Speech by

# Dr DAVID WATSON

## MEMBER FOR MOGGILL

Hansard 20 July 2000

### BUDGET 2000

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—LP) (Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.14 p.m.): The Treasurer has signed his own political death warrant. He survived the koala tollway, he survived net bet and he survived Fluffygate; but he will not survive this sorry excuse for a Budget. Yesterday afternoon on the radio, I thought that a former colleague of mine, the respected economist, John Stanford, from the University of Queensland, summed up the Budget quite succinctly. He said that the Budget lacked any kind of ideas or vision and stated further—

> "You really begin to wonder whether the Government does, in fact, understand the important kinds of forces which drive growth in this State. This is really bad news for those who are looking for jobs, because growth at that rate in this State is not going to create enough jobs for all of those who are coming into the work force."

Those two sentences sum up the Budget. The last sentence says that this Budget is not one for jobs growth, despite the fact that the core promise of the Premier at the last election was for jobs, jobs, jobs. Secondly, it asks the questions: does the Government really understand what actually drives growth in this State? What are the important forces that drive growth in this State?

A number of people in Brisbane and elsewhere—both in business and in business economic circles—have said to me that their impression of this Government is that it does not understand what drives growth in this State. Although the Government may have an understanding—as the Premier seems to have—with respect to the electorate as a whole, what drives economic growth in this State is not understood whatsoever by this Government. That is what comes through when one looks at this Budget in detail.

I want to concentrate on four aspects of this Budget. The first aspect is the operating performance of this Government as represented in this Budget. Unlike its predecessor, the last coalition Government, the operating performance of this Government is a deteriorating performance. The second aspect is the issue of capital formation, or the way in which we fund public infrastructure in this State. Again, the Budget documents demonstrate clearly that, in terms of capital formation in this State, this Budget represents the Government's deteriorating performance in this area. That is important—and I will refer to it again later on—because if there are not sufficient or the right kinds of public infrastructure, then there will not be sufficient business investment and, therefore, there will not be jobs generated. The third aspect is the debt position of this Government and, in particular, the rising debt that has been incurred by this Government and where it is, in fact, hurting the performance of the traditional areas of the public sector. Finally, the fourth aspect is Queensland's relative declining performance as compared with the rest of Australia.

As the Leader of the Opposition touched on earlier, there is no doubt that one of the most disturbing things in the underlying assumption and the forecast is that Queensland is now being outperformed consistently by the other States of Australia in virtually every major indicator of economic performance. When the coalition took Government in 1996, it commissioned the Queensland Commission of Audit. That Commission of Audit was chaired by the very eminent economist and consultant, Dr Vince FitzGerald. Of course, Vince had not only an outstanding academic career—having graduated with first-class honours in economics from the University of Queensland and a doctorate from Harvard—but also had a distinguished career in the public sector, particularly holding the equivalent position of director-general of the Department of Finance, appointed by the Federal Minister for Finance at the time, John Dawkins. It is worth reiterating a couple of key points that are contained in the executive overview of that document, because they indicate what was happening during the term of the Goss Labor Government and, I am afraid, it is a point that has started to be taken up by this Government. It states—

> "On a comprehensive accrual basis, the State's operating budget position deteriorated from a surplus of $325 million in 1994-95 to an estimated deficit of $337 million in 1995-96.
>
> Budgeted spending increases for 1995-96 were an important factor, together with some significant overruns.
>
> An even bigger starting deficit is projected for 1996-97.
>
> Of more concern for the future is an inbuilt trend to progressive deterioration in the State's operating budget position—by about $200-250 million per year.
>
> If unchecked, the operating deficit is projected to reach $2.7 billion in 10 years."

That was a key driver in addressing that issue. The Commission of Audit indicated that a responsible Government had to address the issue of operating expenses outrunning operating revenue. We cannot do that year after year without affecting not only the day-to-day performance but also, most importantly, the balance sheet and the health of the State or any other business, for that matter, in the longer term.

At the end of May this year, it was a little disturbing to read the consolidated reports for the 1998-99 financial year and the comparisons with the 1997-98 financial year. At that time, the Auditor-General commented that it was unfortunate that the report for the previous year, the year ended 30 June 1999, could be delivered only at the end of May 2000 and that he intended to say more about that in the future. What did that show? This is the important point, because it relates back to the warning given in 1996 by the Commission of Audit to the coalition Government.

When we look at the consolidated operating statement for the two years ended 30 June 1998 and 30 June 1999, what do we find? We find that revenues have increased slightly but, most importantly, expenses have gone up substantially. On a consolidated level, the operating surplus had fallen by $204m, from $976m down to $772m. But even more disturbing was the fact that, when one looked at the notes to those financial statements, one learnt that in the general Government area— the area we are talking about in this debate on the Budget; money is being appropriated from the Consolidated Fund—revenues had risen from $16.6 billion to $17.1 billion but total expenses had risen from $15.5-odd billion to $17.3 billion. We went from having an operating surplus of $1.022 billion to having a deficit of $188m. Of course, because we are under accrual accounting, some non-cash items are included in that, such as depreciation and amortisation. If we take those out and look only at the cash position, we see in effect that the surplus fell from just over $2.2 billion to about a billion dollars. Either way, there has been a massive change in the operating position of the Government.

This is precisely what the Commission of Audit warned about. It said that we cannot keep doing that. Yet we find in a report, which was brought down 11 months after the end of the financial year, that in its first year this Government had fallen into the trap that was the hallmark of the last few years of the Goss Labor Government. No wonder we have concerns. The people of Queensland should have concerns about the way in which this Government is managing the financial affairs of the State. If we look elsewhere in the Budget we see confirmation that that problem is continuing.

On page 73 of Budget Paper No. 2 a chart illustrates the level of service provision ratios. It compares the expenses in Queensland with those of other States. Interestingly, it shows that, under the Goss Government, the ratio was increasing. Our level of expenses compared with those for the other States was increasing. Queensland was catching up. The Government might say that that was because it was providing extra services. But that is not clear. It is not clear that there was any benefit to the community at all. For example, hospitals had long waiting lists and they were getting longer.

Interestingly—and the Leader of the Opposition touched on this earlier—under the coalition Government that ratio fell. In other words, the costs of running our Government compared with those for the other States fell under the coalition. At the same time, expenditure in the key areas of Health and Education increased relative to that in the other States. The coalition was increasing the provision of services in critical areas such as Health and Education but was controlling the rate of growth in expenditure, and the total rate of growth in expenditure fell. Under the Beattie Government, that position has been reversed. It has been reversed at a time when expenditure on Health has fallen and expenditure on Education has remained constant. The cost of running Government has gone up, but expenditure in the key areas of Health and Education has either fallen or remained static. If we look at other aspects of the Budget, in particular the GFS statements, we see that the projections do not give us any reason to expect that that position will change.

I did an analysis of revenues and expenses projected for the next three or four years, as detailed in the Budget papers. I took out a couple of the non-cash items— depreciation, amortisation and write-downs— because they seem to vary, in particular the write-downs, without any justification whatsoever. The figures seem to be selected arbitrarily to balance things out. When I did that I noticed that, over the next few years, the ratio of expenses to revenue will rise by roughly 2% to 3%. The problem with that is that, as the ratio of operating expenses and revenue rises and it costs more to run the Government on a day-to-day basis, that removes the opportunity to invest in capital formation. When we do not allow sufficient excess of revenues over expenses to pay for some of the capital, we end up with what we are seeing in this Budget, namely, rising debt levels simply to give the same level of capital formation.

The audited financial statements delivered in May of this year for the year ended 30 June 1999 showed that this Government was falling into exactly the same trap as the previous Goss Government. In addition, when we look at the forward projections on a GFS basis, we see examples of the sorts of concerns expressed by the Commission of Audit. As I said, the inability to use ordinary revenues to help fund capital creates a problem in terms of capital formation.

One of the problems we have in this State—and the other day this was referred to in a document by Michael Knox from Morgans—is that we are not generating sufficient private investment. This is something that I will go into in more detail later in my speech. However, we are also not generating sufficient capital investment from the State.

We should forget about the capital works budget of $5.3 billion, which has varied according to some accounting rules, and instead look at a comparison of the States on a GFS basis or a gross fixed capital formation basis. This is mentioned on page 22 of Budget Paper No. 2 in table 2.4 and in some other tables. We see that in Queensland, gross fixed capital formation is falling and has fallen over the past couple of years. It has fallen from $4.273 billion in 1998-99 to an estimated actual of $4.143 billion last year to an estimate of $3.805 billion this year, in other words, about a $400m decrease in the past couple of years. Less public infrastructure is being funded by this Government. Honourable members should forget about the capital works budget, which is influenced by changes in inventories, disposal of assets and things like that. They should look at what goes on in the same way that economists would look at whether or not we are generating sufficient capital in this Budget.

One of the things that surprises me—and I see that Alan Tesch is here—is that, when we look at table 7.3 on page 76, General Government Gross Fixed Capital Expenditure—and table 2.4 is broken up into general Government sector and the public trading sector—what do we see? One of the deceitful things about this Government is what it leaves out. I will refer everybody to this. It is on page 76, table 7.3. When we look at the chart, we see it lists general Government gross fixed capital expenditure from 1993-94 going all the way to 1999-2000. Is that not a lovely graph? It goes up year after year. Do honourable members know what was missing from the graph? The year 2000-01! What happened?

**Mr Borbidge:** Why?

**Dr WATSON:** Because according to the Government's own figures it dropped from the previous year of $2.465 billion down to this year's expectation of $2.233 billion.

**Mr Borbidge:** Didn't they put it in?

**Dr WATSON:** They did not put it in. So when it is going down Treasury somehow forgets it.

**Mr Borbidge:** They must not let on what they know internally.

**Dr WATSON:** The Opposition Leader raises a good point. I thought that that was written by someone in the Deputy Premier's office. Now we know when she got it. She got it when she was in Treasury. There is no question about that because they replicated it in the documents. I can guarantee that honourable members can go through other places—and I do not have time today—to find other issues. There it is.

**Mr Laming:** They were too busy laughing.

**Dr WATSON:** They were too busy laughing, as the member for Mooloolah says.

**Mr Springborg:** Sounds like a dodgy cover-up.

**Dr WATSON:** Of course it is. The Deputy Leader of the National Party got it right. There we are, when it comes to the nice, pretty graphs that people are going to look at and that will capture their imagination, the Government wants to hide the figures that are no good. Yes, we have to try to get into the documents.

**Mr Borbidge:** Treasury would have been instructed to do that.

**Dr WATSON:** I am surprised that Treasury would have allowed that to go ahead because it certainly gives a misleading position to the statements.

Let me go on. That whole issue of gross fixed capital formation is, in fact, perpetuated when we look further at the general Government tables A.1, A.2 and A.3. We see what has happened over the past couple of years being perpetrated over the next four years. We see that gross fixed capital formation is projected to fall all the way from $3.8 billion this year down to $2.7 billion in 2003-04. If we look at the individual areas, we see that general Government is going to fall from $2.233 billion this year down to $1.296 billion in 2003-04 and that the public trading enterprises are going to fall from $1.57 billion down to $1.316 billion.

We have a Budget this year that has a lower capital formation base than it has had in previous years, and that is projected to continue all the way through to the end of these Budget papers. And the Government wonders why Queensland is starting to fall behind! When it is not generating the public infrastructure, how is it going to encourage business infrastructure into this State? If it does not have an efficient public infrastructure, then it is simply not going to encourage businesses to put their money into the State; they are going to look at other places where they can get much better value for their dollars.

Unfortunately the problem gets worse. The Leader of the Opposition talked about the fact that the Beattie Government is balancing the Budget on the Bankcard. He talked about the increasing borrowings, which have gone from $533m two years ago to $2.038 billion in this particular financial year. So over the past three years we have racked up in net borrowings something like $4 billion. The problem, of course, is that the Government has not only been using this method to raid these particular public trading enterprises with higher dividend demands, as the member for Surfers Paradise said, and use it for debt equity swaps, as it is doing in this particular financial year but it has also raised the debt in the general Government area. In fact, it has raised it from a negative $82m in the first year to a positive $731m in this financial year.

In quoting Standard and Poor's earlier on in question time, the Treasurer conveniently forgot to mention that his cash surplus of $330m in the general Government area was primarily because he borrowed $731m in net borrowings in that area. That is what generated it. Without the $731m, he would not have had it. It is no use saying, "We fund superannuation", because that was the position for 32 years of coalition Government before Goss came to power and that was the position right throughout the Goss period. So that has not changed. That is not an excuse. The fact is that this year the Government has gone into a substantial cash deficit and there is a cash surplus only because it has generated the $731m through borrowings.

I find it most disturbing to look at the public trading enterprises. They are borrowing $1.307 billion. Unfortunately, that is about the same amount—a little bit less—than what they are going to be spending in capital. The capital is just over $1.5 billion. They are going to borrow about $1.3 billion—more than 80%. That has changed dramatically. If we go back and look at the capital development when the Labor Party took over Government, we see that the public trading enterprises were contributing about $2.2 billion to capital formation and they were only borrowing $600m. So two years ago the public trading enterprises of this State—the GOCs—were borrowing only about 30% of their requirements in terms of capital formation and this year they are borrowing 80%. It is no wonder that Standard and Poor's said—and the Treasurer forgot to mention this, too, in his speech—

**Mr Borbidge:** He left a few bits out.

**Dr WATSON:** He left a couple of bits out, obviously accidentally—one of those arbitrary kind of things.

**Mr Springborg:** Fairly important bits, too.

**Dr WATSON:** So important! Standard and Poor's said—

> "As a result of the borrowings by the public trading enterprises, the balance sheet for the public sector (excluding public financial enterprises)"—

which are not really relevant—

> "is not as strong as that for the general government sector alone."

He is right. The balance sheet for the public trading enterprises is not as strong because, over the past couple of years, the Government has been using borrowings to fund capital formation rather than reinvesting earnings or part of those earnings.

A consequence of raiding 95% of after-tax dividends from public trading enterprises, which is what the Treasurer and the Minister for Mines and Energy have done, is that those enterprises have to borrow money to maintain their productive capacity. The Treasurer and the Energy Minister were warned about that. The directors of those companies recommended that the level be 70% or 75%, but not 95% of after-tax dividends. They said to the Treasurer and the Minister for Mines, "You can't go taking dividends out at that level. You have to leave us some money to fund capital expansion and maintenance." This is irresponsible fiscal management by this Government because it is irresponsibly extracting dividends from these enterprises at such a level that they cannot sustain their productivity and, most importantly, cannot continue to expand.

This relates to two areas—capital formation and borrowings. Capital formation drives public sector infrastructure and is important to attract businesses and to enable business to use their own investment efficiently. Capital formation has fallen under this Government not only in the past two years but will continue to fall in 2003-04, judging from the Government's projections. When this situation is combined with rising debt that leads to problems.

**Mr Seeney:** Even in the GOCs.

**Dr WATSON:** Most importantly in the GOCs, as well as Government generally. It is important to remember that when capital formation falls and debt rises, it is the worst of all possible worlds. The ideal situation is for capital formation to expand and for debt to fall. That, in turn, provides more efficient public infrastructure of the kind needed by business to be competitive. But that is not happening under the leadership of this Government. That is the reason John Stanford and other business economists around this State are saying that this Government does not understand the factors which drive economic growth—not one iota. That has been quite clearly shown in the Budget.

However, I went further and looked at this year's capital works budget. Capital works is supposed to create jobs and set up Queensland's public infrastructure. When I travelled around Queensland and spoke to businesses in the construction industry and elsewhere, they told me that things were slowing down. I said, "What do you mean they are slowing down? There was supposed to be a $5.2 billion capital works budget last year and this year it is $5.3 billion. How can things be slowing down?" So I looked at the capital works budget again. It shows what projects are on the books right now but not what will happen six, eight or 10 months down the track. There is no forward planning. However, there is a good reason why we cannot see what will happen down the track, and that is because there is nothing.

**Mr Borbidge:** They have got a power station.

**Dr WATSON:** Yes, it has private power stations. How much of this $5.3 billion capital works budget is going to new projects? How many new projects in the capital works budget, that is, Budget Paper No. 5, had no expenditure before 1 July this year?

**Mr Seeney:** How much?

**Dr WATSON:** Some 10%—only $500m. This confirms that nothing has been planned down the track. What those businesses told me is clear for all to see in the Budget papers, and I looked at all of them. I was particularly interested in important infrastructure in Transport and Main Roads. Some $1.8 billion is allocated in the Budget for Transport and Main Roads. But how much of that is designated for new projects? I say "new" because I gave the Government the benefit of the doubt. The member for Gregory will probably want to shoot me for giving it such an easy time. The amount allocated for new projects in that area is $174m.

Do members know what that included? I included in that the $88m designated for the new track between Rockhampton and Cairns, even though the previous year an amount of $250m had been designated to cover Brisbane to Cairns. Because Brisbane to Cairns had been split and the Rockhampton to Cairns amount was not included previously, I counted that as a new project. However, it amounted to $88m, but it could be said that half of that was designated for a phantom project. That is what the Budget showed in relation to Transport and Main Roads, which are pretty important infrastructure areas. One would have thought that a Government trying to encourage investment would have thought further ahead and had projects coming down the track, so to speak. But, no!

What about Mines and Energy? Earlier, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned how the budget in this area was also decreasing. This is an important infrastructure area. It was allocated $1.4 billion in the Budget. How much of that is dedicated to new projects? Some $125m, which is much less than 10%. It is the same with virtually every department. However, I did find some departments where new projects had increased—that is, Environment, with $180m, and Natural Resources, with $32m.

**Mr Borbidge:** No new dams, though.

**Dr WATSON:** No, no new dams but other things. I am sure Rod Welford will be able to build his dingo fences.

**Mr Malone:** Lots of reports.

**Dr WATSON:** Yes. Another was State Development, which has a budget of $141.5m. Its new projects total approximately $57m. The important point to remember in all of this is that less than 10% of the projects included in the Capital Works Program for this year are in fact new projects. That is why businesses are telling us that nothing is planned down the track. That is why business is saying, "This Government is not committed to capital formation." That is why respected business economists such as Michael Knox are saying to the general public that there is a problem with getting business investment in this State, because this Government is not serious about it.

The fourth point I want to raise incorporates my first three points: that this Government has a deteriorating performance in its operational area, which has been conclusively proven by published reports audited by the Auditor-General, as well as projections in this year's Budget; there is deterioration in capital formation demonstrated by the GFS figures in this State, which is projected to continue; and the fact that there is a rising debt level. When those issues are combined, they create problems. The fourth issue I want to refer to is Queensland's relative position with respect to the rest of Australia. I do not always listen to John Miller's show on 4BC, but I listened to what he had to say yesterday. He is a general commentator, but he actually summed up the Budget rather well. With all due respect to him, I will repeat what he said. He said—

> "Whatever happened to the powerhouse where growth was measured by the number of cranes on the horizon, and was the Promised Land for southern deserters? In cold clinical terms, the Beattie Government hasn't been able to deliver its election promises and appears unable to do anything about improving its performance or our standard of living in the foreseeable future."

That was part of John Miller's summary of the Budget.

If one looks at the economic review and outlook, one can see in black and white what he was talking about. When one looks at the forecasting and the forecasting assumptions underlying this Budget, one sees some of the issues that I talked about earlier coming to the fore. One sees some of the problems that are besetting Queensland in particular when compared with the rest of Australia.

Let us look at private investment. Private investment is expected to fall by 4.5% this year, according to the forecasts in the Budget papers. Private investment in Australia is projected to grow by 2.75%. Queensland is falling behind.

Let us look at business investment. Business investment is very strongly related to the issue that I spoke about earlier in respect of capital formation and the things Michael Knox spoke about. Business investment in Queensland last year was actually projected to grow by 4.5%. The outcome was a negative 4%. Business investment was expected to grow, but it actually fell. This year it is expected to fall further—by 5.75%. I noted this earlier in relation to some of the ABS statistics, but I thought it was most important—

**Mr Hayward:** Are you going to explain the basis of that projection?

**Dr WATSON:** I am not going to go through it. The member can go through that. I will speak about the ABS statistics. There would be an econometric model there.

The fall in business investment is not as a result of the GST. It is not because of interest rates. It fell last year, before those things were issues. The fall is also not as a result of Federal Government policies. The Federal Government expects growth in business investment across Australia of 3.25%. It expects business investment to grow in Australia, but in Queensland it will fall. So the fall in business investment is not because of these other factors at all. If it were due to these other factors then the fall would be apparent right across the country, and that is simply not the case.

The interesting thing is that business investment in Queensland peaked in December 1998—six months after Labor was elected. That was as a result of the flow-on of the policies adopted by the previous Government. Since December 1998 business investment in this State has been falling. That can be seen in Queensland's economic record. It is in the Treasury documents. It fell in every quarter last year. I just checked the ABS statistics to see what they said, and they show that business investment fell in the first quarter of this year as well.

The ABS statistics show that there was a peak in June 1998, of $2 billion, but it peaked after that at $1.918 billion in the December 1998 quarter. It fell in every quarter of last year, down to $1.846 billion, and it fell to $1.792 billion in the first quarter of this year. Business investment in this State has fallen dramatically under this Government.

Jobs will not be created without private investment. We are already seeing that public investment is falling. Labor says that it wants to generate jobs, yet the two major factors that will push jobs are falling in this State. Gross fixed capital expenditure at the State level has fallen for the two years of this Government, and for the last 18 months business investment has fallen dramatically. How can we generate jobs when the two major drivers of job generation—that is, business investment and gross fixed capital investment—are both falling in this State? It is not going to happen. That is before we even talk about issues such as industrial relations, payroll tax increases, workers compensation premium increases and so on.

**Mr Hamill:** Workers compensation premium increases?

**Dr WATSON:** It was dropped by 0.01% this year.

**Mr Hamill:** It is continuing to drop.

**Dr WATSON:** No, the Government raised it first. Let us not forget that. First it raised it, then it dropped it off a bit. Let us get away from that nonsense. Let us look at payroll tax. It was dropped to 4.9%. Why? The Government expanded the base so much—

**Mr Hamill:** To 4.8% from 1 July.

**Dr WATSON:** Yes, and between 1 January and 30 June it was left at 5% while the Government expanded the base by including superannuation of 7%.

**Mr Horan:** They took more than they gave away.

**Dr WATSON:** A lot more, because the effective rate was 5.35%. Those paying payroll tax were paying more on 1 July 2000 than they were on 1 July 1999—with the same number of employees, the same pay rates and the same superannuation. So much for the drop!

**Mr Hamill:** You oppose a further reduction, I suppose.

**Dr WATSON:** We moved an amendment to reduce it to 4.6% to compensate, and the Government opposed that. It has not a leg to stand on because it refused to compensate and to leave payroll tax where it was. It made a payroll tax grab, and that comes out in this Budget as well. It shows an additional $99.7m. So let us not talk about that nonsense. The fact is that, before we talk about things such as payroll taxes, industrial relations and so on, the major drivers of investment are falling dramatically under this Government. We will never see an increase until that situation is reversed.

It is no wonder this is happening when we look at unemployment in Queensland compared with the rest of Australia, as can be seen in the graph I have here. The Queensland rate is falling, but the rate for the whole of Australia is falling dramatically. The gap between Queensland and the rest of Australia is widening. After two years of a Beattie Government we are in a worse position than we were in at the end of the coalition Government. Queenslanders are comparatively worse off today than they were in July 1998. They are worse off because of the policies of this Government. It is okay to say that unemployment is a bit lower because of the policies generated by the Federal Government. To see how well we are performing as a State we have to compare ourselves with the rest of the country.

**Mr Springborg:** The gap is twice as wide, at least.

**Dr WATSON:** And we used a narrow range graph, so we could have made it even wider if we used a different graph!

We can also see the trends in unemployment. Unemployment has been flat-lining since January 1999. There has been no significant change in unemployment, despite the inception in December 1998 of this Government's jobs program. The House passed its program. It was in the Budget. It took effect from December 1998. Ever since then, unemployment has been flat-lining. What a tremendous recommendation for Labor's policies! This year it is putting another $91m into the jobs area and taxing businesses another $99.7m in payroll tax. It is taxing real jobs in order to fund its phoney jobs, and it does not affect unemployment one iota.

In this Budget we are seeing a continuation of the worst kinds of policies any Government can ever adopt. They are policies that destroy the operating capacity of the Government. They are the same kinds of things that Cain, Kirner, Bannon and Burke did. First of all, these policies destroy the everyday operating capacity of the Government. They are starting to destroy the capital base of this State, both in terms of gross fixed capital formation and business investment. Not only that, they are starting to put this State into further debt. That combination has a negative effect on the things that are really important to people—that is, the services they can expect and the jobs they want for themselves and their children. People cannot find jobs because there is not sufficient investment, because the private sector does not want to put its money into areas where there is insufficient public infrastructure.

Strong economic and fiscal management is not an end in and of itself. The idea of that is to provide services to the people we were elected to serve. Under this Government that is getting out of the reach of the ordinary, everyday battler.