no evidence to suggest (indeed, it is unlikely) that the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence had an effect on employment. The stamp duty rebate for new home buyers could have had a small employment generating effect, but this is not borne out by the figures, which show a substantial reduction in new building construction in the past three years.

The abolition of succession and gift duties, which were payable by only a small proportion in the State, does not seem to me to have acted as an employment stimulus. There

was no guarantee, and probably no reasonable prospect, that additional funds available to the private sector by this means would result in its utilisation in productive enterprise. It is not possible for one State in Australia to be out of line to any great extent on taxation measures. Given the abolition of succession duties in some of the other States, its abolition in South Australia was probably inevitable, but, because of the Government's miscalculations, its method of abolition has had a disastrous effect on State finances and an adverse effect on employment in this State. Had succession duties been phased out over a period, it is likely that some of the present financial mess could have been avoided. Some of the State Government's financial mess could have been avoided and more people could have been kept in work through the construction of capital assets, by the \$141 000 000 which will have been withdrawn from capital works by the end of this financial year.

The Tonkin Government's response to criticisms in this area is two-fold. First, it says that the practice of using capital moneys for recurrent expenditure is common in other States. That simply is not true, and I will demonstrate that. Secondly, it maintains that it was left liabilities by the Labor Government, which had been responsible for its disastrous budgetary position. Again, that cannot be substantiated.

Document 4, which I tabled earlier, shows that at 23 December 1981, from '1979-80 to 1981-82, no other States have transferred funds from Loan Account to Consolidated Revenue. All transfers of significance appear to be in the other direction to boost capital spending.' The figures for 1981-82 were at that time estimates only. In the Budget debate last year the Hon. Ren DeGaris said:

This is the only State that is making large Loan fund transfers to the Revenue Budget. It is fair to say that all other States are making no transfers from Loan to Revenue.

He pointed out that Queensland was making a large transfer from revenue for capital works. Document 4 also updates the position. In New South Wales in 1981-82, \$9 500 000 unspent on capital items was used to partly offset the revenue deficit of \$69 400 000. In this financial year, its budgeted \$119 900 000 for a capital surplus will again partly offset a revenue deficit, leaving an overall consolidated deficit of \$39 500 000.

Document 4 shows that in Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia there have been transfers the other way, that is, money has been available from revenue surpluses for capital works spending (or it will be on the basis of their Budgets this year). Tasmania has allowed its deficit on revenue to remain without using its capital moneys to cover it.

Therefore, New South Wales is the only other State besides South Australia to have adopted this practice. It is only in this financial year, 1982-83, that a comparatively large amount of \$119 900 000 will be used. Even so, this is considerably less than the Tonkin Government has used in the three years it has adopted the practice, that amount being \$141 000 000. Even in 1982-83, the amount to be used in this way by the New South Wales Government is less in proportionate terms than that of the Tonkin Government. New South Wales proposes \$119 900 000 in a Budget of \$6 796 000 000, that is, 1.76 per cent of the Budget, compared to what South Australia proposes of \$42 000 000 in \$1 974 000 000, which is 2.12 per cent of the Budget.

If the New South Wales Government were using capital funds at the same rate as South Australia, the figure would be \$144 000 000. If South Australia were using funds at the same rate as New South Wales, it would be using \$34 000 000; that is considerably less than the amount actually used by the Tonkin Government. Although of the other States, New South Wales and Tasmania, have consid-

erable difficulties, there is no State that is in a worse budgetary position than South Australia. In the debate on the Supplementary Estimates in June this year the Premier said:

South Australia has taken the hard decision and is now better placed than almost any other State to cope with the current economic situation which applies to all States across Australia and, indeed, to many other countries in the world.

In terms of South Australia's budgetary position, that is clearly not true. The Premier also said:

Other States, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, have found it necessary to reserve large amounts of capital funds to support their recurrent operations.

That again is untrue. New South Wales is the only State to have done it and then to a much less extent than South Australia.

The question now arises of how we get off this treadmill. The Liberal Government clearly has no plans to do it. One can only hope that a Federal Labor Government will provide more adequate guarantees to the States—and I will deal with that matter later when talking about the Liberal Party's new federalism policy.

I will now turn to the Tonkin Government's second response to its demonstrably inept handling of State finances, that is, to place all the blame on the Labor Government for liabilities that the Tonkin Government says it was left. I said earlier that this argument cannot be sustained. In this context the following projects are usually mentioned: Monarto, the Land Commission, the Frozen Food Factory and the Riverland cannery. In respect to Monarto, I refer to Document 3, the conclusion from which is that it now appears likely that the net cost to the State Government on the Monarto project will be in the range of \$10 000 000 to \$12 000 000. It should be pointed out that the Liberal Opposition supported the project initially on the basis of population estimates at the time, that many people were employed over the period of the project, and that there is still an asset remaining for conservation and recreation purposes of some 2 750 hectares.

Regarding the Land Commission, despite the Liberal Government's attempt to label it a financial millstone (the Attorney-General said on 15 June this year that the Land Commission was a \$89 000 000 liability to the State), the fact is that the Land Commission has cost and will cost the State Government absolutely nothing. In fact, Document 1, an analysis of the Land Commission's finances, concludes:

The South Australian Government has made a substantial gain in respect of the commission, rather than incurring a loss, but that gain has been at the expense of the Commonwealth Government.

The conclusion is that South Australia has the Commission (now the Land Trust) with net assets of \$30 000 000 to \$40 000 000, which is much more than is necessary to cover any liability of the Commission to the State Government. So, the proposition put forward by the Attorney-General that the Land Commission has been responsible partly for adversely affecting the State Government's budgetary position is patently untrue.

I do not have the total net costs to the State Government of the Frozen Food Factory. The Ministerial statement made by the Premier on 1 October 1981, when the factory was sold, indicated that it cost \$9 200 000 to build and that it was sold for \$8 150 000. In addition, there were debt servicing charges and operating expenses, but the total cost to the State over the period is unlikely to have been more than \$5 000 000.

Most of the substantial payments to the Riverland cannery have been made since September 1979. Document 2 tables the payments made over the past few years since 1976-77. It is interesting to note that up to 30 June 1980 (a period, one could say, of Labor Government Budgets) \$351 223 was allocated by the State Government to the Riverland cannery.

Up to the end of this financial year the Liberal Government allocated a further \$12 300 000 for the Riverland cannery and has budgeted this financial year to allocate \$4 500 000 for the cannery. So, most of the substantial payments in relation to the Riverland cannery have been made by the Liberal Government since 30 June 1980.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Who involved the State in that project?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is difficult to blame the Labor Government for attempting to keep a viable fruit processing industry in the Riverland. Indeed, that policy has so far been continued by the Liberal Government. Had it disagreed with the policy, it presumably could have withdrawn financial support from the cannery. By saying that the Riverland cannery is a liability handed to it by the Labor Government, the Tonkin Government is saying that it would have allowed the cannery to close had it been in Government before September 1979.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We would not have bought that piece of junk from Victoria.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The fact is that the State Liberal Government, since it came into office, has made substantial payments to the Riverland cannery which dwarf the payments made to it by the previous Government. The fact is that the present Government has continued the policy of trying to ensure that a viable canning operation remains in the Riverland. If the Government has changed its policy in that respect, then it should indicate it to the Parliament; but it cannot claim that that is a liability which it would not have had, because, had it not agreed with the policy, it could have jettisoned the cannery when it came into office or before it made the substantial payments to keep the cannery going.

The statements made by the Government's spokesmen about liabilities left by the Labor Government are grossly exaggerated. Monarto and the Frozen Food Factory have had a minor impact on the State's budgetary situation.

The Land Commission has cost not 1c, and a substantial asset was gained. The Liberal Government has continued a policy of trying to maintain the Riverland cannery as a viable industry in that area. Even if one concedes Labor Government responsibility for the cannery, and I do not, the total liabilities which the Labor Government's operations have caused in connection with the Liberal Government's budgetary position are small, particularly in comparison with the \$141 000 000 capital assets which the State has lost because of the Tonkin Government's bad budgeting, plus the \$24 400 000 loss in servicing that debt.

In comparison with this, the small losses on Monarto and the Frozen Food Factory of no more than \$15 000 000 pale into insignificance. In the light of these facts it is clear that the Tonkin Government's claim to be a good economic manager does not stand up. In 1981-82, the Budget position turned out better than expected, provided always that one considers it legitimate to defer capital works programmes in order to produce a surplus on capital expenditure that can be used on recurrent funding.

However, in 1980-81 it was estimated that \$16 000 000 would be transferred from capital to recurrent activities. In the end, \$37 270 000 was needed, that is, a miscalculation to the tune of more than \$20 000 000. Document 5 indicates that there has not been a worse result since 1950 in budgetary miscalculations. Since 1950 the Revenue Account was overspent only six times, and then by comparatively small amounts.

I now turn to the reaction of Parliament, the press and the public to this extraordinary state of affairs. Labor members have pointed out problems. Liberal members, with one exception, have failed to recognise the enormity of the Government's mismanagement. Only the Hon. Mr DeGaris

has been critical of the Government. However, more surprising has been the muted attitude of the press, which seems to have treated the significant alteration in previous practice as somehow being consistent with good management, despite the fact that it had never been done previously on a consistent basis and that the Tonkin Government commenced it earlier, with to date only New South Wales following suit and then to a lesser extent than the Tonkin Government.

One could contemplate the howls of outrage that would have ensued if this practice had been adopted by the Labor Government. In 1980 the *Advertiser* editorial praised Mr Tonkin for holding his tight ship and failed even to mention the projected first transfer of capital funds to keep the tight ship afloat. In 1981 it pointed out the transfer which had occurred and said that it may well be a responsible form of budgeting. In 1982 the *Advertiser* editorial pointed out that Mr Tonkin had maintained the thrust of his previous three Budgets seeking to project an image of responsible financial management rather than one of a dispenser of bounty which the State cannot afford. Overall, this Budget is reasoned and responsible.

This is the *Advertiser*. Although the transfers were mentioned, there was no criticism from the press. This year the *News* editorial stated:

It is difficult to see why Mr Bannon chose to describe it—the Budget—

as an appalling document which was a confession of failure. In the circumstances such talk is convincingly lurid. All in all the State's first \$2 billion Budget is a prudent piece of housekeeping.

At no time has there been any criticism of the depletion in the State's assets, the adverse effect on employment, the interest payable on moneys used for a non-existent asset or any discussion of what the future holds.

What has happened over the past three years has been budgetary mismanagement of proportions that have not been seen in the recent history of South Australia, yet the issue has gone unanalysed and uncriticised by our daily press. The Government line of prudence and good management has been swallowed without a murmur. I trust that the analysis that I have made today injects some realism into the community's discussion and gives the lie to the Tonkin Government's claim of good management.

I find it particularly disappointing, and I would criticise the press substantially for it, that it has in this State followed and swallowed the line advanced by Mr Tonkin on this issue. There has been no critical analysis by any of the local press that I can find. There has been no discussion. There have been reports of the deficit, particularly when Opposition members have pointed it out, but there have been no detailed analyses by financial or political journalists on the effect that these transfers have had on the State's budgetary position.

There has been no taking up of the criticism by at least one Liberal member, the Hon. Mr DeGaris, of the State's budgetary position. The press has continued to repeat the propaganda fed to it by the Premier and by the Government's spokesmen that the Premier has been responsible for sound financial management. They have done that despite the fact that, by the end of this financial year, \$141 000 000 that could have gone to creating public assets, that could have gone to employ people in this State, has been withdrawn by the Tonkin Government from the State's finances because of its budgetary miscalculations before the last election.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Are you suggesting that—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am suggesting that there has been no critical analysis of a situation that deserves some research and comment by the press in this State. I am suggesting that the press has done nothing.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That's a reflection on the journalists.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not care on whom it is a reflection: I am saying that this has happened in South Australia and that there has been no attempt by anyone in the public area or the media to analyse critically what has happened. I am critical, and openly critical, of that. They have accepted uncritically what has happened. They have not asked the Government what is the long-term future or effect of these transfers on the State in the years to come. They have not asked, and the Government has not responded and said what it intends to do about this matter in the future.

Does it intend to keep this method going indefinitely? Frankly, I have been disappointed about that. Certainly, I hope that what I have said today has put the record straight to some extent, and I hope that someone will take up the matter on the public front. I hope that some financial journalist will see the enormity of the budgetary mismanagement in which this Government has engaged and the incredible effect the withdrawal of \$141 000 000 from employment-generating works in this State must have had on this State's unemployment situation over the past three years.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: There has been comment on this—comment on the excessive wage demands which have made it necessary.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Dr Ritson cannot control himself as usual. I point out to him that in the Budget papers the position is clear: that, as set out on page 4 of the Premier's statement, \$78 000 000 was allocated in the last financial year for wage and salary increases expected to occur in 1981-82.

What was the result, in fact, in that financial year? Only \$59 700 000 was expended in wages and salary increases. In other words, the Government budgeted the \$78 000 000 in the past financial year for wage and salary increases but in that year only \$59 700 000 was spent in that regard.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The full-year impact is \$140 000 000.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Attorney will have a chance to respond when he debates the issue. I am reading from the Budget papers that were prepared by the Premier. In any event, the increase in wages cannot be any excuse for the State's budgetary position. A prudent Treasurer, at the beginning of a financial year, estimates what wage increases will be. He knows more or less what wage increases will occur and he makes allowances for them. It is just not on to blame the increase in wages for the State Government's budgetary position. There were increases in wages of quite substantial proportions over the last decade, yet the State was not in the same financial mess then as it is in at present. The conclusions that can be drawn—

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Will you support the action taken by the States in America in relation to this question?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know that the Hon. Mr DeGaris has suggested that there should be legislation prohibiting transfers of capital moneys to recurrent operations and, quite frankly, I have no firm view on that. However, I believe that it could introduce an inflexibility into State budgeting arrangements that would not be desirable and, of course, it is true that all the moneys now go into one account. There are no separate accounts, such as a Revenue Account or a Loan Account, as there once were. At this stage, I am certainly not prepared to say that there should be a constitutional limitation, because I believe that some Budget flexibility is required.

However, the gravamen of my criticism is that what has occurred in South Australia over the past three years, as far as I can ascertain, has not previously occurred since 1950,

and these past three years may well be the only time in the history of the State when this depletion in capital assets occurs. There is no indication from the Government what it will do in the future—none whatsoever. The conclusions that can be drawn from these documents are as follows. First, in the 1979-80 Budget, which the Corcoran Government prepared and which was inherited by the Tonkin Government, the State budgetary position was sound: there was a surplus in Revenue Account such that \$15 540 000 could be transferred to capital works. Secondly, in less than two years of the Tonkin Government, that is, by 30 June 1981, that surplus, from the previous sound financial position, had been turned into a deficit requiring \$37 270 000 from capital for recurrent purposes. That is a deterioration from 30 June 1980 to 30 June 1981 of \$52 800 000 in recurrent activities. Thirdly, up to 30 June 1982 no other State had used capital funds for recurrent expenses to any extent, and now only New South Wales is doing that, and to a lesser extent than is the Tonkin Government. Fourthly, a total of \$141 000 000 up to 30 June 1982 which should have been spent on capital works and to stimulate employment was required to keep recurrent operations going, but, by 30 June 1983, the State will have paid \$24 400 000 to service its loan.

Fifthly, the Land Commission has had no adverse effect on the Budget, and Monarto and the Frozen Food Factory have had only a minimal impact. Sixthly, compared to the \$141 000 000 loss in capital assets under the Tonkin Government, the loss on Monarto and the Frozen Food Factory is comparatively minor. Seventhly, the 1980-81 Budget was so badly out in its estimates that over \$20 000 000 more than estimated had to be transferred from capital funds to prop up recurrent activities. This sort of miscalculation has been unknown in recent South Australian history.

I believe that those conclusions, based as they are on the documents I have tabled and the analyses I have made of those documents, are reasonable. I do not believe that the Tonkin Government has come to grips with what it has done in this area of the State Budgets over the past three years. It has not made any attempt to explain to the Parliament what it intends to do about the quite severe rundown that has occurred in public assets. Unfortunately, we now face a problem, and that is the difficulty that any Government in the future will be faced with. We have a problem, because, quite clearly, the Government miscalculated before it came to office on what it could do. Obviously, the Government did not understand the situation in regard to the State Budget and it has got this State into an incredible mess.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: You have forgotten Monarto and all that.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I have indicated, the total loss to the State from Monarto would be about \$12 000 000. The honourable member should compare that to the \$141 000 000 lost by this Government in three years. The final matter with which I wish to deal is the federalism policy of the Fraser and Tonkin Governments. I relate my remarks to the previous matter with which I dealt, because Premier Tonkin now partly blames the Federal Government for his budgetary position. Of course, the Premier will blame anyone except himself for his budgetary position; he will blame wage and salary earners, if it suits him; he will blame the previous Labor Government, if it suits him; and, of course, he will blame the Federal Government, if it suits him. The answer to the problems that this State and one other State face—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Victoria.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is not true. As I have indicated, there has been no transfer in Victoria.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The Victorian Government just increased State taxes—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There has been no transfer in Victoria. One can hardly blame the Labor Government for the situation in that State, because it came to office only very recently. In Victoria there has been no transfer from capital operations to recurrent works. That has been done in New South Wales, and only this year, whereas Mr Tonkin has been doing it for two years prior to this.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Four—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr DeGaris says that Tonkin has been doing it for four years.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: He has not been in office for four years.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He has had four Budgets.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Three Budgets—one was already prepared.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: One of the four was a Labor Budget. The answer may be in a future Federal Labor Government's modifying the new federalism policy to provide a more adequate guarantee of funds from the Commonwealth to the States. I want the Attorney to indicate what his Government intends to do in the future about the situation that I have outlined to the Chamber this afternoon.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: What will the Opposition do?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will be working for the return of a Federal Labor Government. I am hopeful (although I do not know) that some financial arrangement can be worked out which provides adequate guarantees to the State. Make no mistake, the Labor Government did not get this State into this mess; it has happened, as I have indicated, since 1979. I am sure that any objective observer of the material I have presented to the Chamber this afternoon would concede that this has happened under a Liberal Government.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: It is not in a mess.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I find that incredible. For the Minister to say that the withdrawal of \$141 000 000 in capital funds from the State's economy over a period of three years does not constitute a mess (with all the implications that action has for the deterioration of assets and lack of employment opportunities in this State) is ridiculous. I turn to the Liberal federalism policy. I said that Mr Tonkin announced another scapegoat in the Budget papers for his difficulties; that is, the Federal Government. In his statement the Premier said:

Despite some positive real growth in payments to the States expected in 1982-83, over the five years since 1977-78, payments to the States have declined in real terms by about 5 per cent compared with a real increase of about 19 per cent in the Commonwealth's other outlays. In other words, the States have borne the full brunt of the Commonwealth's cost-cutting exercise.

Attachment 2, which discusses developments in Commonwealth/State relationships, states:

Thus, over the last five years, payments to the States have grown about 40 per cent less rapidly than other outlays. In real terms, payments to the States are, on the measure used above, now some 5 per cent less than in 1977-78.

He continued:

This lack of balance in the application of expenditure restraint policies has been one of the most notable, and disappointing, features of Commonwealth financial policies in recent years.

The Premier and the Government are now blaming the Federal Government, in part, for the budgetary position in which they find themselves. The fact is that the Commonwealth Government has not kept up payments to the States which they have kept up in their own expenditure. What the Tonkin Government does not seem to realise (or it has forgotten), or what the Liberal Party does not seem to

realise, is that this is precisely the policy supported by the Liberal Party, enunciated by Mr Fraser in 1975, and wholeheartedly supported by the Premier, Mr Tonkin. It is the whole basis of new federalism—the withdrawal, the contraction of funds from the Commonwealth to the States, is what new federalism is about. It is the logic, the end result of new federalism.

Let us see what the new federalism policy stated in 1975 about the States, in respect of responsible Government, as follows:

If Government is to be effective, it must be accountable for its actions. It should raise the money which it spends.

That, of course, is the philosophical basis of new federalism: that the Commonwealth and States are sovereign Governments within their own spheres of activity and that if the States wish to provide services for their citizens then they should have responsibility for raising funds to provide those services to their citizens.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Do you disagree with that?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If one accepts federalism then that is the logic of it, as the Hon. Mr DeGaris accepts and has made clear in this Council. However, he is the only Liberal who has been honest enough to stand up for new federalism. In addition in the new federalism policy as enunciated, the power to raise taxes was given to the States. They now have that taxing power that was proposed by Mr Fraser in 1975 and supported wholeheartedly by Mr Tonkin. On 20 September 1976 Mr Tonkin was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

The Party's federalism policy is the best thing that could happen to Australia and the States.

On 7 April 1977 the Premier was referred to in the *Advertiser* as follows:

Dr Tonkin said that he would support the federalism policy no matter what Government brought it in. 'It is in the best interests of South Australia,' he said.

What we have is a federalism policy announced by Mr Fraser in 1975, fully endorsed by the Liberal Party in 1975, fully supported by Dr Tonkin at that time (indeed, I believe he had some say in formulating that policy), and fully endorsed by him since that time. The logic of that federalism policy is that moneys available from the Commonwealth to the States are contracted and the States should raise moneys in order to provide services for their citizens.

In the face of that inevitability, when the logic of that new federalism policy becomes known to the Tonkin Government then, in its Budget papers, it criticises the Federal Government for carrying out a policy which Mr Tonkin fully endorsed when in Opposition. The Tonkin Government's difficulties, insofar as they are related to the Federal Government, are of its own making. They are consistent with the policy adopted in 1975 in co-operation with Mr Fraser and fully supported by Mr Tonkin. As a result of this, Mr Tonkin has no moral authority to complain to the Federal Government. When Mr Tonkin complains to Mr Fraser that South Australia is having its funds cut, or that the Commonwealth Government is contracting the funds available to the States, what does Mr Fraser have to say? He says, 'But Mr Tonkin, that was the policy we formulated in 1975. Shut up and go home.' There can be no moral authority, no persuasive authority, for a Liberal Government such as the Tonkin Government going to the Federal Fraser Government and trying to get greater payments for the State, because the Tonkin Government agreed previously that those funds should be contracted.

I have mentioned the federalism policy because it is another area where Liberal Party policies in Opposition

have been found wanting in practice. I also mention it because it may be that the only way that the disastrous situation in which we now find ourselves in South Australia can be corrected in the absence of any substantial tax increases by the Government is in a review of the new federalism policy, a review of that federalism policy to the extent that greater guarantees are provided for Commonwealth funds to the States. The alternative, of course, is to further cut back public sector activity. It might well be that the Attorney-General can tell us what the Government has in mind about that. It could be that the Government will sell the Land Commission's assets of \$30 000 000 or \$40 000 000 to try to make up its Budget deficits. That we do not know, but it may be that, consistent with the State maintaining a reasonable level of public sector activity, the only way this mess can be resolved is by Federal Government guarantees, which would negate the new federalism policy of the Fraser Government.

I have attempted this afternoon in the Council to place the facts before honourable members which I believe are justified by the papers that I have tabled. I believe that the conclusions are justified from those papers. I will be interested to hear the comments that honourable members have to make on them, because the papers are freely available to them. However, I maintain on the basis of what I have put to the Council that what has happened over the past three years can only stamp the Tonkin Government as probably the worst managers of a State Budget that this State has seen since the war, and probably for a considerable period prior to that.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is a very hard act to follow, and I congratulate my leader on a splendid job. This is the fourth and the last Budget that will be tabled by the Forty-fourth South Australian Parliament. It has been debated in a time of ever increasing speculation about a State election, combined with ever increasing speculation about a Federal election, just to complicate the picture. However, whichever is to come first, we must go to the polls before March next year, so this will be the last Budget that is brought in by this Administration. It is therefore appropriate that I should analyse the performance of the Tonkin Government in the health area over these four successive Budgets. It is an area in which, like many others, the extravagant posturing and rhetoric have been sadly unmatched by performance and which shows the high social cost of small government.

This afternoon I shall advance and discuss three main points: first, the inadequacy of the presentation of the Health Commission's budget in the present form; secondly, the progressive and increasingly disastrous assault by the present Government on the State's hospital system; and, thirdly, the transfer to an ever increasing flat rate of taxation that masquerades as health insurance.

First, I refer to the presentation of the health budget. While the Government and the Health Commission persist with the presentation of the health budget in its present form, it is largely without meaning. While any Government and the Health Commission persisted with the presentation of the Budget in its present form it would be without meaning. There is no doubt that under present arrangements with the health budget the estimates are no more than guesstimates. There are three main reasons for this: first, the individual budgets of the health units are not finalised for more than two months after the preparation of the Budget papers. One of the factors in this is that the State health budget relies so heavily from year to year on the

Federal Budget. There is really no comparable area. Obviously, this will not be resolved until either the health budgets are put on a triennial basis and/or the present Federal funding arrangements are restructured.

Secondly, it is imperative that the State Treasury be given a much greater measure of control over the Health Commission. Thirdly, there is no effort in the Budget presentation to relate estimates to the previous year's performance in real terms. In the health area, this is as idiotic as it is idiosyncratic. This was nicely highlighted by the Chairman of the Health Commission in his evidence to the health Estimates Committee. Referring to the yellow book, the so-called Programme Estimates for 1982-83, he said:

As I have said, it is confusing. If one looks at page 7 one can see that it is not comparing like with like... the actual expenditure for last year was \$475 800 000. The estimate of \$505 000 000 for this year does not include the amount held by the Treasurer in round-sum allowances for both wages and the proportion for inflation. There is additional money in the round-sum allowances for both wages and the proportion for inflation. In fact, our figure includes 4 per cent for inflation. There is additional money in the round-sum allowances. We anticipate that, if wage rises proceed as expected, it will probably reach about \$30 000 000. Therefore, one must add \$30 000 000 to the \$505 000 000 when comparing it with the \$475 000 000, which gives a rate of 12 per cent, but we are anticipating that the system will probably move. In relation to community health centres, if that figure holds, as I believe it will, and it is used for community health, it will produce a figure of 14 per cent...

That is one of the confusing things about this area, and that is... why the Commonwealth Government estimates what it will be. Rather than keeping it as a round sum in the Treasurer's fund, they add that figure of \$30 000 000 to the (estimated) expenditure.

That is a pretty torturous piece of prose. I say that without disrespect to the Chairman of the commission, because he was trying to explain to the average reasonable person something that was virtually inexplicable. In the health budget, the use of 'round-sum allowances' in the State Treasurer's fund is a conjuror's trick to make genuine comparisons of increased or decreased expenditure meaningless.

I am not questioning the use of round-sum allowances in the overall State Budget estimates, but in an area such as the health budget they make comparisons with previous performance an impossible task for the Parliament. This was clearly illustrated again when the Chairman of the Health Commission was questioned about the allocation to the Western Domiciliary Care Service. The actual expenditure in 1981-82 was \$1 369 000, but the estimate for 1982-83 is given as \$1 407 000, a decrease of approximately 8 per cent in real terms. However, the conjuror's trick is revealed again. The Chairman explained:

In relation to the Western Domiciliary Care Service, it was \$1 360 000 last year and it is \$1 400 000 this year, which is an increase of 2.74 per cent on that economic estimate.

In fact, it is an 8 per cent decrease in real terms. However, the conjuror's trick was then produced, when the Chairman said:

The Executive Director of the western sector has explained the situation to me. The Western Domiciliary Care Service has been amalgamated with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which proposes to start a domiciliary care rehabilitation service and assessment rehabilitation service. Therefore the \$150 000...

There is no indication of whether the \$150 000 is a white rabbit produced from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's top hat, from the original \$1 400 000, or from elsewhere. He continued:

Therefore the \$150 000 for domiciliary care in the western sector is earmarked for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Following this erudite explanation, the Chairman said:

In addition to the 2.7 per cent increase, one must add an increase of about 6 per cent, presumably from the magical round-sum allowances to achieve an actual figure which amounts to about 8.8 per cent for Western Domiciliary Care... resources going into domiciliary care... are also affected by the district nursing service to domiciliary care services, and as we pointed out there is a very large increase in their capacity which will impact on that service.

Again, that is prose that is almost impossible for any reasonable person who is not an insider to follow. The Chairman and the commission are victims rather than villains in this procedure. Is it any wonder that my colleague, the member for Playford, was moved to say of the yellow book presentation:

The descriptive manner under 'Implications for Resources' is a sheer masterpiece of drafting of which any lawyer could be proud... there is the possible reallocation of possible funds depending on possible events that might or might not occur depending on whether something does or does not happen. That is a magnificent anticipated self-defence.

The buffoonery which poses as a health budget does not stop there. The health Programme Estimates for 1982-83, the so-called yellow book, must surely be the most inane document ever presented to the South Australian Parliament. I find it difficult to believe that Treasury officers, as distinct from Treasurer Tonkin, had anything to do with it. Quite clearly they had no control over its contents and are very embarrassed by it.

From page 17 through to page 93 we have all sorts of pretence at significant initiatives. No doubt some of these will occur, but it boggles the mind that in every unit the figure giving the estimated number of employees for 1982-83 is identical with the actual number in 1981-82. On page after page, from page 7 to page 93, the number of employees is identical in every case, and in every unit. It is the South Australian joke book for 1982 and should immediately be placed in a glass case at the Constitutional Museum.

Let me give some of the more remarkable examples. At page 6 under 'Implications for Resources' this amazing publication states:

Increased share of resources for institutional care to non-institutional and preventive care services.

Expanding on this theme at page 7, the book states:

The major areas towards which existing resources continue to be reallocated are: community health and domiciliary care service; environmental and occupational health services; and health promotion services.

When one examines this extraordinary chronicle on pages 35 to 39, one finds an amazing story. This section refers to 'Health Services mainly for the aged and physically disabled living at home'. On page 35, under 'Issues and Trends', the document states quite commendably and, I hope, accurately:

The appropriate balance between institutional and non-institutional forms of care is likely to be the major issue in the foreseeable future. The costs involved and the extent to which non-institutional forms of care can be regarded as alternatives to institutional forms of care are likely to be critical issues during a time when the number and proportion of aged people in the community is increasing.

However, from pages 36 to 39 we find the number of full-time equivalent staff proposed for this area in 1982-83 identical to those in 1981-82. On page 72 we have the heading 'Major Resource Variations 1982-83' as against 1981-82. I ask members to note the heading 'Major Resource Variations'. It states:

Reallocation of resources to community health centres.

Yet again we find the number of proposed full-time equivalent staff given as 176.2 for 1982-83, exactly the same as

that provided in 1981-82. At page 80, under the heading 'Environmental and Occupational Health Services', we see listed under 'Specific Targets and Objectives':

Additional staff and equipment are proposed for the Radiation Control Section.

Yet again at page 81 we see the number of proposed full-time equivalent staff for 1982-83 given as 104.3 full-time employees, which is identical to the actual number of staff employed in 1981-82. This whole comedy is played out page after page for 87 pages in the joke book. It is little wonder there are some red faces in both the Treasury and the Health Commission.

I turn now to the progressive and increasingly disastrous assault on the Government hospital system. I have a series of tables prepared by the research officers in the Parliamentary Library from annual reports of the South Australian Health Commission, the statistics branch of the commission and from information provided by the Sturt campus of the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. They relate to:

Patients admitted to 11 major Government hospitals, plus the Queen Victoria and Adelaide Children's Hospital in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82.

Total staff in those 11 major Government hospitals in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82.

Medical staff, visiting medical specialists, paramedical, scientific, technical and nursing staff in 11 major Government hospitals, the Queen Victoria Hospital, the Adelaide Children's Hospital and Glenside, Hillcrest, and Strathmont in the calendar years 1978 to 1982.

The number of applicants, quotas and acceptances for the Diploma of Applied Science (Nursing) at Sturt C.A.E. for the years 1975 to 1982.

The number of applicants, quotas and acceptances for the conversion course for the Diploma of Applied Science (Nursing) at Sturt C.A.E. for the years 1977 to 1982.

The tables are all purely statistical, and I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Patients Admitted to Major South Australian Hospitals 1978-1982

Hospitals	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Royal Adelaide	37 023	39 818	40 885	40 261
Queen Elizabeth	30 609	31 514	32 069	29 129
Flinders	21 463	23 714	25 348	26 694
Adelaide Children's	17 128	16 605	17 080	17 262
Queen Victoria	8 298	8 461	9 524	8 389
Modbury	10 441	10 568	10 282	10 097
Lyell McEwin	9 496	9 967	10 642	10 779
Mount Gambier	7 453	6 974	7 124	7 381
Port Augusta	4 725	5 179	5 370	5 497
Port Lincoln	2 455	2 333	2 491	2 815
Port Pirie	3 780	3 813	3 973	4 330
Wallaroo	845	764	1 006	823
Whyalla	10 924	10 372	10 482	9 323
Total	164 640	170 082	176 276	172 780

Sources: South Australian Health Commission, Annual reports.
South Australian Health Commission, Information supporting the Estimates 1981-82 and 1982-83.

Staff in 11 Major Hospitals (Total Staff (F.T.E.))

Hospital	1981-82	1980-81	1979-80	1978-79
Royal Adelaide	3 325.9	3 593.6	3 671.2	3 850.5
Queen Elizabeth	2 471.2	2 345.7	2 368.1	2 548.1
Flinders	1 838.9	1 984.1	1 899.3	1 943.4
Modbury	688.7	673.2	643.8	672.0
Lyell McEwin	456.4	460.5	459.9	461.1
Mount Gambier	370.0	379.9	387.5	414.0
Port Augusta	241.2	223.4	217.1	223.7
Port Lincoln	125.7	120.5	123.8	116.1
Port Pirie	299.5	273.7	284.0	280.1
Wallaroo	95.3	95.0	97.3	93.7
Whyalla	513.2	483.3	471.9	512.9
Totals	10 426.0	10 632.9	10 623.9	11 115.6

Sources: South Australian Health Commission Annual Reports.
Information Booklet Supporting the 1981-82 Estimates.

Medical Staff and Visiting Medical Specialists in Major South Australian Hospitals, 1978-82 (F.T.E.)

Hospital	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Royal Adelaide					
Medical	265.8	263.5	271.7	277.3	261.5
V.M.S.	62.2	55.0	55.1	50.2	52.1
Total	328.0	318.5	326.8	327.5	313.6
Queen Elizabeth					
Medical	180.0	171.3	180.0	176.0	180.0
V.M.S.	27.7	26.8	28.0	28.9	29.1
Total	207.7	198.1	208.0	204.9	209.1
Flinders					(March '82)
Medical	183.6	180.0	173.5	176.1	184.5
V.M.S.	21.1	19.8	19.1	18.2	18.9
Total	204.7	199.8	192.6	194.3	203.4
Queen Victoria					
Medical	13.5	15.0	14.2	10.3	11.8
V.M.S.	7.0	5.7	5.7	5.7	6.6
Total	20.5	20.7	19.9	16.0	18.4
Adelaide Children's					
Medical	81.5	85.0	102.8	95.0	95.0
V.M.S.	23.5	23.2	23.3	19.8	20.1
Total	105.0	108.2	126.1	114.8	115.1

Medical Staff and Visiting Medical Specialists in Major South Australian Hospitals, 1978-82 (F.T.E.)—*continued*

Hospital	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Modbury					
Medical	31.0	33.0	45.0	51.0	51.0
V.M.S.	7.8	8.2	8.2	9.6	9.7
Total	38.8	41.2	53.2	60.6	60.7
Lyell McEwin					(Nov. '81)
Medical	?**	13.0	13.0	13.4	13.0
V.M.S.	?	—	—	—	—
Total	?	13.0	13.0	13.4	13.0
Mount Gambier Medical	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Port Augusta Medical	1.0	.4	.2	.2	.2
Port Lincoln Medical	1.0	1.0	1.0	.1	.1
Port Pirie Medical1	.1	.1	.1	.5
Wallaroo Medical	1.2	.3	.2	.3	.3
Whyalla Medical	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.0	[1.0]

Est.

Total Medical Staff and V.M.S. in Major South Australian Hospitals, 1978-82 (F.T.E.)

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Medical	773.8	764.7	803.9	802.8	799.9
V.M.S.	149.3	138.7	139.4	132.4	136.5
Total	923.1	903.4	943.3	935.2	936.4

*Note: 1978 statistics may not be strictly comparable with those for later years because of a category 'miscellaneous' which was distributed to the relevant categories in the other years dealt with in the table.

**The medical staff at Lyell McEwin in 1978 was estimated to be 13.0.

Source: South Australian Health Commission Statistics Branch.

Mental Health Services

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Glenside					
Medical	19.7	22.0	21.0	22.0	21.4
V.M.S.	—	—	—	—	—
Total	19.7	22.0	21.7	25.4	22.3
Hillcrest/Enfield					
Medical	29.1	25.9	23.0	24.8	32.2
V.M.S.	—	—	3.2	1.7	1.9
Total	29.1	25.9	26.2	26.5	34.1
Strathmont					
Medical	1.0	2.7	3.2	4.4	4.1
V.M.S.	—	—	.1	.3	.1
Total	1.0	2.7	3.3	4.7	4.2
Total Mental Health					
Medical	61.5	67.8	63.4	56.8	81.2
V.M.S.	—	—	4.0	17.0	2.9
Total	61.5	67.8	67.4	73.8	84.1

Paramedical, Scientific and Technical Staff in Major South Australian Hospitals 1978-82
(F.T.E.)

	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Royal Adelaide					
Paramedical		219.9	213.5	230.8	196.5
Scientific and Technical		90.0	93.0	99.6	88.2
} 360.1					
Total	360.1	309.9	306.5	330.4	284.7
Queen Elizabeth					
Paramedical		164.3	154.0	127.4	141.2
Scientific and Technical		206.2	200.9	228.8	219.8
} 375.4					
Total	375.4	370.5	354.9	356.2	361.0
Flinders					(Mar 1982)
Paramedical		98.7	108.0	88.2	91.3
Scientific and Technical		166.6	164.9	207.5	203.2
} 292.0					
Total	292.0	255.3	272.9	295.7	294.5
Queen Victoria					
Paramedical		26.5	33.7	26.5	26.0
Scientific and Technical		21.0	19.7	21.5	22.5
} 48.6					
Total	48.6	47.5	53.4	48.0	48.5
Adelaide Children's					
Paramedical		150.6	145.5	103.5	102.8
Scientific and Technical		92.0	92.2	122.0	121.1
} 243.5					
Total	243.5	242.6	237.7	225.5	223.9
Modbury					
Paramedical		29.0	29.5	32.3	33.7
Scientific and Technical		5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
} 35.4					
Total	35.4	34.0	33.5	36.3	37.7
Lyell McEwin					(Nov. 1981)
Paramedical	19.0**	19.3**	21.0**	23.6	18.4
Scientific and Technical	—	—	—	6.0	5.0
} 19.0					
Total	19.0	19.3	21.0	29.6	23.4
Port Pirie					
Paramedical		7.8	5.0	12.6	15.3
Scientific and Technical		—	3.0	4.0	3.0
} 3.0					
Total	3.0	7.8	8.0	16.6	18.3
Port Augusta					
Paramedical		7.3	6.6	7.8	7.9
Scientific and Technical		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
} 5.5					
Total	5.5	9.3	8.6	9.8	9.9
Whyalla					
Paramedical		22.1	21.3	15.0	} 21.4
Scientific and Technical		—	—	5.0	
} 18.3					
Total	18.3	22.1	21.3	20.0	21.4
Port Lincoln					
Paramedical		2.6	2.7	3.7	3.3
Scientific and Technical		—	—	—	—
} 6.2					
Total	6.2	2.6	2.7	3.7	3.3
Walleroo					
Paramedical		2.9	2.7	3.1	2.6
Scientific and Technical		—	—	—	—
} 2.8					
Total	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.6

Mental Health Services

Glenside					
Paramedical	} 57.2	56.6	57.6	62.0	60.3
Scientific and Technical					
Total	57.2	56.6	57.6	70.6	64.8
Hillcrest/Enfield					
Paramedical	} 53.0	53.3	56.6	58.8	58.1
Scientific and Technical					
Total	53.0	53.3	56.6	58.8	58.1
Strathmont					
Paramedical	} 42.4	40.5	29.2	31.5	39.7
Scientific and Technical					
Total	42.4	40.5	29.2	31.5	39.7
Total Mental Health					
Paramedical	} 211.6	214.5	215.6	229.8	227.3
Scientific and Technical					
Total	211.6	214.5	215.6	238.4	231.8

Total Paramedical, Scientific and Technical Staff in Major South Australian Hospitals 1978-82

1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
1 409.8	1 323.8	1 320.2	1 374.9	1 329.2

*Note Figures for 1978 may not be exactly comparable with those for subsequent years because of a 'miscellaneous' category, which in later years was distributed to various staff categories.

** Lyell McEwin did not separate paramedical from scientific and technical officers until 1980-81.

Nursing Staff in Major South Australian Hospitals 1978-1982
(F.T.E.)

Category of Nurse	1st Pay Period* July '78	1st Pay Period July '79	Last Pay Period June '80	Last Pay Period June '81	Last Pay Period June '82		
Royal Adelaide (Includes Dental School and Northfield Wards)							
Nursing Students and Trainees	1 012.0	800.2	691.0	604.0	537.4		
Nursing Other	970.5	—	39.1	35.0	21.8		
Unqualified Nurses	} 999.9	} 1 054.3	1 060.7	{ 738.9	934.7 { 683.8		
Registered Nurses						321.8	250.9
Enrolled Nurses							
Total	1 982.5	1 846.3	1 784.4	1 699.7	1 493.9		
Queen Elizabeth							
Nursing Students and Trainees	742.0	625.9	478.0	420.0	462.0		
Nursing Other	476.0	21.5	46.0	43.0	39.0		
Unqualified Nurses	} 480.3	} 510.5	581.5	{ 470.5	558.5 { 438.5		
Registered Nurses						111.0	120.0
Enrolled Nurses							
Total	1 218.0	1 127.7	1 034.5	1 064.5	1 059.5		
Flinders							
Nursing Students and Trainees	61.0	59.0	31.0	35.0	(March '82) 39.6		
Nursing Other	671.0	—	11.0	12.0	9.2		
Unqualified Nurses	} 729.9	} 739.1	789.9	{ 529.3	725.5 { 492.8		
Registered Nurses						260.6	232.7
Enrolled Nurses							
Total	732.0	788.9	781.1	836.9	774.3		
Queen Victoria							
Nursing Students and Trainees	79.0	57.0	57.0	69.0	45.0		
Nursing Other	289.0	29.7	2.0	1.0	—		
Unqualified Nurses	} 263.0	} 245.2	257.1	{ 208.7	257.2 { 221.0		
Registered Nurses						48.4	36.2
Enrolled Nurses							
Total	368.0	349.7	302.2	327.1	302.2		

Nursing Staff in Major South Australian Hospitals 1978-1982
(F.T.E.)—continued

Category of Nurse	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Adelaide Childrens					
Nursing Students and Trainees	344.5	293.5	258.0	261.0	218.0
Nursing Other	290.0				
Unqualified Nurses		—	18.8	29.3	18.8
Registered Nurses		250.0	237.9	260.7	249.0
Enrolled Nurses				{ 183.0 77.7	{ 176.5 72.5
Total	634.5	543.5	514.7	551.0	485.8
Modbury					
Nursing Students and Trainees	105.0	145.0	145.0	81.0	55.0
Nursing Other	220.1				
Unqualified Nurses		—	3.0	2.0	1.0
Registered Nurses		178.4	157.6	245.1	250.1
Enrolled Nurses				{ 212.7 32.4	{ 211.7 38.4
Total	325.1	323.4	305.6	328.1	306.1
Lyell McEwen					
Nursing Students and Trainees		—	134.0	128.0	(Nov. '81) 97.0
Nursing Other					
Unqualified Nurses	?	—	1.0	1.0	1.0
Registered Nurses		276.9	148.2	154.7	183.3
Enrolled Nurses				{ 104.5 50.2	{ 134.0 49.3
Total	[300]**	276.9	283.2	283.7	281.3
Mount Gambier					
Nursing Students and Trainees	116.0	108.0	83.0	87.0	78.0
Nursing Other	163.4				
Unqualified Nurses		—	6.5	7.7	5.6
Registered Nurses		161.1	160.2	152.1	131.7
Enrolled Nurses				{ 98.8 53.3	{ 89.7 42.0
Total	279.4	269.1	249.7	246.8	215.3
Port Augusta					
Nursing Students and Trainees	60.0	66.0	55.0	40.0	37.0
Nursing Other	89.7				
Unqualified Nurses		2.9	1.3	1.4	1.4
Registered Nurses		74.7	80.5	89.9	105.4
Enrolled Nurses				{ 65.6 33.3	{ 71.8 33.6
Total	149.7	143.6	136.8	140.3	143.8
Port Lincoln					
Nursing Students and Trainees	36.0	28.8	29.0	27.0	30.0
Nursing Other	35.7				
Unqualified Nurses		1.0	1.0	—	—
Registered Nurses		34.7	36.0	48.2	45.9
Enrolled Nurses				{ 29.2 19.0	{ 28.9 17.0
Total	71.7	64.5	71.1	70.2	70.3
Port Pirie					
Nursing Students and Trainees	102.0	—	75.0	64.0	45.0
Nursing Other	104.2				
Unqualified Nurses		12.8	13.4	4.0	9.0
Registered Nurses		163.0	91.4	85.6	106.4
Enrolled Nurses				{ 46.6 29.0	{ 60.2 42.2
Total	206.2	175.8	179.8	153.6	160.4
Wallaroo					
Nursing Students and Trainees	11.0	11.0	6.0	8.4	11.0
Nursing Other	40.6				
Unqualified Nurses		9.3	7.6	6.7	5.8
Registered Nurses		27.2	36.0	33.2	31.5
Enrolled Nurses				{ 14.2 19.0	{ 14.5 17.0
Total	51.6	47.5	49.6	58.3	48.3
Whyalla					
Nursing Students and Trainees	126.0	100.0	82.0	84.0	94.0
Nursing Other	181.9				
Unqualified Nurses		—	13.9	10.5	15.6
Registered Nurses		184.1	173.3	189.8	161.8
Enrolled Nurses				{ 115.9 73.9	{ 93.7 68.1
Total	307.9	284.1	269.2	284.3	271.4

Mental Health Services

Glenside						
Nursing Students and Trainees	158.0	124.0	73.4		79.0	89.0
Nursing Other	259.5					
Unqualified Nurses		9.0	7.0		7.0	6.0
Registered Nurses				332.3	289.3	264.8
Enrolled Nurses		292.0	323.5		43.0	42.9
Total	417.5	425.0	403.9		418.3	402.7
Hillcrest/Enfield						
Nursing Students and Trainees	136.0	91.0	78.0		60.0	45.4
Nursing Other	297.9					
Unqualified Nurses		—	11.0		7.0	5.4
Registered Nurses				310.4	273.2	265.1
Enrolled Nurses		298.2	307.9		37.2	52.0
Total	433.9	389.2	396.9		377.4	367.9

Category of Nurse	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Strathmont					
Nursing Students and Trainees	174.0	128.0	123.0		65.0
Nursing Other	341.5				
Unqualified Nurses		179.1	183.0		181.5
Registered Nurses				249.7	249.7
Enrolled Nurses		219.6	223.8		—
Total	515.5	496.7	529.8	525.2	542.1

Total Mental Hospitals

Nursing Students and Trainees	468.0	343.0	274.4		233.0	199.9
Nursing Other	909.9					
Unqualified Nurses		188.1	201.0		195.5	226.3
Registered Nurses				919.9	839.7	829.6
Enrolled Nurses		836.3	878.7		80.2	94.9
Total	1 377.9	1 367.4	1 354.1		1 348.4	1 350.7

Total Nursing Staff in Major South Australia Hospitals 1978-1982

Category of Nurse	1978*	1979	1980	1981	1982
Students and Trainees	2 944.5	2 432.8	2 124.0	1 908.4	1 749.0
Other	3 682.1	3 808.2	3 837.6	4 125.8	3 869.5
Total	6 626.6	6 241.0	5 961.6	6 034.5	5 612.6

Source: South Australian Health Commission Statistics Branch

*Note: Figures for 1978 may not be exactly comparable with those for subsequent years because of a 'miscellaneous' category, which in later years was distributed to various staff categories.

** Estimate Nursing Staff have been distributed to categories as follows:

Nursing students and trainees	150
Nursing Other	150

Nursing Courses at Sturt C.A.E.
Diploma of Applied Science (Nursing)

Year	No. of Applicants	Quota	Acceptances
1975	150	60	57
1976	200	70	72
1977	314	80	90
1978	709	90	96
1979	559	90	98
1980	622	100	103
1981	725	110	110
1982	614	110	112

Diploma of Applied Science (Nursing) Conversion*

Year	No. of Applicants	Quota	Acceptances
1977	108	30	34
1978	139	30	37
1979	163	40	42
1980	164	50	53
1981	139	50	53
1982	143	50	52

*Note: This is a course for Registered Nurses who wish to upgrade their qualifications to Diploma level.

Source: Telephone Information Sturt C.A.E.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am very grateful to the research staff and the officers of the Statistics Branch of the Health Commission for providing this information. It has a very funny history, both peculiar and amusing.

Members will recall that more than two months ago I placed eight pages of questions relating to statistics on health on the Notice Paper. The Government refused to provide answers to the great majority of them on the spurious grounds that the time and effort required to produce them was not warranted; spurious in view of the fact we are talking about a health budget well in excess of \$500 000 000. It is also despite the fact that almost all the relevant information was readily available in the Statistics Branch of the commission and is or will be a matter of public record. People less mild mannered and reasonable than I might have interpreted this as obstructing Her Majesty's Opposition in the performance of its legitimate responsibilities. But not I.

Following the Government's refusal, I simply took the same questions to the Parliamentary Library research staff and asked them to pursue the answers through the normal and perfectly legitimate channels. We were not seeking access to Cabinet documents, to any classified or confidential information, nor were there any clandestine meetings after dark. The exercise was carried out in the same proper way as it is in any other Government department or instrumentality when the research staff from the Parliamentary Library are seeking information.

However, when the Minister of Health heard that this information gathering exercise was proceeding, she reacted in a most petulant and paranoid way. She caused acute embarrassment to the Librarian and the Library staff, ordering that information be withheld until she had personally vetted it. Most of the statistics were eventually released, although only after information concerning bad debts in hospitals had been shredded. Her behaviour was appalling and she surely owes the staff a written apology.

There are some other interesting sidelights to this story. One of the questions on notice concerned a draft report on the Julia Farr Centre, of which I already had a copy. I had a copy of the draft report when the questions were placed on notice. Another question concerned some meteoric staff rises in the Health Commission and the possibility of irregularities surrounding these promotions. I will return to that shortly. The remainder were compiled by me in long hand sitting at the end of the dining room table at West Lakes Shore going through Health Commission listings in the telephone book.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: West Lakes Shore, that is a distinguished address.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It has a good ring to it, but property values under this Government are severely depressed, I regret to say.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is a distinguished area of Adelaide, is it not?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: One should not believe everything one reads in the papers. I repeat that these 7½ pages of questions, as they appeared on the Notice Paper, were prepared by me with the help of the telephone book sitting at the end of my modest dining room table at West Lakes.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: West Lakes Shore.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The postcode is 5021. I went through the telephone book, as anybody with intelligence could do, and placed the unremarkable questions on notice, including how many nurses there were at the 12 hospitals in the past four financial years.

I have been grossly insulted to learn that some senior Health Commission officers believed that the questions were all prepared for me by an insider in the commission. Such was their conviction on this point that they have been studying prose style of middle level officers within the commission in an endeavour to find the source of my imagined informant. Amazing scenes indeed.

Apart from the draft report on the Julia Farr Centre, I have been supplied with only one other document from within the commission. It is a summary of Public Service Board decisions dated 1 December 1981. It recommends that no fewer than 21 positions should be 'reviewed upon vacancy'. In other words, there is a clear inference that many Health Commission positions have been over-classified. I will not name people concerned in those 21 positions. I do not think that that would be reasonable. However, no fewer than seven of these are in the very senior ranges EO1 to EO3, three are in the MO8 to MO9 range, and two are in the NU11 to NU12 range; that is a very senior person at the top of the range. Indeed, it is the top of the tree.

It is surely legitimate to seek the Government's response to these comments and to allegations of meteoric rises a little further down the tree. This is especially so when one sees what the Public Service Board said in its document. I will quote directly from the document, which I was not foolish enough to bring with me today in case someone asked me to table it. However, I am happy to show it to selected audiences. I can say, in order to save people the time and trouble, that the handwriting on it is my own. The document states:

The board also agreed that it should point out to the S.A. Health Commission that the undertaking given to employees outlined in the Health Commission's statement of principles governing the organisation process is not consistent with Government policy on salary maintenance for redeployed surplus personnel.

Obviously, the commission believes that it is a law unto itself. But let me return to the hospital statistics which the Government was so keen that I should not be able to produce. It very clearly supports my repeated claims that our once great public hospital system has been deliberately devastated by four successive Tonkin Government Budgets.

Over the past two years my office has been continually deluged with complaints from patients, their relatives, nurses and other health care workers. There has been an obvious and widespread community concern that service and quality of patient care in our major Government hospitals were being severely affected by funding and staffing cuts. An analysis of figures from 1978-79 to the estimates for 1982-83 now make it clear that those fears were well founded. Despite strenuous efforts to divert patients away from Government hospitals, in-patient numbers in 1981-82 were substantially higher than in 1978-79. Every indicator, including percentage bed occupancy, average length of stay, total occupied bed days and total number of in-patients shows an overall marginal increase in utilisation of Government hospitals. I seek leave to have a statistical table relating to capacity and usage incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Capacity and Usage of Major Hospitals in South Australia, 1979-82

Hospital	Bed Capacity				Percentage Bed Occupancy				Average Length of Stay (Days)				Total Occupied Bed Days			
	June 1979	June 1980	June 1981	June 1982	June 1979	June 1980	June 1981	June 1982	June 1979	June 1980	June 1981	June 1982	June 1979	June 1980	June 1981	June 1982
Royal Adelaide	1 122	1 107	982	1 039	78.6	79.3	90.8	83.5	8.5	7.9	7.8	7.5	322 033	321 284	325 473	316 817
Queen Elizabeth	728	692	696	702	70.2	73.7	74.8	73.3	6.0	5.8	5.8	5.8	186 448	186 730	189 998	187 926
Flinders Medical Centre	473	471	494	494	70.9	78.6	81.5	85.7	5.6	5.6	4.7	5.8	122 379	135 540	147 030	154 516
Modbury	214	214	228	228	77.2	77.7	71.8	74.6	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.9	60 313	59 804	59 780	61 738
Lyell McEwin	184	184	184	184	69.8	72.0	77.8	75.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.6	46 858	48 464	52 260	50 321
Mount Gambier	213	213	213	193	61.3	59.4	61.4	60.9	6.4	6.5	6.7	5.7	47 649	46 339	47 689	42 912
Port Augusta	119	119	128	128	80.8	80.3	78.8	79.8	7.3	6.6	6.7	6.8	35 075	34 950	36 793	37 290
Port Lincoln	69	69	69	71	56.1	68.3	73.3	71.6	5.9	7.3	7.3	6.4	14 113	17 232	18 487	18 561
Port Pirie	205	204	143	150	53.4	48.6	72.0	70.6	10.3	9.3	9.3	8.5	39 978	36 297	37 633	38 659
Walleroo	70	84	83	83	57.6	49.2	56.6	55.2	16.6	18.9	16.3	19.3	14 720	15 128	17 157	16 740
Whyalla	244	244	244	230	70.8	62.5	65.8	67.3	5.7	5.3	5.5	5.9	63 087	55 828	58 960	56 514

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It should be noted that bed capacity should not be confused with available beds. In the topsy health care system, approved beds must never be confused with available beds. The most striking figure to come out of this analysis is the number of nurses who have disappeared out of the system. The Minister, when questioned about this before the Budget Estimates Committee, said:

The number of students and trainees at Government metropolitan hospitals in 1978 was 2 949. In 1982 it was 1 749, a reduction of 1 195 trainees.

That is almost 1 200 fewer student nurses in the wards. We are now told that student nurses are of very limited value in hospital wards. In the conventional wisdom now prevailing they are said to be almost a nuisance. According to the Minister, they take up the time of registered nurses; they get in the way. Surely she does not really expect anyone who has ever been in hospital to believe that about second or third year trainee nurses. In the same period that 1 200 student nurses have disappeared from the wards of our

Government hospitals, the number of registered nurses has increased by 187.

In other words, more than 1 000 nurses have disappeared out of the system in the major metropolitan hospitals, 489 at the Royal Adelaide Hospital alone. This is an immediate and visible problem. It is having a direct and disastrous effect on the quality of patient care. When a nurse tells a patient requiring assistance in 1982 that she 'will be back in a minute', she often knows only too well that the minute may well be an hour. Quite clearly, the majority of so-called 'efficiency and cost saving' in public hospitals has been achieved by reducing the number of nursing staff.

Clearly, the Government has decided that they are fair game. I have a table prepared by the Parliamentary Library research staff which shows actual nurse salaries and projected salaries at constant prices in four major Government hospitals over the past five financial years, and I seek leave to have that statistical material inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Nursing Salaries in Four Major South Australian Hospitals 1977-82

Hospital	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Royal Adelaide	19 948 231	20 763 341	21 171 591	22 923 563	24 895 556
Queen Elizabeth	11 341 124	11 753 959	12 165 137	13 243 771	14 836 000
Modbury	3 804 008	3 872 196	3 897 861	4 556 136	5 219 451
Mt Gambier	—	2 723 740	2 797 011	2 984 907	3 206 081
Total	35 093 363	39 113 236	40 031 600	43 708 377	48 157 088

Nursing Salaries in Four Major S.A. Hospitals at 1977-78 Constant Prices*

Hospital	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Royal Adelaide	19 948 231	21 583 985	23 778 291	26 012 493	28 705 504
Queen Elizabeth	11 341 124	12 271 096	13 518 619	14 788 825	16 319 877
Modbury	3 804 008	4 115 937	4 534 377	4 960 426	5 473 967
Mt Gambier**	—	2 723 740	3 001 561	3 282 107	3 625 298
Total	35 093 363	40 694 758	44 832 848	49 044 851	54 124 646

*Note: Constant prices have been arrived at by inflating post 1977-78 figures by the increase in the C.P.I. for the appropriate periods.

** Mt Gambier salaries are expressed in 1978-79 Constant prices.

Total Shortfall in Nursing Salaries

	\$
*1978-79	1 581 522
1979-80	4 801 248
1980-81	5 336 474
1981-82	5 967 558

*Excludes Mt Gambier.

Shortfall per Hospital in Nursing Salaries 1981-82

	\$
Royal Adelaide Hospital	3 809 948
Queen Elizabeth Hospital	1 483 877
Modbury Hospital	254 516
*Mt Gambier Hospital	419 217

Calculated over 3 years only.

Per cent increase in Funds necessary to maintain Nursing Salaries
at 1977-78 Levels

	Per cent
Royal Adelaide Hospital	15.3
Queen Elizabeth Hospital	10.0
Modbury Hospital	4.8
Mt Gambier Hospital	13.1

Total Outlays of Four Major S.A. Hospitals 1977-82

	\$				
Hospital	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Royal Adelaide	71 422 833	73 258 817	75 360 953	83 278 267	93 193 967
Queen Elizabeth	—	39 973 467	42 110 570	46 898 094	52 907 000
Modbury	12 330 251	12 365 024	13 233 167	14 854 183	16 946 855
Mt Gambier	—	5 892 019	5 972 055	7 175 082	7 390 509
Total	83 753 084	131 489 310	136 676 730	152 205 620	170 438 310

Total Outlays of Four Major S.A. Hospitals at 1977-78 or 1978-79 Constant Prices*

	\$				
Royal Adelaide	71 422 833	77 279 505	85 136 016	93 135 374	102 777 450
Queen Elizabeth**	—	39 973 467	44 050 760	48 168 027	53 204 684
Modbury	12 330 251	13 341 331	14 697 659	16 078 647	17 743 231
Mt Gambier**	—	5 892 019	6 493 005	7 099 883	7 842 277
Total	83 753 084	136 486 310	150 377 420	164 481 920	181 567 630

*Note: Constant prices have been arrived at by inflating post 1977-78 figures by the increase in the C.P.I. for the appropriate periods.

** Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Mt Gambier salaries are expressed in 1978-79 constant prices.

Total Shortfall in Total Outlays

	\$
*1978-79	4 997 000
1979-80	13 700 690
1980-81	12 276 300
1981-82	11 129 320

*Royal Adelaide Hospital and Modbury Hospital only.

Shortfall per Hospital in Total Outlays 1981-82

	\$
Royal Adelaide Hospital	9 583 490
*Queen Elizabeth Hospital	297 684
Modbury Hospital	796 376
*Mt Gambier Hospital	451 768

*Shortfall since 1978-79.

Per cent increase in Funds necessary to maintain Total Outlays
at 1977-78 or 1978-79 Levels

	Per cent
Royal Adelaide Hospital	10.3
*Queen Elizabeth Hospital	0.5
Modbury Hospital	4.7
*Mt Gambier Hospital	6.1

*Calculated on 1978-79 levels.

Nursing Salaries as a per cent of Total Outlays 1977-82

Hospital	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Royal Adelaide	27.9	28.3	28.1	27.5	26.7
Queen Elizabeth	—	29.4	28.9	28.3	28.0
Modbury	30.8	31.3	29.4	30.7	30.8
Mt Gambier	—	46.2	46.8	41.6	43.4

Sources: South Australian Health Commission Annual Reports.
South Australian Health Commission Information Supporting 1981-82 and 1982-83 Estimates.
Telephone Information from Hospitals.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The material shows clearly, using 1977-78 as a base, that there has been a reduction in real terms of \$6 000 000 in the amounts allocated for nurses salaries at R.A.H., Q.E.H., Modbury and Mount Gambier. In the longer term the consequences are even more worrying. It has been estimated by both the Nurses Board and the commissioners working party that South Australia needs to train and qualify between 750 and 800 nurses annually to meet projected demand through the 1980s and into the next decade.

That rate has been maintained to date because of the number of student nurses who were already in the system when this Government came into office. But we now know there are 1200 less student nurses in the major metropolitan hospital-based nursing schools. In addition, many country-based schools have been instructed that they should not have student intakes in 1983. The very loosely stated policy of the Government, through the Health Commission, is that future nurse training in South Australia should be based on tertiary courses. However, the Sturt C.A.E. is the only tertiary institution offering such a course at present. Its intake over the past three years has been 103 in 1980, 110 in 1981 and 112 in 1982. In the previous three years the intakes were 90, 96 and 98. Allowing for inevitable wastage, they will graduate significantly less than 100 nurses per year in the foreseeable future.

In summary, we have a documented reduction of 1 195 student nurses in the major metropolitan hospitals, a further estimated reduction of 500 in nursing schools formerly based in country and religious hospitals, and virtually no increase from Sturt. In other words, the Sturt output will be relatively constant. There could be a critical shortage of qualified nursing staff as early as 1985, even if urgent action was taken immediately.

Finally, I wish to examine the disastrous situation that now prevails particularly in our hospital system since the introduction of the so-called 'user-pays' system on 1 September 1981. It must be placed on record that public hospitals admit quite freely that they have been unable to cope with the changes. The Chairman of the Health Commission said in evidence to the Estimates Committee on health as follows:

The introduction of the new arrangement has caused problems in hospitals in relation to their work loads and a number of actions have been taken, including reviews by both hospital administrations and by consultants. At the moment a number of new arrangements for billing systems are before the commission.

Twelve months after the new scheme came into operation a number of new arrangements for billing systems are still being considered by the commission.

The inability of the hospitals and the commission to handle the change was the subject of specific comment by the Auditor-General. Yet for 18 months the Minister of Health has been the system's staunchest advocate. She reiterated her support for it in evidence to the Estimates Committee. Let us examine what actually happens in practice. The Budget estimates show that the State Government's contribution to recognised hospitals in South Australia will

fall from \$134 200 000 in 1981-82 to \$111 000 000 in 1982-83. Presuming an inflation factor of about 11 per cent, this is a decrease of approximately \$37 000 000 in real terms and at first glance looks like a bonus for taxpayers. However, as against that \$37 000 000 decrease in real terms from the Government's contribution, patient contributions through increased hospital charges are estimated to rise by \$42 000 000. This will be achieved by the full year's impact of the 110 per cent increase in hospital charges.

This additional revenue will be derived from the increases in the flat rate of tax which masquerades as health insurance. The system, of course, is open ended. Estimates are wildly inaccurate. In 1981-82 it was estimated that the Health Commission would receive \$91 500 000 from increased hospital charges and removal of the universal cover for public patients under the fifth Fraser health scheme. However, there was a massive short-fall of \$17 200 000 in the nine months during which the scheme operated.

A percentage short-fall of this magnitude on the estimated \$116 000 000 over a full financial year in 1982-83 must result in a further massive rise in hospital charges. I predict, I believe quite accurately, that a further rise of at least 25 per cent in hospital charges will and must occur by 30 June next year. Let me explain why. Both the State and Federal Governments grossly underestimated the number of people who would qualify for health cards. Because of the deepening depression in the South Australian economy, more than 300 000 people, or about 25 per cent of the population, now live below the poverty line, on the Government's own definition.

At the same time, the Government grossly over-estimated the number who would insure. Almost 18 per cent of those who do not qualify for health cards, or approximately 180 000 South Australians, have no cover whatsoever, according to A.B.S. surveys. In some cases they may be what the Minister describes as 'healthy young people who choose to take the risk'. But, in the overwhelming majority of cases, they are single income families who are just over the Government's qualifying poverty line and who simply cannot afford insurance. They are literally walking bad debts waiting for a health disaster to arrive. It is no wonder the Minister was so desperate to suppress the figures on outstanding, bad and doubtful debts which were originally supplied to the Parliamentary research staff.

There is another very nasty and dirty little trick called double-counting in which the Minister and her colleagues indulge to grossly under-estimate the number of uninsured. Many of the card holders are, in fact, pensioner health benefit card holders. A very large number of these elderly pensioners use the p.h.b. card for fringe benefits, but they purchase at least basic hospital insurance. Nothing is more important to aged persons than to know that they will have immediate access to a hospital bed should the necessity arise. They will (and do) literally go without meals to keep up their private hospital insurance.

There are anything up to 100 000 people in this category in South Australia. The Government uses the nasty trick of

adding them to the statistics of both categories (health card holders and the insured) then taking away the number from the estimated uninsured to produce a false low figure. I could go on for hours but I do not intend to inflict that on my colleagues in this Chamber. The political rhetoric about deinstitutionalisation, domiciliary care, and keeping people in their families and in their own homes is all sadly unmatched by performance or reality, as is the shambles that is called Aboriginal health care and the run down in almost every area which costs money.

In summary, as I said at the outset, this is the high social cost of small government. This is a Government long on posturing, on false boasts and unfilled promises. The Government has already served more than three years. Let it now give the people of South Australia their democratic right to pass judgment as soon as possible.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I appreciate the attention that honourable members have given to this Appropriation Bill. Of course, consistent with the practice in recent years, members have also had the opportunity to speak on the motion to note the Budget Papers, which has given them a chance over the past six weeks to prepare themselves for the second reading debate on the Appropriation Bill itself. I appreciate the attention that honourable members have given to the motion to note the Budget Papers.

The Leader of the Opposition has provided voluminous papers on certain aspects of the capital budget, and I have not had an opportunity to consider them, but, in some respects, they reflect the statements made by Opposition members over a period of time. To a very large extent, the claims made in those papers and by the Leader of the Opposition have been answered both in relation to the supplementary Appropriation Bill as well as in the public arena.

However, several matters require direct response. One matter, of course, is the criticism that the Government has transferred capital funds to meet recurrent expenditure. As the Premier has said and as I have said on previous occasions, the Government is not pleased that this occurs, but it is endeavouring to reduce the extent to which that transfer is required.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Reduce it? In the past financial year you increased it by about \$20 000 000.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It has been reduced in the current year and, if the Leader of the Opposition cares to look at the Budget papers, he will see that this year the Government expenditure on capital works has increased from \$18 000 000 to \$236 000 000, an increase over the previous financial year of about \$55 000 000, or 30 per cent. Some of the Government's Budget strategies are designed to reduce Government expenditure, particularly expenditure on public sector employment where, by careful budgeting and without any retrenchments, the Government has been able to reduce significantly its public sector work force by something like 4 500 employees, which has had a net benefit to the Budget of from \$80 000 000 to \$100 000 000.

In addition, it has reduced its taxes in the area of stamp duties on the first principal place of residence by providing stamp duty concessions, and this has resulted in a total saving to first home buyers of over \$10 000 000 in the past three years, benefiting some 22 000 first home buyers. The land tax concession on the permanent place of residence, pay-roll tax concessions, and the abolition of death duty and gift duties have saved the taxpayer in this State more than \$100 000 000. By careful marshalling of the resources of government and control of growth in the public sector work force, we have been able to save from \$80 000 000 to

\$100 000 000 a year without any retrenchments in the public sector work force.

That is the best record of any Government in Australia. If one looks at what is happening in Victoria one sees that, as a result of the last Budget, there are to be 12 000 new jobs created in the public sector by the Victorian Government. There has been an increase in State taxes as a result of the last Victorian Budget to a total of \$600 per annum per man, woman and child—the first Budget in Victoria of the Cain Government. There has been an increase of \$109 in State taxes per man, woman and child in Victoria.

We have seen the Victorian Government using a cash management fund to support a \$98 000 000 shortfall on its recurrent operations, that fund is being financed from balances held by all the statutory authorities in Victoria. The imposts on the Gas and Fuel Corporation and on the State Electricity Commission have been increased quite dramatically. The pipelines tax, for example, is being doubled from about \$10 000 000 up to, I think, \$20 000 000 (certainly quite dramatically in terms of millions of dollars). Of course, the impost on the Gas and Fuel Corporation, the State Electricity Commission and the pipelines authority in Victoria will necessarily be passed on to consumers by way of increased charges. The Victorian Government has placed a 1 per cent surcharge on pay-rolls over \$1 000 000—a permanent levy on pay-roll tax. In addition, there has been a dramatic financial institutions tax imposed in Victoria making the total State tax impost \$600 per man, woman and child in the current financial year, a figure I believe to be the highest in Australia.

In New South Wales we have seen the introduction in its most recent Budget of a financial institutions tax. We saw in 1981-82, and again this year, a transfer of substantial funds from Loan Account to recurrent expenditure in New South Wales. In 1981-82 New South Wales called back substantial funds from its authorities to shore up recurrent operations. There is an article from which I have quoted on previous occasions which appeared in the 30 July 1982 *Business Review Weekly* under the heading 'Who runs Wran' which discloses some interesting figures about the budgetary situation in New South Wales before the 1982-83 Budget was handed down a week or so ago. The article states:

In 1980-81, New South Wales had a Budget deficit of \$29 000 000 and it budgeted for a \$3 200 000 deficit in the financial year just ended. The official deficit is \$69 300 000. This is small in a \$5.5 billion Budget, but it is the highest state deficit since the depression—and even that official figure is a sleight of hand.

The article continues:

To maintain the public image, the State pumped into the Budget \$221 000 000 in recouped debts from the State Rail Authority (where Hill is now chief executive) and a recouped \$15 000 000 establishment grant from the Lands Commission for the Wran Government's low-cost home sites policy which the commission had made no provision to repay.

The instrumentalities raised this money by the sale and leverage-leasing of the rail authority's rolling stock and the issue of promissory notes when interest rates were high. To use the same deficit calculations of previous years, the 81-82 deficit was really about \$306 000 000.

Added to that was the fact that after the June Loan Council meeting the Wran Government in New South Wales sought to introduce a mini Budget on the basis of increasing fuel tax and public transport and hospital charges to raise about \$350 000 000. The price of petrol has recently risen by 3c per litre and diesel fuel by 5c a litre from 1 August. Fares rose, on average, 20 per cent on 18 July. Hospital bed rates will increase by 25 per cent on 1 September.

At least the Government in this State is prepared to put all its cards on the table and to expressly indicate that it is, in fact, transferring funds from capital to recurrent expenditure. We have made no secret about that and have indicated

the reasons for doing so. They are quite clearly spelled out in the Budget papers.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Do you think that it is good practice?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: When there is a reduction in funding from the Commonwealth level, and when you are endeavouring to maintain a policy of low taxation by keeping tax rises to a minimum and by abolishing other taxes, coupled with high wage increases, there is on occasion no alternative but to adopt the practice which has been reflected in this Government's Budget.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It didn't have to be done at any other time in the past 30 years.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We are in difficult times, as the Premier has said, and as is recognised around Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: I would like to know what the Opposition would have done.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I think that what the Opposition would have done is maintain a high level of taxation. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition in the other place is on record as saying that he would undoubtedly increase State taxes and State charges.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: He said 'charges'.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: He is on record as bemoaning the fact that succession duties and death duties were abolished in this State. I have already indicated the advantages which have come to many thousands of people from the tax concessions this Government has given them. The Opposition, in its own policy, has provided for an increase in the public sector which will have to be paid for through increased taxes and charges, there is no other way in which that could be done. I could speak at some length on this topic. However, I have already covered the development which has occurred in South Australia when I spoke on the supplementary estimates, and when I spoke on other occasions. The development in this State under the Tonkin Government has been quite staggering compared with the development of the previous decade. The expansion of industry under the Tonkin Government has been quite massive when compared with the contraction of the previous decade. This Government has pursued the course it set for itself at the last election of ensuring that there are opportunities for the private sector to come to South Australia to develop and expand.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Do you agree with Mr Goldsworthy that it is poor economics?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have already given my response to that particular aspect of the Budget and I do not believe that there is any need to go over that ground once again. I thank honourable members for their attention to this important Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Issue, payment and appropriation of money.'

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: During my second reading contribution I asked the Attorney to indicate to the Chamber the Government's attitude to the practice his Government has introduced of using capital works funds to prop up an unsatisfactory situation with respect to recurrent expenditure.

I particularly wanted to know what the Government's response to this practice would be in the future. I wanted to know how long the Attorney anticipated that this practice would continue and, as I recall it, there was absolutely no response on that score from the Attorney during his reply to the debate. I said in my second reading speech that I would press the Attorney for answers to questions on what the Government's attitude is to the continuing use of capital funds for recurrent activities. I said that there was no response to that in his reply that was in any way definitive.

This Government has adopted this practice for the first time since the Second World War and, I suspect, for the first time in South Australian history on a sustained basis.

We have no indication from the Government of what the future holds. I would like to know from the Government what the long-term effects of this are. If \$40 000 000 per year is transferred over the next 10 years and if we end up after that period with the State's assets depleted by \$400 000 000 and we are servicing a loan to that effect, what is the long-term economic effect of that on the State? Can the State continue to do it? If it can do that without any adverse economic effects except the very obvious ones of loss of the stimulus to the economy and loss of employment-creating moneys in the meantime, then perhaps we have found the secret of continuing to finance the Government's activities. I would like to know from the Attorney what the Government says are the adverse effects of this, if there are any. Does it agree that there will be adverse effects in the long term? If it does agree, what does it intend to do about it?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I did get a response to that in my reply at the second reading stage. If one accepts the conventional wisdom, the practical situation is not quite as clear as the theory would suggest, because there are many expenditures which are characterised as recurrent but which provide benefits in the future. For example, expenditure on the salaries of planners and reductions in tax also can lead to future benefits and may well be designed for that purpose. So, it is not quite as clear cut as the Leader of the Opposition would want to make it out to be.

In addition, there is considerable expenditure through the agencies which does not necessarily appear in the Budget papers, for example, the Housing Trust, whose programme has had one of its highest levels ever in respect of expenditure on new housing. It has increased dramatically over the last year or so in this State, largely because the Government is using what would be described as capital funds to spend on capital works, but they are funds which do not appear in the Budget. So, the division between capital and recurrent is not as clear cut as some would suggest, and in the Budget there is not an adequate reflection of the capital expenditures which had some bearing on the Government's total capital works programme. They are not adequately reflected in the Budget. With those two matters taken into consideration, the Government would want to ensure as much as possible that it did not expend capital moneys on recurrent expenditure. However, as I have already indicated, under certain conditions such as those that prevail currently, there is no alternative. As I say, in the current Budget—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: There was an alternative.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Well, increase State taxes.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Not an increase in State taxes, but doing your calculations before you got into Government. You got us into the mess; let's face it. In your first Budget there was a \$15 000 000 surplus that you could have transferred from revenue to capital. Within 12 months you were transferring \$37 000 000 the other way, and you say that the Labor Government was to blame for that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Let us not get into an extensive debate on the Riverland, Monarto, the Land Commission, and the Frozen Food Factory. We will get to that if we have to.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Stop going on with that garbage.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have made the point clearly that the Government is endeavouring to reduce as much as possible the amount which is transferred from capital to recurrent expenditure, and I have indicated that there has been a substantial increase in the current year over last year of something like \$55 000 000. I have indicated that a significant amount of the Government's capital expenditure is

in many other areas which are not reflected in the Budget. I have mentioned the Housing Trust. There is also the Electricity Trust and the Transport Authority, you have to take that into account when you make a judgment on the total income and expenditure.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Everyone knows that the Housing Trust depends on capital expenditure.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We have increased expenditure by a large amount in the current year. The Leader of the Opposition knows that. That sort of answer puts him on the spot, and he is not prepared to take it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That answer is totally insufficient. Of course, we know that there are large numbers of Government public service activities which are not presented in the Budget where there is capital works funding, but that is not an answer to the proposition. I know that there are other areas of capital funding in the public sector. Everyone in the Parliament knows that. I do not know whether the Attorney-General has just found it out, but to tell us that tells us nothing. The response from the Attorney has told the Parliament nothing. I am a bit inclined to stay here until I get a response from the Attorney because I think that it is a serious matter and I do not think that any analysis has been done by the Government on the long-term effects of this on the State economy and on the State budgetary position. I want a response to know from the Attorney or, if he cannot give it, from the Treasurer or, if he cannot give it—and that is highly likely—from the Government's Treasury officers. I assume that there are some economic literates in the Treasury Department who may be able to tell us the effects of this in the long term.

The Government has accepted and carried out this practice for three years and appears to be prepared to continue it indefinitely. There is no indication at all from this Government that this practice will cease. If it is to be carried on indefinitely, I want to know, and I think that the Parliament ought to know, because it has not been told anywhere, in the House of Assembly or in this Council, what the long-term economic effects of this practice are.

The Deputy Premier, when he was in Opposition, apparently believed that it was bad economics. The present Government apparently does not believe that it is bad economics. Will the Government say what the economic effect of this is? Can we keep doing it *ad infinitum*? Does it have any adverse effect on the State Budget? Is the only adverse effect a depletion in State Government assets and a run down in community assets—that money is not spent over a period on construction activity and, therefore, that has an adverse effect on employment? Is that the only problem that there is with it?

The Attorney-General owes it to Parliament to tell us if that is the case. If he does not know, he should report progress at this particular time during the Committee stage and let Parliament know what the considered position is on this matter. The Attorney-General clearly has not satisfied me, and I suspect he has not satisfied anyone else in the Council up to the present, of the long-term budgetary implications of this practice or, indeed, whether or not it can quite happily be continued *ad infinitum*. The Attorney should also say whether he concedes that the Government is paying interest on moneys which have been borrowed and not spent to produce assets for the community. Does he concede that that is happening? Does he, therefore, concede that we will have an increase in debt burden and be servicing that debt for assets which have not been built? Is that what is to happen over the next 10 years?

I want some kind of response to that from the Attorney-General. I think that the Council should want some kind of response to that before we leave tonight. If the Attorney-General cannot answer it and wants to consult his officers,

I would like to see him do that so that we can get some decent response from the Government. It has not answered these questions anywhere—during Estimates Committees, during debate in the Parliament and now during this Committee stage. This is the last time before the election that we will be in a position to get a statement from the Government.

The Attorney-General is trying to brush the whole issue off as if it never happened: it was not his fault, it was not the State Government's fault—it was the Labor Party's fault, it was the Federal Government's fault and the workers' fault because they ask for too much money. That is the impression that the Attorney-General tries to give. In doing that, of course, the Attorney overlooks the stark reality which was that, during 1980, it was possible to transfer \$15 000 000 from revenue to capital works. At the end of 1981, \$37 000 000 had to be transferred back the other way. If that is not some kind of financial bungling and mismanagement, I do not know what is. The Labor Government left the budgetary position of this State in a relatively good position as is obviously clear from the movements that could be made in 1979-80 Budget and which were not made in the 1980-81 Budget. I want responses to those questions from the Attorney-General.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have endeavoured to put this whole thing into its proper context and to indicate that there is substantial capital expenditure in excess of what has occurred previously in other areas of Government responsibility. One cannot look only at the Budget and say that that is it, without taking into account the increased expenditure on capital works in other areas.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We know that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If we are talking about running down assets, we only have to look at the policy of the previous Government with respect to its school maintenance programmes, which were virtually non-existent but which this Government has revived; we only have to look at the prison system, which was deplorably run down, and on which this Government plans to spend a substantial amount of money rectifying the deficiencies accumulated over a period of at least 10 years in running down that particular asset, on the basis, as I have heard it, that the previous Government's Premier (Hon. D.A. Dunstan) always said there were no votes in prisons. He might be right in that respect, but this Government has accepted its responsibility by undertaking extensive upgrading of the prison system, as well as embarking on a substantial increase in maintenance work of Education Department properties. These properties were starting to fall down around people's ears until this Government decided that it ought to spend a reasonable amount each year to catch up on the backlog in that expenditure.

Now, the question of long-term economic effects has to be judged in the context of the total Budget and the total expenditure by the Government and its agencies, at both the recurrent level and in the capital works area. That is one of the reasons why the Treasury is now working on a Consolidated Account because one gets an overall picture, which one does not get if one looks at it as the Opposition is still looking at it, in a compartmentalised context.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: On that basis it is all right if the Government spends all its capital money on recurrent, is that right?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not saying anything of the sort. One has to spend on capital works, but one has to look at the whole thing together, not in isolation. One also has to take into account that one can only spend the money that one is able to raise and, if one wants to spend more money, one raises it from the people. The thing that this Opposition does not seem to take into account is that all

the money that the Government spends, whether for capital or recurrent purposes, is money that the people pay. Any increase in expenditure, whether recurrent or capital, must in one way or another be recovered from the people. It can only be recovered by increasing State charges, by increasing State taxes or by introducing new taxes and charges.

All that is part of the context of an objective assessment of the Budget. That is why the Adelaide media have not been critical of this Government's Budget, because they have looked at it objectively as a total package. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to criticise the media, but what he is doing is reflecting on the competence of the Adelaide media. I do not believe that that reflection is responsible. I believe that the Adelaide media have looked at the Budget and assessed it as a whole, and not taken the blinkered approach which the Leader of the Opposition has reflected in his comments today.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If I wanted any response to indicate that the Attorney either does not know what he is talking about or is unwilling to provide the Committee with information on this important topic, his response is the prime example. First, he talked about prisons for some obscure reason which completely escaped me. Secondly, as the Attorney and every other honourable member in this Committee knows, there was a substantial increase in public assets during the 1970s.

The Attorney then went on to talk about the fact that we have now a Consolidated Account instead of separate accounts, and the Committee can assume only that the mere fact of putting recurrent and capital moneys into one account by that device means that there is no difference between the two, that one can use capital moneys for recurrent expenditure willy-nilly without any problems.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What does the Hon. Mr DeGaris think about it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not know; he seems to have decided to take it easier this year than he did last year.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: I spoke on the Budget papers this year.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know, but I would like to know from the honourable member what he sees as the long-term budgetary implications. Finally, the Attorney's response to me was that I should not blame the media. My only point about the media was that this important issue has been overlooked in terms of critical analysis. I would have thought that a substantial change in the State budgetary system, which has occurred in South Australia for the past three years (for the first time on a sustained basis in the history of this State), would have attracted some attention and some critical analysis, particularly in the way that it came about, given the fact that, before it was done for the first time, the Labor Government left a substantial surplus on Revenue Account, and given the fact that, in terms of the Government's economic objectives stated at the last election, its intention was to create jobs. This has been an incredibly negative factor.

In view of that, I would have thought that some critical analysis was justified by the State's media. I trust that the omission which has occurred will be rectified in the near future. It would be a reflection on the diligence of media representatives if they did not now take up that issue. It is an important issue which should have been treated more seriously than it has been. It has substantial influence on the State's budgetary position and on our employment position.

I ask the Attorney to report progress, to consult with the Treasurer and bring back a considered response to the Committee on these questions, which basically ask what does the future hold for this practice and, secondly, in economic terms, in regard to the State's economy and in regard to the

future servicing of our debts, what is the effect of this device that has been used. I am willing to listen to the Government's response and whatever economic argument the Government has about the long-term effects. What we have heard in this Chamber is nothing. We have heard excuses for what has happened and we have obtained no real answers to the questions asked.

Will the Attorney answer the question? If he cannot, because he has not the economic expertise and he needs a response from Treasury officials, will he report progress and bring back a considered response tomorrow so that at least the Committee, for the first time, and Parliament, for the first time, will be in a position to give a proper and reasoned consideration to the Government's attitude?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not willing to report progress because the answer that will come back will be similar to the information that I have already given.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Which is what?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Leader has not bothered to listen. In the terms of a Budget, one has to look at all the Government's expenditure and income, both recurrent and capital, not only for the Government but also for its agencies. As I have already said, the question of the Budget—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That's no answer as to whether there are any long-term adverse effects in continuing this practice.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I draw the Leader's attention to the fact that one-third of Loan Council funds come as grants.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I said that in my speech.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Just take it into account in context: if the Leader looks at each Budget objectively he will be able to make an assessment according to the current economic conditions on the impact of that Budget in that particular year. The assessment which has been made with respect to 1982-83 is that it is a responsible Budget in the light of economic circumstances and that, if there was to be increased money available on the recurrent and capital side, it would be achieved either by increasing taxation or by the imposition of new taxes or by lower wages. Honourable members can have their choice as to the way it is done. The Leader and his Party would obviously seek to increase State taxes, perhaps as dramatically as has happened in Victoria, where, in this most recent Victorian A.L.P. Budget, State taxes have increased by \$109 per man, woman and child in that State to a total of \$600 for every man, woman and child.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Are you saying that State taxes will not be increased if a Liberal Government is elected at the next election?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not the Treasurer. All I am saying is that if you want to spend more money you have to increase your taxes or pay lower wages and, if you increase taxes, you get it from the people. All the money that you have to get in this State Budget comes from the people—don't you forget it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In view of the fact that the Government if it wishes to follow this practice (on the Attorney's own admission) will have to increase taxes—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I did not say that, and it is not so.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Attorney said that a number of things will have to be done.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I said that you will have to do things if you want to do what you suggest.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Either wages and salaries will not be increased or there will have to be further cuts in recurrent expenditure, or taxes will have to be increased. If the Government wishes to turn around the situation which it has created and which it has agreed to for the past three

years of using capital funds in this way, and to change the position after the next election, can the Attorney say whether the Government will increase taxes in order to do so?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I did not say anything about future Budgets. I was talking in an historical context—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Hysterical!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is historical. That is the basis upon which the matter has been answered. I have already indicated that I do not know what the future holds with regard to the use of capital funds for recurrent expenditure. That is something that one can assess only at the time that one frames each Budget.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Last year when I asked this question the Attorney responded and said it depended on a number of factors, including the Commonwealth Grants Commission's review of relativities and its attitude to grants to this State, and I read the response into *Hansard* again this afternoon.

I also stated that the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the Grants Commission is now known, and in view of that will the Attorney advise the Council what the Government intends to do in relation to this movement of funds from capital to recurrent?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have already answered that question in some detail, and if there are any aspects that I believe ought to be further answered (I doubt whether there are, but if a check of the *Hansard* proves that there are), I will let the honourable member have the answer by letter. I cannot believe that I have left anything unanswered.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In view of the problem in regard to the Government's recurrent expenditure, can the Attorney advise the House whether, following the next election, if the Liberal Party wins, there will be an increase in State taxation and, if not, how does the Government intend to reduce the transfer?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Government intends to do what it has been doing for the past three and a bit years, that is, exercise very careful budgetary control. Regarding what will happen after the election, I have no knowledge of any intention at all to do anything as suggested by the Leader.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If I can summarise the debate thus far—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That's a bit presumptuous.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, the Attorney will not do it. I would like the Attorney to obtain some information from Treasury officers. I believe that this situation is disappointing: in fact, it is grossly irresponsible if the Attorney, the Treasurer or anyone else in the Government is not prepared to give the Parliament any indication of the adverse effects of this practice. The Attorney has not been prepared to tell the Parliament how long the practice will continue and, quite simply, we have been deprived of essential information that we should have in order to make up our minds about the efficacy or otherwise of the practice in which the

Government has recently engaged.

Quite simply, there is a denial not only to the Parliament but also to the public and to the press of a decent analysis from the Government, including facts and some comment on the adverse effects of this practice. It is quite clear that, if we stay here all night, all day tomorrow, and, in fact, until Parliament is prorogued, the Attorney-General will not (in fact, he steadfastly refuses to do so, as has the Premier), provide the Parliament with relevant and important information.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Burdett is muttering again in his incoherent fashion. We will not obtain that information, no matter how long we stay here and request it. That attitude is disappointing and irresponsible. I have read the material in appendix 4 and, quite frankly, I have never read a more gabbled lot of mumbo-jumbo in my life. The appendix contains a number of inaccuracies and, if the research that I have done is any indication, I suspect that it was written by some poor Treasury official who was told by the Premier to justify what the Government has been doing over the past three years.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is the only conclusion I can come to.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is a reflection on your own inability.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Treasury officials were told by the Premier—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Nonsense!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I suspect that that is what happened.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is a reflection on Treasury.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is not.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: They did a pretty good job: it was an impossible job.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They were able to come up with something. The appendix does not list the adverse effects, if any, on the future of this State in terms of the budgetary position or general economic welfare. We will not get the answers, so we might as well go home and have dinner.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 11), schedules and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver a message on the Bill to the House of Assembly when the Council is not sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 13 October at 2.15 p.m.