

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 October 1986

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairperson:

Ms D.L. Gayler

Members:

The Hon. B.C. Eastick
 Mr G.A. Ingerson
 Ms S.M. Lenehan
 Mr M.D. Rann
 Mr P.B. Tyler
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRPERSON: There are a few preliminary matters. We will adopt a relatively informal procedure. There is no need to stand to ask or answer questions. The Committee will determine the approximate timetable for consideration of the proposed expenditures and that timetable will assist in arranging the changeover of departmental advisers. Changes to the composition of the Committee will be notified to the Committee as they occur. If the Minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and submitted no later than Friday 31 October.

I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make opening statements if they wish, which statements should last approximately 10 minutes but no longer than 15 minutes. I will take a flexible approach to giving a call for asking of questions based on three questions per member, alternating sides. A member will be allowed to ask a brief supplementary question before switching to the next member.

Subject to the convenience of the Committee, a member who is outside the Committee but desires to ask a question will be permitted to do so once a line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by Committee members. Indications in advance to the Chairperson would be appreciated. Questions should be based on lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates of Payments. However, reference may be made to other documents, including the Program Estimates and the Auditor-General's Report. Questions are to be directed to the Minister, not to his advisers but, of course, the Minister may refer questions to his advisers for a response. So far as time allowed for Services and Supply expenditure is concerned, I understand that agreement has been reached that it will be from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is the agreement.

The CHAIRPERSON: I invite Dr Eastick to make his opening statement.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I have no opening statement.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Before the examination of the estimates commences, I would like to provide the Committee with some background information on the operations of the Department of Services and Supply. The members of the Committee will be aware that the role of the department is to provide a range of common services, primarily to Government agencies. These services include computing, printing, transport, supply/procurement, analytical chemistry, forensic science and remote sensing.

The financial performance for 1985-86 operations was creditable. Both recurrent and capital operations were well

within budget although the line estimate papers indicate that the department exceeded recurrent voted appropriation by \$255 000. Closer examination of the department's performance shows that of this additional expenditure, \$204 000 was due to national wage increases, \$130 000 was re-directed to enable the common automated procurement system project team to be established and \$65 000 was input to further develop the South Australian centre for remote sensing. The department made savings of approximately \$150 000 to minimise the impact of unavoidable increases in costs.

A number of the operations of the department are funded through deposit accounts. These include the Government Printing Division, Government Computing Centre, State Supply Division stores operations and the transport services car pool. A net surplus on deposit account operations was achieved in 1985-86.

Turning to the capital account, the department made savings in 1985/86 of \$605 000. These savings relate primarily to the timing of acquisition of image analysis equipment for the South Australian centre for remote sensing (\$310 000) and the purchase of motor vehicles for the Government agencies. Remote sensing equipment will now be purchased from within the 1986-87 allocation. During 1986-87 the Government has committed additional funds for the:

- Implementation of the common automated procurement system (CAPS);
- Expansion of the questioned documents function of the forensic science division; and
- Upgrading of operational equipment at the South Australian centre for remote sensing.

A number of new developments will also be actioned by the department including:

- An assessment of the feasibility of satellite car pool operations in the outer metropolitan areas;
- The development of a unified financial system which supports flexibility in the deployment of resources and promotes the integration of management objectives; and
- Response to service wide initiatives such as the Government Management and Employment Act, occupational health and safety and equal opportunity.

Services and Supply, \$11 384 000

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Minister of Transport.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr H.E. Roeger, Director-General, Department of Services and Supply.

Mr P.J. Bridge, Director.

Dr I. Dainis, Director, Chemistry.

Dr W.J. Tilstone, Director, Forensic Science Division.

Mr D.J. Woolman, Director and Government Printer.

Mr M.E. Jones, Director, Government Computing Centre.

Mr D.R. Patriarca, Acting Director, Support Services.

Mr T.A. Culshaw, Executive Assistant.

The CHAIRPERSON: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. I suggest that the relevant items of the miscellaneous lines that apply to Services and Supply be also dealt with in this period to 1 o'clock.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I wonder whether we could extend that opportunity to question some aspects of the capital expenditure which directly apply during that period. There will be no further debate on that issue when it subsequently comes to the vote.

The CHAIRPERSON: That would be most appropriate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is very difficult from the financial papers to compare apples with apples because of the change of accounting system which applies. I draw attention to the fact that in the summary given at page 124, the expenditure for this year is \$11 384 000 against an actual payment last year of \$10 851 991 and a budgeted amount of \$10 597 000. The increase this year is relatively minimal and I am not quite sure that it even rates with the 4.7 per cent increase which was the overall figure given for increased Government expenditure.

That apart, taking up the point that the Minister made in his opening address that there is a scheme afoot to manage the provision of the designated common services and, more specifically, to maximise the return on public funds invested within the department and recognising that the department is now a little over 12 months old in its new form, under its new management with the new Act, I am a little concerned to see under the implications for resources the statement that the department has planned for a period of consolidation. How much longer is that consolidation going to take place? In essence, have all of those requirements of reorganisation been put into place and is the department now a functional unit without the need for a great deal more looking back or looking forward? That is not a criticism: I am trying purely and simply to establish just where we are in relation to the new corporate image and the new delivery of services.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: First, I acknowledge the point made by the honourable member about the difficulty of comparing this year's budget estimates with last year's amounts voted and actually spent. As all members of the Committee would have obviously noted over the past week, we have gone from line to program estimates. Of course, next year it will be much easier. We are now considering one of the departments that are transferring over this year and, therefore, in relation to the Estimates of Payments, the comparisons are not easily made. The Department of Services and Supply has been in operation for some 10 years. I think the honourable member referred to the new State Supply Act, which was introduced some 12 months ago and which has been operating very efficiently since that time. I think it is fair to say—and the estimates would bear this out—that the various departments within the Department of Services and Supply have met all the challenges given to them. They have operated within both their recurrent and capital budgets.

The honourable member was correct in pointing out that this year's budget is significantly less in real terms than the amount spent last year—even that which was voted last year. The reason is that we do have a very stringent budget; we are in tough economic times. Secondly, a number of our departments are deposit funded. They have to be efficient; they must provide services at the demand of clients and in competition with other agencies. Therefore, they need to be efficient and the prices that they charge need to be very competitive. That is an added pressure that they face, and it really ensures their efficiency and their economic viability. I suppose the basis of the honourable member's question is whether or not I, as Minister, and the Government feel that the Department of Services and Supply has met the task that has been given to it. I would have to say that, yes, the department is meeting that task. It is not satisfied with the present level of service and the present level of efficiency. We are continually monitoring the performance and we are continually monitoring the personnel that we have—and that will continue. It is a requirement of Government, anyway, for all departments to strive to make further savings and the Department of Services and Supply quite clearly

has played its part in that role, and it will continue to do so.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is the Minister able to identify any areas in relation to which the departmental head still requires an additional input or reorganisation to, in the terms used, maximise the return on public funds invested in the department? In what areas is the public likely to see changes occur during the period of this budget?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am not too sure that there will be any dramatic changes, although I point out that currently a number of reviews are taking place. For instance, a review is being undertaken of our remote sensing operation at Technology Park, to advise Government as to what further support should be given to the Remote Sensing Centre, so that, as has been explained to me, it is able to take advantage of the winter of opportunity that currently presents itself. That study is currently under way and recommendations will be put before Cabinet, it is hoped, fairly soon.

As the honourable member will no doubt be aware, studies are going on within Government as to our chemistry operations and there will be some changes, but I am not too sure whether they will be in the next 12 months. We have had what you could call a settling in period with the State Supply Act, and we have had quite a dramatic change in the nature of the State Supply Board. We have introduced commercial and union representation to the State Supply Board, and that has been an advantage: I am certain of that. I expect that it will continue to improve in its effectiveness.

The Forensic Science Division has had major reviews (which we can draw out later in the discussion) which have made forensic science the unit that the Government would wish it to be. We have been fortunate to have an excellent scientist with that division to provide the standard that I think the community in South Australia would require. The Government Printer is continually monitoring the work that he has, to see what can be done internally and what can usefully be let out to the private sector.

I do not know that one can expect a dramatic improvement in our Government Computing Centre, which is running very profitably. They are just general responses concerning some of the divisions. We will continue to monitor: I do not think it would be wise for me to suggest that there will be dramatic change. That will depend on recommendations made to me as a result of a number of the inquiries which are currently taking place. Any changes made will be announced in the Parliament and elsewhere.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer to the last occasion the Minister and I had a discussion as to the 'user pays' concept which was becoming more high profile in Government utterances, and so forth, and I draw attention particularly to the last paragraph on page 476 where it is stated:

Constraints placed upon the budgets of clients will encourage them to choose carefully the quantity and quality of services they require from this department.

Is the Minister able to quantify for the benefit of the Committee any real evidence of constraints being placed by individual departments upon the services which, hitherto, have been provided by the Department of Services and Supply and, in fact, is there any rationalisation taking place as a result of initiation by his department with other client groups which results in benefit to resources or services which the Supply Department provides but which are concurrently being supplied by some of the client departments, where they seek to do the easy things themselves and leave the harder things or less profitable things to Supply?

We could develop the particular things within the broad basis of that question over an extended period of time, but I believe that the Minister is aware of the position I am

putting; that, for example, a number of departments, in the belief that they can supply simple testing operations for themselves, do so without necessarily looking to the health and welfare of the people being asked to provide those services back in the departments without all of the constraints of management or of safety that ought to be applied. I am interested to know whether there has been an effective address of this matter by the department in this period of 12 months to come to grips with some of those interdepartmental circumstances which I have briefly related.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask some of my advisers whether they wish to respond more specifically but, in general, the honourable member has pointed to the existence of a system which is well known and, it is fair to say, is accepted within Government: that is, we have a Government Computing Centre but we have departments with their own computing operations. They may be competing with the Government Computing Centre.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: They are not always compatible.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is right, but the overall economy and wellbeing of Government is being monitored continuously. If operations are more profitable with the computing centre, those recommendations are made. The centre's Director talks to the departments about our compatible roles. There are some statutory authorities in the Department of Services and Supply with the capacity to purchase through State Supply or to purchase themselves. The decision is made, taking account of their corporate and financial responsibility to taxpayers. That, too, is monitored continuously.

Of special interest is our Chemistry Division. Several other Government agencies such as the Agriculture Department, CSIRO and institutes of learning, of which the honourable member will be aware, are capable of being involved in chemistry operations. We always intend to be compatible and to do what we are best able to do and to allow agencies to do what they do best and economically. There is interrelationship between the departments and the agencies to which the honourable member referred.

Because of the deposit funding of the operations the divisions in Services and Supply are required to act commercially. They are required to pass the real cost of providing services on to the department or agency which requires them. They do not compete with outside agencies, although an argument for that could be advanced. We have regard to the need to provide work in the private sector, the Government being a major client for the private sector in South Australia.

I have responded in general terms. I am not aware of an area in which work done by the Department of Services and Supply could be done more cheaply or effectively elsewhere, but perhaps the Director-General could add to that reply.

Mr Roeger: There are no outstanding examples of a service that we think we could provide that is being done elsewhere at a greater cost. We acknowledge the resource implications involved, as referred to in the paragraphs that the honourable member read. We say on page 476:

By maintaining the price of services at a competitive level and pursuing appropriate customer-oriented strategies demand for services can be maintained at a level where output from the use of departmental resources is provided economically and efficiently.

We work hard to do that. We have recently had reviews of the quality and cost of our services. For example, there was a review in the Chemistry Division last year of all Government analytical laboratories. The divisions came out favourably.

Part of the exercise involves our being quite overt in informing people that the Chemistry Division can offer a good quality service at a good price. A review is being undertaken at the Government Computing Centre to look at the quality of service and again at the costs. That will prove to our clients that we do act competitively and that there is no real reason why they should set up their own resources. To some extent that counters them.

In relation to Government printing requirements, a Printing Board of Review has been in existence for some years. It looks at departments buying their own printing requirements and it performs a coordinating role in ensuring that any expansion of printing requirements by outside departments is not to the detriment of the Government Printer, or in fact is not done so that it would cost more money.

Ms LENEHAN: At page 476, the yellow book stated that in some areas the department faces competition from the private sector. What are some examples of areas in which the department faces such competition?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that a good example would be in the Government Printing Division. Perhaps the Government Printer could give some examples of work done by him which faced some competition from the private sector.

Mr Woolman: Perhaps it is far easier to compare the private sector in the printing industry as against a public printer. We give an estimate on the specifications we receive from a department. Those same specifications can then be given to a private sector printer and another figure is given, so we are compared directly with the private sector. We are in a situation (and we have developed this over a period of time) whereby, when we find that our competitiveness starts to slip and that in fact the Government could be paying more for that printing from us than if it purchased from the private sector, we then usually call a tender from the private sector and let that type of work to the private sector. That situation has occurred since about 1978 and a great deal of printing that was done previously in the Printing Division is now done by the private sector. That is simply because of the capital expenditure that would be required to make us more competitive.

Also, we tend to be a producer of print on a general basis rather than on a specialised basis and a lot of small printers in the private sector specialise in specific work. In areas where there is direct competition, we measure ourselves with the private sector on a competitive basis so that we know our costs and we know the costs of the private sector. We try to maintain the technology to keep up in those areas, and I suppose that is the backbone of the Printing Division within Government. As members are aware, our prime responsibility in the Printing Division is to service this Parliament and that takes approximately six months of the year. In the remaining period we have to keep the staff busy and, being on a commercial basis of breaking even over a three-year rolling period, additional work has to be attracted. We monitor the competitiveness very carefully in those areas and to this stage we have done that reasonably well.

Overall, the work that we retain within the Printing Division is on a competitive basis. We monitor it very carefully in comparison with the private sector. Any area in which we become uncompetitive is subcontracted to the private sector. By doing that, we maintain the purchasing power of Government in calling tenders. The last analysis done in this area revealed that, by purchasing through our division, we are getting cheaper prices than an individual department going out and purchasing on its own and calling those tenders from the private sector.

Ms LENEHAN: I wonder whether the analytical chemistry services may at times be in competition with the private sector. Are there other areas, or is that the major one?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is the major area. There is some competition with the Chemistry Division. I have checked with the Director who says it is of a minor nature. I will get Dr Dainis to give some examples of that.

Dr Dainis: In so far as the Chemistry Division is concerned, since introduction of cross charging there has been some comparison by clients of our charges with those offered by private sector laboratories. This occurs in the high volume areas such as trace elements and soil analysis. It is only a fairly small proportion of our work, most of which is done for Government agencies. We do very little private client work, some being done for farmers in the soil analysis area.

Charges are higher than those of the private sector as a consequence of two factors; one is the lower volume of our operation, the other the high proportion of professional people we employ because of the regulatory nature of most of our analyses. A lot of clients compare our costs with those of the private sector. The private sector does not regard us as competition because of our higher prices. The situation is that this competitive area forms only a small proportion of our workload at the moment. Where it might impact on us in the future is if Government clients go out and tender for services on a larger basis we may be pushed into a situation where we have to compete in the tendering process for analytical services. In those circumstances we would have to review our pricing structure and reach an arrangement with Treasury about what we could do in those circumstances.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Warehousing is another area where there could be comparisons drawn between the private sector and the Government sector. Mr Bridge is the Director of State Supply, so perhaps he can respond about his particular area.

Mr Bridge: The warehouse at Seaton is our largest one. We have two smaller warehouses, one at Whyalla and one at Mount Gambier. The main thrust is at Seaton. We sell of the order of \$15 million worth of goods through the warehouse each year. We very much watch the prices of our competitors in the private sector to ensure that we are selling goods to Government at a price which is competitive with the private sector, and in many instances is considerably cheaper because we are able to buy in large quantities and perhaps ship truck loads into the warehouse and then distribute them to our many customers around the State, principally the schools. It is a very competitive area.

Ms LENEHAN: As the Committee is aware, the Government produced a 1986-87 Budget and Its Impact on Women document, which was tabled by the Premier and Treasurer as part of the budget papers. In reading that document and looking at the introduction and overview in which the Treasurer talks about the various reasons for having this document, I note that the Department for Services and Supply is not one of the departments that participated either last year or this year in providing an input for this document.

I seek indulgence of the Committee to talk about a couple of aims of the document: it talks about the types of expenditures being allocated to remove disadvantages experienced by women and girls. The Treasurer obviously sees the document as forming part of a means of identifying initiatives covering employment, training and a whole range of areas that come under the control of the Government. I am talking now about the first page of the document. I do not

intend to elicit all the areas looked at, but will the Minister say whether it is the intention of the Department of Services and Supply to become a participating Government agency next year in the preparation of the budget papers; in other words, is the department going to look at the impact of budgetary decisions on women and girls, both within the general community and within the department? The reason I have raised my question is that in reading and preparing for today's discussions I notice that there is the equivalent of 858.8 full-time equivalents as at 30 June in employment and that seems to be a large number, so perhaps it would be possible for the department to provide input to this document next year.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is part of the corporate plan for the Department of Services and Supply to participate in the scheme that the honourable member has referred to. I think it is fair to say that within most of the divisions that form the Department of Services and Supply there are very technical areas and I understand that we do have female scientists and females with computing skills; also, females within the Chemistry and Forensic Science Divisions and within the GCC. We are employing technical female people.

We are certainly anxious to ensure that we get the best skills available to us, and so much the better, I guess, because of the significant minority representation in the work force of women, that those professional skills are held by females. We will certainly be part of the general policy plan. We will be doing our part to increase opportunities available for women and young girls within the departments. I point out that, as I said earlier, they are generally skilled areas, and obviously women do figure very prominently in computing and the other two areas I have mentioned. I am not sure about supply; we employ women, but do not have any in senior positions in the Department of Supply.

Mr Bridge: Not yet, but it is increasing. I guess it has traditionally been a male dominated career structure, but increasingly we are finding that women are coming into State Supply Division and are working their way up the promotion ladder.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The question is whether or not there is active encouragement for women to do so and we will be meeting the Government's requirement in that area. The Government Printer started taking female apprentices in 1978, so what was again a predominately male career structure has now been broadened appropriately to allow young women to be trained in the printing industry. There are numbers of them working at the Government Printing Division, but not at a level at which the honourable member would wish to see them. Here again, encouragement is given and, here again, the Government Printer will meet the Government's requirements in that area.

Ms LENEHAN: By way of supplementary question, the reason I asked the question was that in the explanation in the introduction of this document it states that because there have been important legislative initiatives by the Bannon Government, namely, the Government Management and Employment Act of 1985, chief executives are responsible for the implementation of any equal opportunity employment program and the devising and implementation of other initiatives to ensure that employees have equal opportunities in relation to employment. This is a way of monitoring how well that Act is being implemented. The second initiative is the Equal Opportunities Act of 1984 which I am sure all members are aware makes discrimination on the basis of arbitrary characteristics, of which sex is one, quite illegal. Sometimes when it is important to

prepare a report looking at the numbers of people employed in various categories it can help to bring to the fore some of the issues that have been raised by the Government at a legislative level. I am delighted with the Minister's answer—

The CHAIRPERSON: The honourable member should come to her supplementary question.

Ms LENEHAN: Does the Minister envisage, in implementing an equal opportunities employment program in the department—and there are about eight of those programs currently operating in the Public Service—whether, in light of the Minister's detailed answer, the department would be prepared to implement such a program?

The CHAIRPERSON: I remind honourable members that supplementary questions should be as brief as possible.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The answer is 'Yes' and it is programmed to be investigated between November 1986 and January 1987. The priority at this stage has been given to occupational health and welfare, but it is part of the department's forward planning. One of the difficulties we have at the moment—and I expect this is a difficulty that a number of departments are having (this is not in the way of excuse but explanation) is that we have a tight employment situation. In the Department of Services and Supply a number of divisions have a reduced work force this year as against last year and will have further reductions next June as against this June 1986.

So, having regard to that, we will be doing what we can to ensure the opportunities are there and that we do have an equal opportunities scheme running within the department. I am personally committed to it and I am sure other departments are. In professional areas particularly, which hitherto had been denied largely to women, they are opening up in a much wider way with opportunities. Because most divisions that form the department are of a technical nature the opportunities are going to be there. The employment of people will be based merely on skills that an individual has. It will certainly not be based on any other characteristic, otherwise we would all be in trouble—somebody would report us, I suspect.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The corporate management objectives of the department specifically state that the demand is increasing for the provision of advisory services to client agencies to promote effective use of departmental services available to them. In what practical way is the department undertaking this distribution of advice? Are there any handbooks or officers who are required to provide that service in-house to the client bodies or general information along those lines?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I thank the honourable member for his question. The Committee will have to be patient because we have so many divisions and each division acts individually in promoting its services. For example, the Government Computing Centre is something that Mr Jones can explain in regard to promotion of services that his centre provides in trying to secure further work.

Mr Jones: The Government Computing Centre provides a service to departments through a group of people that we call business analysts. They have a number of departments assigned to them and call regularly on those departments to advise on the most appropriate way to use the services of the Government Computing Centre. All the options that might be available to them to use are explained. We also have a lot of information going to all departments by way of newsletters which advertise all facilities available. We also promote training in all areas of computing to all departments across the Public Service and in general provide advice and consulting services in computing to all agencies.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As a supplementary question, recognising that there are a number of service departments, is there any real attempt to coordinate the effort from top management so that you do not have a whole duplication of people running around addressing the matter to the same department?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will direct this question to the Director-General of the department. The department itself is very thin on the ground in personnel. It is made up of a number of divisions constituting largely departmental operations. The Director-General does have an office and a role and will be pleased to tell the Committee how limited are the resources available to him to play that coordinating role. It is effectively being done division by division, but I will ask Mr Roeger to respond.

Mr Roeger: The coordination of the activities of the various divisions causes me concern and costs a lot of time. We do not have large resources on a central basis and, if I did, the divisions would take me to task as we cross charge the central support services to the operating divisions. I meet with the directors of each division on a regular basis and we do a lot of corporate and departmental planning and control. We call it CEG—the corporate executive group. We meet at least each fortnight. We do our whole planning through the corporate group—our strategic planning and operational planning.

The ethos of the department is that the customer is the most important person in the organisation because we sell services to other Government agencies. If other Government agencies do not want our services we have no reason to be in existence. It is terribly important to maintain contact with our customers. We know what is going on. We coordinate the activities of the various divisions through the corporate executive group. Departmentally we carry out annually a marketing survey of all our clients with all the services we offer. We solicit comments on the degree of satisfaction or lack of it with the products, cost, quality, timing, and so on. We try to maintain our position as selling services that our customers want and need.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have a decentralised marketing policy because the divisions are largely specialist operations and services. To respond to the initial question, the Government Printer obviously has personnel who work within Government departments to ensure that the work that can be done at the Government Printing Division is done there.

The Chemistry Division has a handbook, and that is available to other agencies. Also, the Remote Sensing Centre has a responsibility to speak to agencies to ensure that they are at least given an opportunity to tender for the work that they are able to do.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Whilst accepting the complexity of the whole matter, it would appear that cost effectiveness would best be served by someone with an overview who could call on the individual expertise of the various departments, thus avoiding having a lot of people roaming around undertaking initial contacts with the departments involved. That is a matter that the Minister might like to comment on. More specifically, in relation to the Central Government Car Pool, in his report the Auditor-General states that the Treasurer has approved a full post-implementation review of the car pool. Subsequently, at page 168 of his report the Auditor-General indicates:

In previous reports, I have commented on several matters associated with the establishment and operation of the car pool. Comment was made on the post-implementation progress review undertaken by the division in May 1985. The Treasurer approved in May 1986 that, before any changes in operations would be considered a full post-implementation review would have to be undertaken considering the following matters—

- achievement of savings compared with the predictions contained in the original proposal to establish the car pool;
- potential for reductions in the size of the long term hire fleet;
- the views of the client departments particularly on product pricing.

A post-implementation review should take into account management reporting systems and the ability of those systems to provide information to permit management to effectively monitor utilisation of vehicles in relation to fleet size. These points have been referred to the department for consideration.

Will the Minister indicate what is the current state of play? What are the criteria that have been laid down for implementation? When will the post-implementation committee make its report? This action was commenced before May 1985; it was referred to again in May 1986; and now, in October 1986, where are we?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I ask Mr Culshaw to respond to the questions asked by the honourable member.

Mr Culshaw: The question of the post-implementation review has been before management continuously over the period to which the member has referred. I can report at this stage that the post-implementation review is in full process. I understand that, apart from some outstanding responses from departments with regard to the services provided, investigations have been all but completed. I understand that the officers undertaking this post-implementation review expect that documentation will be completed within the next several weeks. It will then go forward for consideration by management and other authorities.

Mr TYLER: I note at page 486 of the Program Estimates that the car pool fleet is scheduled to increase. I understand that it is Government policy to reduce the overall size of the fleet. Can the Minister or one of his departmental officers explain the increase as shown in the Program Estimates?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is true that an increase in the car pool fleet is budgeted. However, that is a necessary part of the plan to decrease the overall size of the Government fleet. I can understand the honourable member's confusion, because one does not necessarily increase the car pool to decrease the overall Government fleet size.

By way of explanation, in 1985-86, the car pool was able to re-charge customers for an average of 6.5 hours per day. This was higher than the ambitious budget of 6.3, and explains the good financial results that were reported. So I think that that should be encouraging to honourable members. Another point of interest is that these vehicles were heavily utilised during their re-charge time. On average, each short-term hire vehicle exceeded 30 000 kilometres per annum or something like 120 kilometres per working day. These high utilisation figures enabled the Government to satisfy its transport needs with a smaller overall fleet size. So, the growth in the size of the car pool is justified on that count. The more vehicles that we have in the car pool, the fewer vehicles we need in the overall Government car fleet. An increase in the number of vehicles in the pool decreases the need overall for vehicles within Government.

Mr TYLER: I refer to the Federal Government's 'Buy Australian' campaign. Can the Minister or one of his departmental officers say whether there has been any coordination with the Federal Government in encouraging the 'Buy Australian' campaign?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: A national preference agreement has been reached between the States of Australia and, of course, South Australia is part of that agreement. Previously, South Australia had a preference for goods manufactured in South Australia and whilst, on the surface, that seems to be an admirable scheme, in effect, it prejudiced South Australia's purchasing policies. It meant that we did not have access to larger markets; so, very often we were

purchasing goods that were more expensive than otherwise might have been the case. It does open the South Australian public sector to the enormous markets that are available in New South Wales, Victoria, etc. When a State limits its preference policy to goods produced in that State, smaller States are disadvantaged, while the larger States are not so greatly disadvantaged. So, it was certainly to South Australia's advantage to be part of the agreement made. I shall ask Mr Roeger, Chairman of the State Supply Board, to respond to this matter in detail. The preference which under the agreement is given to Australian manufactured goods is of advantage to not only the Australian economy but the Australian work force. It enables our secondary industries to develop a capacity to compete with international markets; the value of the dollar of course has helped enormously in that. By the diligent use of the massive purchasing power of Governments, we can promote development of secondary industry in Australia. I now ask either Mr Roeger or Mr Bridge to provide some more details in response to the preference issue that the honourable member has raised.

Mr Roeger: The honourable member referred to the question of how much liaison there is with the Federal Government, and so forth. The State Supply Board does not liaise directly, but a member of the State Supply Board comes from the Department of State Development. At present that member is Mr John Cambridge, who has very direct links with the Federal Government. The State Supply Board is very actively trying to promote the use of Australian products, wherever possible, in preference to overseas products. It is a fairly complex exercise. The Minister has mentioned the preference agreement, which imposes a 20 per cent penalty against overseas products.

It is sometimes too late in the piece, after tenders have been called, to look at local products—and by local I mean Australian—against overseas products. In many cases, if local industry had been aware of future purchases they could have geared up to produce something, and it is that latter aspect to which we are giving attention now by advising industry of our forward procurement plans and by liaison with industry to ensure that manufacturers can gear up to produce something. I think it will be much more successful than purely looking at tender prices for products already in existence. In other words, I think that Australian manufacturers need some kind of opportunity to gear up for Government purchases.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that a registration of interest under tender No. 0048 re fleet management of light vehicles was called by the Government last year, and that tenders closed on 4 February 1985. Several of the companies which declared an interest received a letter advising them that Touche Ross had been called in to advise on the matter. Is this matter still under consideration? What were the conclusions, and is it possible for the Touche Ross reply to be tabled? This was in relation to the private sector taking over the purchasing of motor vehicles, and the concern is that the tender has been put out, a significant amount of work has been done by a lot of companies in putting in a proposal, and there has been no reply at all by the department. What is happening?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Director-General, Mr Roeger, to respond to that: if it is 1985, it predates me a bit. I am not as familiar with it as I otherwise might be.

Mr INGERSON: I think it is called part of a privatisation plan.

Mr Roeger: It is true that in about April or May of last year registration of interest was called—it is not strictly a tender. Registration of interest was called for a fleet management system which was to be a computer hardware/

software system to enable the department to manage the fleet. Currently, we are working in PCs and a self-developed management system.

We had responses to the registration of interest. Included in one or two of the responses was an offer to take over the management of the whole fleet from us, but that was not really the purpose of calling for registration of interest. We engaged Touche Ross to help us to look at the various replies received and to assist us in selection of something which would satisfy our requirements for a fleet management system.

That exercise proceeded, but the end result was that the hardware and software costs which would be incurred in our opinion did not warrant the expenditure at the time. The benefits would not come from such a large expenditure. If our fleet were twice as large as it is at present, probably there would be benefits, but we thought that all the proposals put up were, in fact, Rolls Royce proposals when what we really wanted was a Commodore proposal.

We therefore abandoned our intention to purchase a fleet management system, and I believe that all registrants were advised of that. If they have not been, I will have to be advised. We are currently looking at a modification of the fleet management system and, to that extent, I think we are helped a little by developments in the private sector, particularly in relation to the fringe benefits tax, which has encouraged the development of software for fleet management systems. There may be something available on the market now considerably cheaper than was the case 12 months ago, but the matter is still under review. It is part of our plan this year to further investigate and, if something is available, to purchase it and put it into operation to help us manage the fleet—but it was not a privatisation exercise.

Mr INGERSON: I ask a supplementary question. Is the Government considering in any way a method which would enable the total pool to be put out to the private sector to be managed and operated?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not have any recommendation before me to suggest that the car pool would be put out to private enterprise. I have just checked it with the Director, and he does not have any plans or indications that there is a demand for that. The answer from the Government is 'No'—there are no plans to do that at all.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister supply to the Committee the breakdown, in terms of percentage for each manufacturer, of vehicles currently being purchased by the Government? He may not be able to do it, but could he advise, in other words, how many Holdens, Fords and Toyotas are being bought in the light vehicle area? The purpose of asking that question is in line with the policy comment that the Minister made earlier. There have been suggestions to me that there are significantly fewer Holdens, in particular, being purchased by the Government; it relates to two things: first, the GMH share of the market and, secondly, the fact that the GMH factory here is the biggest private employer in the State.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We can get the information for the honourable member. I should point out that the role of the State Supply Board is to call tenders for a whole range of vehicle types; then the various departments and agencies within Government—and other agencies that come within the criteria established by the Act—can purchase vehicles through those contracts which State Supply writes with the various car manufacturers. The majority of the vehicles covered by our contracts would be Mitsubishi vehicles. I think it is fair to say that the next highest category would be Ford, and General Motors do not figure very prominently, although General Motors supply all of the police

vehicles. A particular vehicle which is suited to police work is manufactured by General Motors.

I spoke to General Motors personnel prior to the tenders being accepted, and pointed out that, whilst we are very anxious in South Australia to ensure that South Australian manufacturers are successful in their tenders, in fact, they needed to sharpen their pencils quite considerably if they wanted to win the contracts. They were more expensive; certainly, so much more expensive as to not justify any preferential treatment—which, in fact, would be frowned upon by the Auditor-General in any event.

General Motors were aware of this. They believed that we should take more account of vehicle capacity rather than vehicle type and that some of their vehicles would be more suited to some of the operations the Government required of vehicles than perhaps Mitsubishi and Ford vehicles would be. The bottom line is that State Supply has to purchase suitable vehicles at the cheapest price, and it was purely on that basis that General Motors were not as successful as they had hitherto been. It was only a very few years ago that General Motors secured the bulk of the vehicle contracts and Mitsubishi (or Chrysler) received very little, so the position was reversed at that time. There is no reason why General Motors should not be extremely successful in future tenders if their prices are such that the Supply Board would be required to give them the business. It is a very competitive market, and we are delighted that Mitsubishi was able to secure such a high percentage of the contracts. We would have been equally delighted to see General Motors secure as high a percentage.

A preference agreement entered into by all States prevents South Australia from giving preferential treatment to its own products. I am reminded that Ford station wagons and utilities were successful. The Government was well aware of GM's position and the matter was discussed with the Premier and me. It would have been inappropriate for me to give any directions to the Supply Board—indeed, it would have been illegal—but I advised GM that it would need to sharpen its pencil, and we would be delighted to buy its product.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister get the figures?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

Mr INGERSON: How many privately owned vehicles is the Government paying for as regards parking in the South Australian centre car park and is fringe benefits tax paid on the reserved spaces?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will get a detailed response. Only very few are involved. The appropriate agencies pay FBT, not the Department of Services and Supply. We cross charge the parking fee, so all of the costs are directed back to the user.

Mr INGERSON: Which departments are cross charged? Who are the people concerned?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will take that matter up with the various departments to get the information for which the honourable member has asked.

Mr RANN: Can the Minister explain the range of services provided by the Centre for Remote Sensing at Technology Park and indicate the extent of its achievements during the past financial year? Will there be any change or extension of its role in the coming year?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Before I answer that question, may I suggest that members who have not taken the opportunity to visit the Centre for Remote Sensing should do so. If they contact Mr Roeger, we can facilitate a visit. Perhaps group visits would be advantageous. I strongly believe that members would be impressed by the work being done there.

Those who watched *State Affair* last night might have seen a brief exposé of the centre's work.

Remote sensing is a fairly new technology, whereby special sensing devices in satellites, aircraft or some other form of mounting pick up light waves from an object of interest. This object is typically the earth's surface, but the technology is expanding to cover other things, such as determining buried mineral formations, charting of coastal waters, producing pictures of sunken ships or internal human organs requiring diagnosis, and quality control of engineering processes, such as welding. When 'light' is mentioned, it covers everything from radar, right up the spectrum through visible light, and on to X-rays. More recent applications use sound or other waves to extend the range of use. The technology consequently has an enormous potential in many areas. The sensors are extremely sensitive to even the lowest levels of energy, and they can sense the difference between slightly different wavelengths (such as shades of colour in the visible part of the spectrum).

After sensing, this information is stored and subsequently analysed by experts. These people are typically scientists or economists and they rely heavily on extensive computer processing to achieve what is known as image processing, before evaluating the significance of the maps and graphs it produces. Once the information is recorded, the user can rapidly view items the size of whole oceans or continents, down to individual motor vehicles or trees. Knowing the patterns of the light detected and the characteristics of the field of interest, the expert can use the information provided to give valued interpretation and advice to customers. Major areas of application include sensing of agricultural pests, locating bush fire risks, performing mineral exploration, providing environmental protection of sensitive areas, locating warm sea currents rich in fish, weather prediction and preparation of maps for civilian and defence use.

Its benefits are the result of a number of features of the technologies it employs. Satellites, aircraft, etc., provide fast and inexpensive access to wide areas of the earth. Modern communications and computers enable the transmission and analysis of staggering amounts of information, and their presentation in terms of pictures which can be readily understood without extensive training. Modern statistical techniques allow experts to predict outcomes to situations over periods of time. They can then look at alternatives, such as the consequences if no action is taken, and the results of each of a variety of corrective actions. In this way, the best treatment for a problem may be rapidly determined and put into effect, before a problem becomes too serious and often before it is scarcely evident from the ground.

Because these satellites, etc., are shared on a virtually global basis, their application to local situations is typically one tenth or one hundredth the cost of conventional methods, which they are steadily replacing. Since they can identify things otherwise unrecognisable or else hopelessly expensive to investigate, they also open up opportunities which were previously impossible or impracticable.

The Centre for Remote Sensing was established at Technology Park in September 1984 with the intention of Cabinet that it offer a commercial style of service to customers—both within the Government and beyond. It is also intended to participate in development of new products and to provide an opportunity for information transfer into local industry. Since then, it has been very successful, achieving sales of some \$133 000 in 1985-86. As well as servicing the needs of Public Service departments and statutory authorities, it has also completed contracts for other customers—South Australian and interstate. The centre has also com-

pleted contracts for the Commonwealth Government, and been selected as prime contractor by them for an overseas aid project in Asia.

In a consortium with other local industry, and against international competition, the South Australian centre recently won a contract for upgrading the Australian satellite receiving station's facilities. This receives and disseminates all civilian remote sensing data for Australia. The first phase of the upgrade involves advice to the Commonwealth Government on the facilities necessary to take full advantage of the new-generation remote-sensing satellites now becoming operational. It is therefore of vital significance to Australia's national and international performance in the aerospace industry. The centre is thus demonstrating its ability to contribute at such a level, while fulfilling its function of attracting business to South Australian industry. Investigation is in process to determine what further support the Government should give the centre.

Ms LENEHAN: I note in the estimates that expenditure has been incurred in introducing the common automated procurement system. What financial benefits will be gained by introducing the CAP system?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is envisaged that the common automated procurement system will automate much of the clerical work involved in placing an order, receipt of goods, matching receipt advice with invoice and statement and payment of the account. Tenders for the required software have been evaluated and it is expected that the successful tenderer will be announced later this week. It is planned to progressively introduce the system into Government departments over the next few years and when fully implemented it is expected to save the Government approximately \$18 million over 10 years.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Auditor-General's Report, in relation to the Government Computing Centre, at page 174 states:

A review of the role of the Government Computing Centre to ensure that there was a sound basis for future developments was undertaken by a working party... Their findings were reported in February 1986.

Following assessment of the report the Data Processing Board is considering extending the review by the engagement of independent consultants.

Will the Minister indicate whether that initial review is available for general perusal, what is the nature of the review, and what are the scheduled dates for material to be made available to the public?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The original review would not be available at this stage for public display. I will ask the Director to respond, but the work has been done by the Data Processing Board and not by the Department of Services and Supply.

Mr Roeger: The review mentioned in February 1986 was a review—and I think I referred to this earlier this morning—carried out to look at the role that the centre had, how well it was meeting that role, and whether there should be any changes to that role. The review was carried out basically by officers of the centre itself, although there was input from the Data Processing Board and Treasury.

The review indicated that the centre was performing fairly favourably, but that there could be some changes made to the role of the centre to enable it to perform better and to meet the requirements of the Government better in the future. Unfortunately, the review was seen as somewhat of a navel gazing exercise because it was carried out by people directly concerned with it, and it was thought that the issues raised should be pursued by a more independent review, so the Data Processing Board engaged, I think, DMR from Melbourne to carry out that review, which is due to be

completed about mid November. The report will be made to the Data Processing Board.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In relation to the Chemistry Division, there is an indication in the Auditor-General's Report at page 175 of the relative costs associated with the major subdivisions of work on pesticides, food in general, cereals, agriculture and trace elements. Does the cost structure reflect the relative workload in each of those major areas? Is it reasonable to say that the ratio of work would be directly associated with the cost structure? I recognise how difficult that can be because of the number of reagents or processes that might apply to trace elements as opposed to a normal chemical examination. I would like a profile of the work being undertaken there. Is the department considering taking on the analyses of swabs, for example, which are taken at various race meetings in South Australia?

Dr Dainis: The question with regard to swabs should be referred to my colleague, Dr Tillstone, because his division, at one stage, I believe, carried out work on swabs for racing. With regard to the actual sections, the amounts noted for each section reflect the number of staff and resources employed on the work within those particular general categories. I should note that the staff are deployed flexibly throughout the division so that if the workload is greater, for example, in the agriculture section than in the trace elements section then staff would be deployed on a temporary basis from one section to another to help meet that workload.

The workload, in many respects, particularly in cereals, agriculture and trace elements, is quite seasonal in nature, so we really have a totality situation measured by inputs. Actual revenues earned are moneys received from clients through the cross charging process. Since the rate applicable in that year in each section was fairly uniform, I think ranging from \$48 per hour to \$58 per hour for pesticides, for example, there is a fair correspondence between inputs and outputs so far as the cross charging system is concerned.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Forensic Science Division used to do swabs for various racing codes in South Australia but stopped doing them because of the expense of the operation. I understand that all swabs, certainly those for racing, now go to Sydney.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: At page 483 of the Program Papers reference is made to installing improved phone equipment and seeking the increase in staff necessary to achieve a service level of 95 per cent satisfied phone inquiries per day. Can the Minister or his advisers expand on that objective?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The technical nature of these departments requires a specific reply rather than ministerial intervention.

Mr Culshaw: The State Information Centre handles a large number of inquiries by telephone every day. I think about 400 per day. It has been a matter of concern to management to ensure that the public is not unduly delayed in getting through to one of the officers to answer inquiries. In July, we installed a new Commander telephone system, which enables various calls to be switched from desk to desk and also calls to be placed on hold. This, under test involving both State Information Centre staff and Telecom Australia officers, demonstrated that we had achieved a significant improvement in the number of callers getting through to an officer without delay. So that installation has been a significant success.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Has the 95 per cent figure been achieved?

Mr Culshaw: The figures calculated indicated an 89 to 90 per cent achievement over a limited period of several

weeks. I cannot say that it has not achieved 95 per cent subsequently, as people have developed more proficiency with the equipment.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Can the Minister give some indication of the way the department is looking to move in the future in not only printing technology area but also in the area of information management and distribution of traditionally printed documents in other forms? I recently commented in an adjournment debate in the House, of which the Minister would be aware, that I thought it was time we looked at other ways of printing traditional documents such as *Hansard*, the *Government Gazette*, and so on, in ways that took account of the revolution in printers, which computers, laser printers, online computers, videotex, and so on, have brought about. I appreciate that the department is bound by the traditions of the Parliament and its clients and is not able to implement such things without the client—the Parliament or the Government—moving in that direction.

As a resource which includes printing technology, a computing division, and so on, I would think it was desirable that the department be providing a lead in this area and encouraging its clients to move in those directions, thus enabling them to take advantage of the latest technology, maybe not right now but within the next five years.

As part of my comments I drew a distinction between the high technology in the House where *Hansard* enters information into its own computers which is transmitted to Netley. I referred to the fact that it then went back some years in technology when it arrived at the Government Computing Centre. My comments were based on information I had gained during a visit about five years ago. I hope the department has moved with the times since then. I apologise if the department thought that I was having a go at its abilities or its technology. I believe that things have progressed since then. Should we be looking at more advanced forms of information distribution rather than simply traditional printing?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Government Printer to respond to that. It would be useful, for the interests of people who work at the Government Printer, if the honourable member's apology is recorded in *Hansard* and so it goes out to the Government Printer when they process it as the statements he made were noted and there was some cause for concern. The honourable member has explained why that may have occurred. If it is possible for that to be recorded, the people who work at the Government Printer would appreciate that, as would the honourable member. The specific question on new technology and the revolution in technology, as the honourable member has pointed out, that has happened in recent years and the promise of what will happen in future years is something about which the department would be concerned and I will ask Mr Woolman to advise the Committee on what research is going on at the Printing Division.

Mr Woolman: The Printing Division, in conjunction with the Government Computing Centre, is looking at information management generally as a top priority. The Printing Division installed computerised typesetting back in 1977 and we went live with *Hansard* in 1978. Since that time the debates of the Parliament have been contained on magnetic tape in the Printing Division so that at any time the Parliament wants to go on line with data base that information is available. In 1980 the Printing Division upgraded its phototypesetting system again, and was the first Government Printer in this country to install specific module-based typesetting equipment so that as technology developed throughout the world this could be added to the advantages

of the laser printing, CD disc and so on, which could be used.

The division has a direct line dial-up system from the transfer of data from the House down to the Printer and this information is taken straight into the system and the corrections are done only in the division. At the conclusion of the weekly *Hansard* the data is done on the tape again so the data base is updated all the time. We have had discussions with the Parliamentary Librarian since 1978-79 concerning information management and retrieval in the House. Over later times demonstrations have been given to the House using data from the Government Printing Division in using facilities by an outside consultant, ICL. The Government Computing Centre has been involved using data from the Printing Division in the same area.

Other discussions have been taking place with the Attorney-General's Department concerning rolling consolidation of Statutes so that a data base can be created for members, the public or the legal profession for general information retrieval for research and for an updated consolidated Statute. With the CLIRS situation the current data base or Acts available will be transferred to that data base in the exact form they are now. They will not be on a consolidated basis. The proposal to the Attorney-General is that this information or technology is available within the Government now and within the Government Printing Division and the Government Computing Centre to do these types of things.

The Attorney-General is working down the line for rolling consolidation and the Printing Division itself has supplied two staff to assist with those consolidations. On the other side of technology the division is working closely with a number of departments in offering services to use other computing systems, taking laser print-out from those departments. They produce the original copies by laser and transfer the data base to the printer. We bring it out in the normal printed format. We work closely with the Audit Department and Treasury.

In other areas of desk top publishing, we are working closely with the Education Department and TAFE so that again the full ramifications of that type of technology of someone using a keyboard to produce a particular document for their own purposes and later being able to transfer that data into documents or having it printed in a conventional way is possible. Those things are being looked at and are available currently. The department has taken information management as a top priority in the Printing Division and the computing centre is closely involved with customers and also internally on development.

Membership:

The Hon. Ted Chapman substituted for the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Obviously, a lot is going on behind the scenes and far more than I was aware. I look forward to seeing the practical implementation of that in our place of work here. A related question that concerns me is the significant investment that the State is making in the form of each individual office and department moving into the microcomputing area and the implications of that in the future for compatibility and integration of networks. Networks of microcomputers will be established in State Government departments and instrumentalities. Policy allows them to make their own choices in regard to the microcomputers they buy currently. It is important technology and will be cost effective, but for the State as a whole to gain benefit it is essential that the networks and individual units and protocols they use are compatible. Is the State

laying down a policy guideline for the purchase of brands of microcomputers and the implementation of networks, protocols and communications between those computers so that we do not end up with the situation where the networks in the Department of Education will not talk to networks in the Department of Services and Supply, and so on?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I acknowledge the importance of the member for Elizabeth's question. It is not really a matter under the responsibility of the divisions of the Department of Services and Supply. It is a Data Processing Board responsibility. I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of State Development and Technology and a reply will be provided. I now ask Mr Woolman whether he would like to add to that.

Mr Woolman: The Printing Division is very aware of the problem of these various data bases. To that extent we have invested in technology which currently will convert about 32 separate devices, word processors, PCs, microcomputers, etc. into a common language, and that language can then be fed back into another data base. Also, in conjunction with the Attorney, we are looking at technology which it is hoped will be available this financial year.

That technology will actually read printed documents so in relation to any document, rather than re-keying in, this device can be re-educated, take the data and put it into a useable data base, which can then be networked or transferred anywhere. The other technology that we are looking at is voice technology which, again, will help the Parliament and also give effect to this transfer of data across networks, etc.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Woolman mentioned earlier that a certain percentage of work goes from the Government Printer to the private sector if for smaller work, etc. it can be proved that the private sector can do it on a cheaper basis. Can the Minister indicate roughly what percentage of work is not handled by the Government Printer but goes to the private sector?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think it would probably be difficult to make an accurate assessment, but I ask Mr Woolman if he would like to respond to the question.

Mr Woolman: We are involved in two areas in relation to letting work out to the private sector. One is subcontract work direct from the printer, and the other is in relation to work that is contracted either through the State Supply Division or direct through various departments. Work that we let to the private sector last year from the printery direct was worth about \$500 000, out of total sales of about \$18.5 million. On top of that, the purchase of other types of material would amount to about \$1.1 million. So, the figure is about \$1.6 million out of \$18 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: To be totally radical, why could not all printing in relation to Government be handled by the private sector? Why can't we have total private sector involvement in regard to our printing?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The reasons are exactly the same as those that applied when the honourable member was a member of Cabinet, and they have not changed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I just wanted your interpretation—that's all.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member would be aware that my interpretation of what a Government should do obviously fits in with the interpretation that he had. There are a number of very good reasons, particularly in relation to the needs of Parliament, which have to be given priority. One has to have an agency that can respond immediately to Parliament. Having one's own Government Printer, which most Governments do, one can respond to that. Just recently we had a meeting of Government Printers

within Australia and the Pacific. That meeting was held here in Adelaide. It is not an unusual experience for Governments to have their own Government Printer. I am aware that some Governments are looking at giving the work that Government Printers do to private agencies. However, in South Australia we consider that the benefits to the community generally of having a Government Printer are so obvious as to be paramount, and that is the reason why we continue to use our own Government Printer. I think that the benefits are quite significant.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I support what the Minister says. I was just interested in his thoughts on the matter. In relation to the forensic science area, I note on page 488 of the Program Estimates, in relation to major resource variations 1985-86 to 1986-87, the following statement:

The increases in expenditure during 1986-87 are mainly due to the full year effect of increases in salaries and related payments as a result of implementation of Cramond initiatives during 1985-86.

Have all the initiatives of the Cramond working party been implemented and, if not, which ones have not been implemented? Further, what are the ramifications involved? I understand what has been stated in regard to increase in expenditure, etc., but I would like to know what are the major ramifications that have come from the implementation of those initiatives.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Before I ask Dr Tilstone to respond, I want to put on record the Government's appreciation—and I am sure that of the South Australian community—for the work that Dr Tilstone has been able to do in forensic science since he came to South Australia. Our forensic science capacity here was subject to some criticisms. I think that any reasonable assessment would conclude that whatever problems previously existed no longer exist. We have had outside and internal audits of the forensic science division operation. Dr Tilstone himself has recently performed such an audit. I now ask him to respond to the matters raised by the honourable member.

Dr Tilstone: The investment in the Forensic Science Centre as a result of the recommendations of the Cramond working party went into three areas: modifications of the building, which were required to provide specialist space for new activities that we were going to offer; the purchase of scientific equipment, which was required to deal with the various exhibits that were coming in; and staffing. The work on the building has been completed. Also work on the scientific equipment to bring the level up to the generally accepted standard has been completed. The funding for the transfer of staff was almost completed in 1985-86—with the exception of the questioned document service, which involves the examination of handwriting, papers in frauds or poison pen investigations. That work will be completed this year.

So, in essence, the money was required for the transfer of services to make physical provision for that transfer and also in relation to the work on the building and the hardware that we have to provide and as well to raise the standard of existing services. The ramifications are quite straightforward. The resources that have been put in have provided a single integrated service line, where any case can be picked up and looked at in its entirety with regard to the scientific investigation of the materials that are submitted for analysis. Most of the work that we do there is for the Police Department in South Australia, but some of it is done for other Government agencies as well. We are quite happy that we are now in a situation where we can provide that service as required.

Ms LENEHAN: I understand that the Government Printer took over the production of the Jubilee Atlas of South

Australia from the Wakefield Press. My question on this matter relates to an earlier question from a member of the Opposition about the degree of competition involved.

Can the Minister report on the advance sales of this most prestigious publication, as I understand that it will not go on sale to the public in a full campaign until about 3 November and I wondered whether the Minister or the Government Printer could report to the Committee on how successful the advance sales are at this stage?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I would be delighted to do so: it is a magnificent document, very well produced by the Government Printer. It is tremendously popular. Very few copies will be available, particularly of the bound version, but Mr Woolman will, I am sure, be very happy to give an update on the atlas and the sale progress.

Mr Woolman: The current sale of the atlas is through an agreement with channel 7 on direct sales to the public. That finishes at the end of October and it is open through general book sales, book shops, etc. from that time. As of this date we have sold about 2 300 copies of the standard edition, of which 7 500 were printed. As of this morning there were about 105 sold of the limited edition of 200, so we are delighted at this stage with the response from the public.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The limited edition is a fully leather bound volume of \$195, and 105 of those have been sold.

Mr Woolman: The limited edition is numbered and signed by the authors.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: A moment ago, we were talking about the merits or otherwise of having the work currently undertaken by the Government Printer transferred to the private sector or, at least, that was the implication of the question asked by the member for Heysen. If the Government Printer does not recover sufficient income to offset the cost of capital expenditure and recurrent expenditure associated with that division, as one would expect the private sector does in order to make a profit, where is the division going wrong?

Where are they off the rails, bearing in mind the remarks that the officer made about the extended sales they make, presumably at or about the levels of market prices for productions that they publish? It is apparent from the remarks made that the Government Printing Division is well equipped compared with the private sector. It is obvious also from remarks that have been made by the officer and the Minister to date on the subject that they are a very efficient team; they do a great job for all of us and the public at large. Further, it is obvious from the remarks that the officer make that they made significant sales to the community at large as well as to other Government divisions, etc., for which I imagine they are paid at the prevailing rates. Given all those industrial and commercial factors and the expertise that is clearly contained in that outlet, why are they not making a profit?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government Printing Division is deposit funded. It is required to operate within that funding, and it does so. The Government Printer has a particular role: to provide for the needs of Parliament. Of course, the cost of that is cross-charged to the Parliament, but they have people working, as the honourable member would understand, at odd hours during the Parliamentary session, and we have people coming in to cope with those peak loads.

In the off period—mainly about six months, I think, all told—when the work of the Parliament is not paramount, the Government Printing Division is involved in the work it does best and it does it at competitive rates. It does meet its targets. It does the work at no cost, in a sense, to the

Government over and above what it would cost to get it done outside. I think that any reasonable test would show that the Government Printing Division does the work it is required to do more cheaply than we could have it done outside.

Mr Woolman has already pointed out that we continually compare the work that we do against the cost of having it done outside. Where it can be done more cheaply outside, we will look at that; where it is done more cheaply internally, we do that—so I do not understand the honourable member's question. Is the honourable member suggesting that the Government Printer is showing some huge loss?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am not suggesting anything. I am simply referring to the report which indicates that over the past several years there has been a shortfall and there has been a recurrent expenditure deficit reflected in the documents as well as significant capital expenditure. Quite clearly, they do not crack even, whereas their counterparts in the private sector, in order to survive, make a profit. I want to identify the difference.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In the time available to us I think Mr Woolman should respond, but we showed a profit up until last year—the honourable member should be aware of that.

Mr Woolman: The division's charter is that it breaks even, and this has been Government policy since the steering committee of 1977. That break-even situation is over a rolling period of three years and, up until this financial year, we have attained that. In fact, we have been in a surplus situation. At the end of last financial year we showed a loss or a deficit (in 1985-86), but the two previous years had a surplus, so we have balanced out over that three-year program.

The capital expenditure is not taken into account as far as those figures are concerned. The interest and depreciation on capital is included in our cost and, of course, that is then recovered over a period of time during which the equipment is being depreciated. That goes into our cost rates so it is recovered over that period of time. We do not recover that capital equipment cost in one year or over a period of time as an actual cost.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: You do not, but that is precisely, with respect—

Mr Woolman: Neither does the private sector.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Just supplementary to that—

The CHAIRPERSON: Before the honourable member does that, I remind members that the Committee did decide on a timetable. We have two votes to put. We can either do that now or have the public servants back after lunch. There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

Works and Services—Department of Services and Supply,
\$6 686 000—Examination declared completed.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRPERSON: We have six votes to deal with this afternoon and this evening and I understand that the agreement is that we will deal with transport recurrent, transport capital, transport miscellaneous and then with the STA later this afternoon.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The STA appears under 'Transport, miscellaneous'. With the agreement of the Committee I thought that it might be as well to do all of the Department of Transport vote and then do 'Miscellaneous' separately,

including the State Transport Authority. I would need to bring a new lot of advisers to the table.

The CHAIRPERSON: Do you want to propose a timetable?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No, but I have Department of Transport and STA officers here and we have advised the Highways Department advisers to remain available should they be called earlier than expected.

Chairperson:

Ms D.L. Gayler

Members:

The Hon. Ted Chapman

Mr G.A. Ingerson

Ms S.M. Lenehan

Mr M.D. Rann

Mr P.B. Tyler

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The CHAIRPERSON: If the Minister undertakes to supply information later, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and submitted no later than Friday 31 October. I ask the lead speaker for the Opposition to make his introductory statement.

Mr INGERSON: It is a privilege to lead this examination for the first time on behalf of the Opposition and to note the number of public servants who are prepared to come along and help us. I thank them for that. There are four major issues in the transport portfolio about which we shall ask questions. They concern the State Transport Authority, its deficit, the cost to the Government, the operating shortage and the significant cost increases of the past three or four years. We would like to express our concern about reductions in money paid by the Federal Government in grants under the ABRD and ALTA systems. We are also concerned that there may be some negotiating difficulties in that area.

We are worried about third party insurance and legislation which may be forthcoming. In 1982-83, the deficit was about \$200 000. This year it is about \$85 million and the potential deficit for 1986-87 is \$160 million. We should like to ask about that. On road safety, we have noted that there has been a significant cut in expenditure on publicity and promotion and a significant increase in the number of staff in the division.

The CHAIRPERSON: I invite the Minister to make his opening statement and to introduce his advisers.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I thank the member for Bragg for his welcoming remarks in regard to the officers who are here to help the Committee. We will deal with Department of Transport and State Transport Authority matters initially and discuss the Highways Department budget later, if that is acceptable to the Committee.

Transport, \$30 229 000

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Minister of Transport.

Departmental Advisers:

Dr D. Scafton, Director-General of Transport, Department of Transport.

Mr K. Collett, Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Mr D. Ryan, Director, Administration and Finance.

Mr I. Lees, Director, Road Safety.

Mr J. Hutchinson, Assistant Director, Transport Policy Research.

Dr I. Richards, Director, Transport Planning.

Mr L. Braddock, Manager, MRD On-line Project Team.

Mr A. Wayte, Director, North-East Busway Project Team.

Mr P. Tregoweth, Senior Finance Officer.

Mr J. Bettcher, Chief Finance Officer.

The CHAIRPERSON: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Even in the current difficult economic climate, the 1986-87 budget for the Department of Transport generally maintains all existing functions and incorporates new initiatives in certain instances, especially road safety. New initiatives include the Victor Harbor railway, the access CAB scheme for the disabled and the vehicle security register. The O-Bahn and on-line projects continue to be high priority activities.

Mr INGERSON: Under program 3, salaries and wages are up 10 per cent. What are the details of the change? What are the new responsibilities and how many staff are involved?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The line to which the member refers incorporates salaries of the Road Safety Division, which includes 38 motor registration licence examiners and 15 in the review section. There is an increase of \$363 265 in salaries due to a transfer of eight positions from the Road Traffic Board to the Division of Road Safety at a cost of \$234 000. There is a carry-over of the Division of Road Safety 1985-86 recruitment of \$23 000 and a carry-over of the national wage increase of 3.8 per cent at November 1985 of \$31 000. The increase of staff numbers in the Motor Registration Division, licence review, with offsetting savings in other areas of the Motor Registration Division, represents \$54 000. A pre-licence motor cycle training field officer cost \$21 000. That constitutes the increase. The total number within the Road Safety Division is 106.7, plus the 38 relating to motor registration licence examiners, plus the MRD licence review section of 15.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to publicity and promotions, I note in the budget line that there is a decrease of \$66 000 or some 19.2 per cent. When talking last year about road safety, the Minister, in reply to a question in the Estimates Committee, stated:

I believe that road safety has a high priority not only with the Government, but within the community generally. . . . The Government has approved the creation of 10 new positions and applications for employment. . . .

The Minister goes on to explain that statement, but he made the most interesting point when he stated:

I point out that one of the factors that bears upon Government is that, as one improves capacity to research and prepare programs, one needs to be able later to provide the ongoing funds to put those programs into effect. So, there is a requirement on Government to become involved in road safety; not only to do the research and planning and to implement programs, but also to ensure that the programs are promoted effectively and that we receive the benefit from them.

That statement, which we support very strongly, seems to be quite contrary to the position where there is now a reduction of 19.2 per cent. An article in the *Advertiser* of 7 October this year stated:

Simply, we are not doing enough to reduce the road toll. Despite vows from the Minister of Transport, Mr Keneally, to make road safety his major priority this year, little has happened.

With this sort of expenditure one can only assume that in the coming year that statement may also prove to be correct. Why is there a reduction in that line?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will respond to the last comment made by the honourable member. I think that he was probably reading from a recent editorial in the *Advertiser*. That editorial went on to say that in South Australia we should introduce a graduated driver system and the sooner the better. That comment followed a statement that I made in Parliament. The *Advertiser* repeated almost exactly what I said. Then, in response to an issue raised by the member for Fisher about driver education in schools the *Advertiser* editorial stated that that program should go ahead as soon as possible. Those statements contained in the *Advertiser* editorial were in response to statements made by me. If I had not made those statements, I doubt that the *Advertiser* would have been aware of them and it could not have included them in the editorial.

In saying that I do not suggest that what the *Advertiser* editorial said does not have merit, because it does, otherwise I would not have raised the matter in the first place. I stand by everything that I said last year. Road safety is a major priority of the Government, but as I said recently in response to another question, the capacity of the Government to affect the road toll is limited to the willingness of the community, particularly the driver who is in charge of a vehicle, to respond to legislation, advertising or programs that are put into effect by Governments. The ultimate responsibility still rests with the driver. All sensible citizens in South Australia would understand that millions of dollars can be poured into road safety but, if people continue to be irresponsible in their driving habits, we will not effect a major improvement.

In terms of fatalities on the road, there has been a dramatic decrease since 1974 when I think it peaked at 382 (and I will check these figures). In 1974 the seat belt legislation came into effect, followed by the RBT legislation in 1981. I suggest that the next important legislation was that relating to child restraints and that program has been recently implemented.

Now that the Road Safety Division has sufficient manpower resources, broader counter measures than just publicity and promotions can be adopted to combat the road carnage. When one has a small group of people working in the department, its capacity to be able to research and put into effect the programs is limited, so in those instances one produces a lot of promotion and advertising material, because that is something that can be done most effectively when resources are limited. The result is that the allocation of money is put towards advertising. It is much more effective to be able to employ people on the ground who can prepare programs which can be sensibly and usefully used in combating the road toll. That is not to say that publicity and promotion is not an integral part of any program aimed at improving road safety.

The reduction of \$66 000 is due to there being in 1985-86 a one-off allocation to publicise changes in licence conditions of probationary drivers. The role of the Road Safety Division is to manage an extensive program of publicity and promotion highlighting the problem of road accidents and providing information and advice aimed at reducing the cost of road accidents. The division, within the road user branch, has appointed a Coordinator of Publicity and Promotions and an Information Officer to manage the publicity and promotions function.

The Road Safety Centre, Oaklands Park, in its recent review has adopted a higher profile as a distribution and resource centre for road safety information, and road safety officers from the centre are encouraged to work directly with community groups in promoting road safety. An advertising agency, Clemenger Adelaide, was successful in tend-

ering for the division's publicity contract for two years with a right of renewal for a further year. During 1986-87 the division has allocated \$280 000 for publicity and promotion programs. The allocation of this budget is as follows:

	\$
Bicycle Safety Campaign (including bicycle safety helmets)	45 000
Occupant Restraint Campaign (including child restraints and Babysafe rental scheme)	80 000
Minor promotions (including eye level brake light, motorcycle safety, pedestrian safety)	55 000
Drink driving	85 000
Young driver of the year	15 000

The division, through its advertising agency, is seeking to extend this budget by attracting corporate sponsorship from the private sector. This strategy has proved successful in the past and also ensures a great community involvement in road safety promotion.

The Babysafe rental scheme is a good example of public and private sector cooperation in managing a road safety program. Other examples are the additional brake light promotion program and the bicycle safety helmet campaign. In September 1986 the Road Safety Centre held an open day sponsored by Nordic Motors (Volvo) where public and private sector organisations combined to provide a focal point for road safety—over 2 000 members of the public visited the centre that day.

The division will continue to work closely with the Federal Office of Road Safety and use their promotional materials and programs. The division will continue to concentrate on providing promotion programs such as Babysafe, random breath testing, pre-licence training for motorcyclists, local community road safety committees, and augment these with high profile media campaigns. In the past, road safety was in South Australia mainly represented by high profile media campaigns. The shift in funding and apparent reduction reflects its changed emphasis. So, we are moving away from promotion towards counter measures; I think that is the appropriate way to go. We could spend all our money on promotion and not implement counter measures, but we believe that it is now time to be involved in counter measures.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Minister for that answer, because I think that both sides strongly support the idea of road safety and, when a significant reduction in expenditure occurred, I think that the Minister expected to receive some criticism, which I think he did receive. In relation to road safety programs in schools, what steps will be taken to make the program that was put forward a compulsory one as it relates to schools? One thing which was raised yesterday and which surprised me was that, in the probationary licence area, there is a clause which states that a probationary licensed driver is permitted to drive up to 10 km/h over the speed limit.

However, that particular rule does not apply to anybody else in relation to speed limits. It is staggering to me that a permit should state on it that a speed of up to 10 km/h over the speed limit is allowed, as it relates to the Road Traffic Act. A friend of mine said to me recently that what that is saying is that a probationary licence holder can drive at 70 km/h generally, or when passing a school can drive at 35 km/h. That seems a quite incredible situation when we are concerned about the high accident and death rate of youth driving vehicles. Will the school safety program be made compulsory? Is the Minister aware that we are publicly saying to probationary drivers that they can drive at

10 km/h over the speed limit, and what is he going to do about it?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The issue of driver education at school is one that has been discussed between the Division of Road Safety and education authorities over some time. As the honourable member would expect, a working party is looking at the future of road safety and driver education in schools. It currently can be part of a voluntary education program implemented in schools. I think that the honourable member understands that, because he asked whether or not we should make it mandatory.

The honourable member suggested in the second part of his question that the legislation is actively encouraging P plate drivers to travel at 10 km/h faster than the approved speed limit. That is not the case, because if an L or P plate driver drives past a school they must drive in accordance with established speed limits. The L and P plate drivers have a limit on the speeds at which they are allowed to travel. I will ask the Registrar to respond to that query after Mr Lees has been able to advise the committee about the present state of discussions between the Road Safety Division and the Education Department about road safety education in schools.

Mr Lees: As the Minister has said, road safety education is not an integral part of the curriculum in schools at present; it is not a required part. Most schools teach some aspects of road safety, and always have done. There is an active curriculum committee that helps to prepare material: the Road Safety Division is involved in it.

The Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport decided recently that this situation, which had existed for many years, needed careful looking at. We have established a working party with representation from the Education Department, Health Commission, Police Force, South Australian College of Advanced Education and the Road Safety Division, but it is far too early to say what will be the results of that working party.

Mr Collett: The Road Traffic Act calls up the speed laws as well as the drink driving laws and any driver, including a probationary driver, who breaches the limits is prosecuted, or can expiate the offence. The probationary conditions themselves for the new driver are called up under the Motor Vehicles Act. They are fairly tough conditions which, in addition to resulting in a person being prosecuted under the road traffic laws, can also result in a person being prosecuted under the Motor Vehicles Act. These conditions are that a probationary driver shall not attempt to put any vehicle in motion where there is an alcohol concentration in the blood. An 0.08 blood alcohol level is applicable for senior drivers. No probationer can exceed any speed limit by 10 km/h. A breach of that condition automatically results in the cancellation of the driver's licence for six months.

Members interjecting:

Mr Collett: They are not to drive a motor vehicle at a speed exceeding a speed limit by 10 km/h. They can be prosecuted under the Road Traffic Act if they go past a school in excess of the speed limit. We are saying that there is a breach of conditions; there is a subtle difference. These conditions were determined by Parliament.

There is also another condition that probationary drivers must display P plates at all times. Also, they are not allowed to accumulate more than four demerit points under their conditions. Once again, drivers who are not subject to these conditions incur demerit points, also, when they breach speed limits or drink driving laws. In other words, if they commit an offence within that 10 km/h span they are still incurring demerit points and four of those takes them off

the road automatically for six months and they resume the probationary conditions again.

Ms LENEHAN: Page 125 of the papers refers to blind and incapacitated persons. I note that, in 1985-86, \$150 000 was voted and the actual payment was \$145 811, and that, in fact, \$24 000 has been proposed for 1986-87. This seems to be an incredibly low figure. Will the Minister explain the difference in the amounts?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is possibly a more accurate figure as to the use of the public transport system that the blind and incapacitated persons have. We will not really have accurate figures as to the individual ticket types that are sold or used on the STA until we have our new ticketing system which is to be introduced next year. In the meantime, a range of concessions applies to the STA, and to other transit systems. I refer to concessions such as pensioner concessions, invalid pensioner concessions, etc. All blind and incapacitated people will be carried on the STA as they always have been. This is, in a sense, an accounting figure. The original figure of \$150 000 was far in excess of what we believed the usage was.

We have had a review of this matter and assessed it as closely as we can, without being accurately able to determine it through the ticketing systems, and believe that \$24 000 is a more appropriate figure. I think that the bottom line here is that all people who are entitled to travel on the STA and other forms of transport at concession rates will continue to be provided with that travel. The previous accounting was an amount of money provided to the STA and other agencies by Treasury, which has looked at that now and which believes that in the line for blind and incapacitated persons \$24 000 is a more accurate or reasonable figure. I know that the bald statement in the budget seems to suggest that we are not providing a facility for the blind and incapacitated persons to travel on the STA. We are. There will be no reduction in that provision. This seems to be a more accurate figure and so it has been used.

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister say whether the introduction of the minimum 20c fare has had a marked impact on the patronage of State Transport Authority services?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I can deal with that question more fully when I have the STA people with me. The honourable member may wish to ask her question again then. There does not seem to be a dramatic effect. The first figures indicate there may be a slight decline.

Ms LENEHAN: I refer to page 442 of the yellow book. Under the heading '1986-87 specific targets and objectives', I note that the second point is, 'Pre-licensed motorcyclist training' and the third point from the bottom being, 'A motorcycle safety program'. I am aware of the article in the media recently highlighting this system. Can the Minister briefly elaborate on the system? Am I correct in assuming that those two points will be part of a program of trying to ensure the safety of motorcyclists, given the high fatality and accident rates of motorcycle riders? The reason I ask is that in my own area we have a high incidence of motorcycle fatalities and accidents. I recently wrote to the Minister regarding a section of South Road where a motorcyclist was killed. Three people have been killed there in a six-week period, one being a motorcyclist. Members for outer areas have constituents who ride motor bikes often because they have to get to work. I am particularly interested in the safety program.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The incidence of young motorcyclists in road accidents, particularly fatalities, is a matter of great concern to me and the Government. Action needs to be taken to provide adequate pre-licence training for new motorcyclists. We understand that motorcyclists do not have

the opportunity of motorists in having an experienced driver alongside them when on the road for the first time. One is in charge of the machine and left to one's own devices. In answer to the honourable member's question, 'yes' in the general sense, but in particular funding of \$176 000 to establish a pre-licence cycle training scheme. An amount of \$155 000 is allocated to administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries and the remaining \$21 000 to salaries. A compulsory scheme for the pre-licence training of learner motorcyclists operates in Tasmania and a compulsory skills test now operates in Victoria. The Australian Transport Advisory Council has endorsed a package of motorcycle safety measures which includes compulsory pre-licence training.

Novice motorcycle riders are significantly over-represented in road accidents. They have an accident involvement rate per kilometre travelled some four to five times that of more experienced riders and some 20 times that of car drivers. The objective of a pre-licence training scheme is to impart significant skills and defensive riding attitudes and behaviours to learner motorcyclists prior to licence issue. Potential accident savings in this group by introduction of the scheme are claimed to represent a 40-50 per cent reduction. The State Government established a committee to advise whether a similar scheme should be introduced in South Australia and the committee recommended in favour. The scheme will rely mainly on part-time paid instructors and the selection, training and retention of these will be a major task. As indicated, funds of \$176 000 have been allocated to support this program in 1986-87. The program is ready to be submitted to Cabinet within the next couple of weeks. We are moving with all speed to introduce this system.

Ms LENEHAN: Has any thought been given or investigation made into a similar system to the probationary system for motor-cyclists where, for the first 12 months, they can only ride bikes up to a certain power? That has been talked about but has there been any research done?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That system does apply in South Australia now. The Registrar could give the Committee some clear indication of how the system works.

Mr Collett: The new motorcyclist is required to take out a licence which allows him only to ride a motorcycle with an engine capacity of 250cc or below. He is still subject to the normal probationary conditions which apply to any other driver.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: One of the problems at which we are looking is that there are some high powered 250cc motorcycles on the road now and we need to take account of that. Some of the supercharged 250cc cycles are very powerful machines.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has any thought been given to increasing the age for obtaining a driver's licence from 16 years to 18 years and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is no consideration of changing the age from 16 to 18 years. I suggest the honourable member is quoting a response I gave to a question in the House recently when I said that the age for obtaining a driver's licence in New South Wales I understood to be 18 years. I correct that—I believe it is 17 years in New South Wales. The Division of Road Safety has for some months been looking at recommending through me to Government a graduated licence system to include a change in the age that a new driver is able to obtain a driver's licence.

There are a number of ways that this could be achieved. We could have a system where one can obtain a licence at 16, but that licence would be surrounded with such conditions until one is 17 years to make it less attractive. There

could be a longer period for both an L plate and the requirement to have an experienced driver present. We could have curfews on the hours one is able to drive, restrictions on the number of people one is able to take in the vehicle and a strong graduated system to last for over 12 months or until one is 17 years. That would make obtaining a licence at 16 less attractive to 16-year-olds. The other option is to have the earliest licence application age set at 17 years as in some other States, although not all. We could also apply a graduated licence scheme.

The Division of Road Safety is currently working on such proposals. The Government does not have a policy on it as yet as I have not put one to Cabinet. I hope to be able to do that some time later this year. The division will be required to get some public input or response to such a scheme. We have not determined the best way of doing that as yet. We are concerned about the incidence of young drivers in accident numbers and I will be taking to Cabinet as soon as possible recommendations that may be able to address the accident rate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: By way of a supplementary question, will the Minister provide details of what happens in other States? I am interested to know the relevant ages.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will obtain a comparison with the other States of the age at which one can obtain a driver's licence and the conditions that apply to such.

Mr INGERSON: When will the Minister announce the road safety strategic plan referred to on page 442 of the yellow book?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Director of Road Safety to answer the question as he has been working on the plan.

Mr Lees: A strategic plan has not been prepared yet and so the Minister cannot table one. I am very hopeful that the work we are doing will lead to the presentation early next year to the Minister of a strategic plan in relation to this very important area.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I expect that it will be a public document. Because the issue is so critical to the community at large, I think it would be a valuable document to make available.

Mr INGERSON: The type of white paper documents which one would expect this document to be have been tabled and discussed in Parliament. Is that the intention of the Minister or will this purely and simply be made available as a public document?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I had not thought of that, but that is a fairly reasonable proposal. I would need to speak to the Leader of the House and my ministerial colleagues to see whether or not when the strategic plan has been completed a number of hours should be put aside for debate in Parliament on road safety issues. That suggestion has value and I will certainly consider the matter. As the honourable member would understand, I cannot give him an undertaking now, but I will follow up his good suggestion.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the road safety campaign and the Grand Prix. In March, the Government announced it would run a road safety campaign, to head off criticism of the involvement of a brewing company with driving. That campaign was going to involve some of the Grand Prix drivers. When will a campaign begin, what form will it take, how much will it cost, and how long will it run? Concern has been expressed at the university research statistics, which show that the accident rate during the build-up to the Grand Prix last year increased. Will this proposed campaign attempt to prevent a similar increase?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask Mr Lees to respond to the initial part of the question. In relation to the latter part of the question, the Government is concerned about the results of the university study, which investigated the rise in the number of fatalities during the period of the Grand Prix held last year. One example is not enough to be able to determine just exactly whether the Grand Prix itself affected the driving behaviour of young drivers. However, it is not unreasonable to believe that it did. I think the Committee ought to understand that in May, June and July of last year—prior to the Grand Prix—the lowest accident rate ever was recorded in South Australia. So, three months before the Grand Prix we had the lowest accident rate ever recorded. We then had a very high accident rate during the Grand Prix season. It is very difficult to determine the causes for either the low accident rate or the high accident rate.

However, it is not unreasonable to believe that the high accident rate had some relationship to the Grand Prix. The Government is aware of that and, accordingly, the Government has tried to get Grand Prix participants to make some statements in relation to road safety, as young people, due to the status of the participants, might be prepared to accept what they have to say. Information from one year is insufficient to determine whether the Grand Prix was directly responsible for that rapid increase in fatalities during the Grand Prix season last year. I am not saying that it was not, but we do not have enough information to say that it was. It will require study for one or two years to be more certain of that. In relation to the questions about what we are going to do, how much will it cost and who is paying for it, I ask Mr Lees to respond.

Mr Lees: Around the time of the Grand Prix we will repeat the sorts of studies that were done last year. This will determine whether the Grand Prix was responsible for the increase in the accident rate or whether it was a one-off random effect. Obviously, we hope that it was a random, one-off effect. In regard to publicity, we shall move in three principal areas. We have had extensive discussions with the Grand Prix Board. I understand that four Grand Prix drivers have agreed to participate in a publicity program. I am afraid that I cannot remember the names of the four drivers. They are a fairly itinerant group of people and it is a bit difficult to catch up with them. However, I understand that in the week before the Grand Prix they have agreed to make various recordings, which will be used on radio and possibly on television.

In addition to that, one of the local radio stations has agreed to provide quite a bit of free air time, so that we will not actually pay for broadcasting. Further, we intend to bring forward the traditional drink-driving campaign that we run just before Christmas to commence immediately after the Grand Prix. So, we will have the Grand Prix drivers helping. I do not know what the cost of that will be; it will be subject to an arrangement between the Grand Prix drivers and the Grand Prix Board. As I have said, we will have the help of a radio station. That provision will be worth some thousands of dollars, because they will give us free air time. The drink-driving campaign will cost us some \$80 000 to \$100 000, which cost will come out of the divisional budget.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to the red light camera proposals that were made last year and confirmed during the examination of last year's estimates. Earlier, in response to a question asked about problems arising from the introduction of red light cameras, the Deputy Premier indicated that the Minister of Transport could provide details about what the problems are and when the legislation concerning this

matter is likely to be introduced. Further, does one of the problems relate to onus of proof?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Legislation should be put before the House in about mid October. It will address the matter of owner onus, as applies in Victoria. The advice that I have received is that, unless there is owner onus in legislation, the red light camera system is ineffective. So, there is Cabinet approval for that, and it will be part of the Bill. Discussions in relation to the actual implementation of the red light camera system are continuing between officers of my department and Treasury. Certainly, they will be introduced in this financial year. It is intended to place red light cameras at the more dangerous intersections and to have them in operation for a while before penalties are applied for breaches of the law. Thus, people can become accustomed to them. We want to overcome as far as possible the problems that have been alluded to now and then by the member for Henley Beach, who has drawn to the Government's attention the increased incidence of rear end collisions—resulting from the existence of red light cameras. No one disputes that, inevitably, there would be an increase in rear end collisions, but it is considered that the Victorian experience and the benefits of advertising that we shall undertake should decrease the incidence of rear end collisions.

They are less likely to cause damage and, particularly, injury than some of the right angle crashes at intersections, which are quite disastrous. So, the legislation should be before the Parliament in October. We should be installing the red light cameras in this financial year. The resources have been made available under the police budget for the Police Department to be able to participate in that scheme. I will get a more complete report for the honourable member, but it is my understanding that it will be some weeks or months after the installation before they start imposing penalties for breaches. I think I am right in saying that, but I will confirm that for the honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: I have a supplementary question. How many installations are we talking about?

Mr Lees: At the present time we are thinking of selecting 15 of the worst intersections and purchasing five cameras which can be rotated among those 15 worst intersections.

Mr TYLER: I am especially pleased to hear the answer Mr Lees gave to the member for Bragg about people involved in the Grand Prix being associated with a road safety campaign this year. Members of the Committee might recall that I raised this question a few weeks ago with the Minister of Transport. I am also pleased that we are devoting some time in these Estimates Committees to the question of road safety. I would like to join the Opposition in a bipartisan approach to road safety.

We must tackle the area of road safety in a bipartisan manner if we are going to make any real impact on the horrible statistics which are before us. The Minister will remember that I have had an interest in the area of road safety for some considerable time. It is not just an academic interest: it is a very practical interest, because I have experienced first hand the trauma and anxiety that road accidents can cause families.

Also, the Committee might recall that I made some comments on the educational approach to road safety a few weeks back. It is my belief that the campaign ought to start in schools; it should be a compulsory subject in the curriculum, because one thing we can learn from the statistics on road accidents is that when people become more experienced behind a wheel or on a bike fewer accidents occur.

I would like to ask the Minister or his officer whether there has been any research done into the effect of the

promotional campaigns, especially the 'Mr Hyde' series of ads which were applauded in advertising circles a few years ago. I have had some concern expressed to me about those 'Mr Hyde' ads. People tell me that they do not identify with a monster image; that they do not associate 'Mr Hyde' with themselves. The member for Briggs mentioned to me earlier today that he had seen a very effective campaign in New South Wales which actually has 'nice guys' turning into the monsters, but it is not done in a monster setting; it was very subtle I was wondering whether there has been any research into the effectiveness of these promotional campaigns.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, we try to evaluate all the campaigns in which we are involved. Not to do so would be foolish and would encourage the Government to sometimes send good money after bad. The promotion to which the honourable member refers, the 'Mr Hyde' promotion, has been evaluated, and I would like Mr Lees to give a more definitive response to this.

As I understand it, the effect of 'Mr Hyde' was greater when it was initially run than it is, perhaps, now. SGIC assisted in the funding of that campaign. I am not too sure whether we will continue it. It is certainly a campaign which we have available to us and which we can introduce at short notice. It will always be a very useful agent for us, or a useful video, but I would ask Mr Lees to respond directly to the question.

Mr Lees: We do attempt to evaluate all the programs we are able to initiate, whether they be publicity programs or any other sort. It is extremely difficult because, unfortunately, the effect of one rolls over into the other. For example, in the past year we have had legislative change; we have had publicity programs; we have started to do on-the-road programs; and it is incredibly difficult to separate exactly what is the effect of one and what is the effect of the other.

We tried very hard to evaluate the worth of the 'Mr Hyde' campaign, and it was to some degree not very conclusive one way or the other. Certainly, there was a very high recall amongst people who saw it. They remembered the message. Whether that recall was translated into changed—and changed for the better—behaviour, we were not able to demonstrate. We believe that some of the later 'Mr Hyde' commercials were not as effective as some of the earlier ones. Whether that is to do with the novelty effect, again, we just do not know. I think it is unlikely that we shall use it this year, but it may be used again in future years.

Mr INGERSON: At page 438 of the yellow book, there is reference to an overrun of \$25 000 last year. Can the Minister explain the overrun?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that is a good question. It is one which has created considerable interest with the Minister himself at the moment, and I will get a response to it.

Mr INGERSON: Particularly in light of the fact that there appears to be a cutback in personnel as well.

The CHAIRPERSON: I take it that the Minister will take that question on notice and provide the Committee with a reply?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the third party fund and any future legislation. As the Minister will be aware, the problem was signalled by the SGIC some 18 months ago. When can we expect legislation to attempt to clear up this problem?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The difficulty with legislation is that only part of it is under my jurisdiction. It is almost

ready to go to Cabinet. The important measures which the SGIC would like to be amended concerning pain and suffering are included in the Wrongs Act, which is with the Attorney-General. Matters are progressing quickly. We have worked on it since receiving the SGIC report. It has taken longer than expected, and longer than the SGIC hoped, but we must ensure that the legislation is sustainable. We are aware of the critical issues that the member for Bragg raised in his introductory remarks about the increase in the deficit in the CTP fund. We intend to act as quickly as we can to allow the fund to remain viable by taking out of the legislation the components which impact on it so adversely. I cannot give a definite date when legislation will be presented, but it is not far from being introduced.

Mr INGERSON: How much, if any, money has been allocated for fringe benefit tax as it relates to the department, the Highways Department and the STA?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I shall check, but it is difficult to assess exactly what costs we will have to meet in terms of FBT. We have to be advised by Treasury. The criteria to be used are still a matter of discussion. It will be \$12 000 for the Department of Transport in the first nine months but I do not have the figures for Highways or the STA at present. The figure is more of an estimate than definitive at this stage.

Mr RANN: It is probably well known that the member for Hayward (Mrs June Appleby) takes a keen interest in road safety. She has publicised the road safety centre at Oaklands Park which is managed by Peter Johns. It is doing a great deal with youth driver education. Can the Minister assure us of ongoing support for the centre?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Oaklands Park road safety centre has provided real benefits to South Australia, but that does not mean that it should not be audited. It was one of the first projects undertaken by the Road Safety Division. It was based on a recognition that the scarce resources available for road safety education could be utilised in a more cost-effective manner.

The division engaged the Management Improvement Division of the Public Service Board as principal consultants, and several sub-consultants with specialist expertise in road safety education. The consultants reported in December 1985. The principal directions generated from this review can be summarised as:

1. A withdrawal from many existing educational activities undertaken from the centre;
2. A re-orientation towards, and major upgrading of, assistance provided to other agencies, principally schools and the local community;
3. A more productive use of human and physical resources;
4. A re-orientation from the provision of physical resources and direct instruction to a facilitating, promoting and coordinating role.

Changes that have so far been made include:

- Some types of driver training have been dropped or significantly reduced.
- Moves towards greater cost recovery have been initiated.
- More emphasis is being placed on training trainers rather than drivers.
- The Director-General of Education has agreed to the Student Driver Education Scheme being moved from the centre to schools.
- Discussions are in hand with marion council regarding council taking over management of the cyclist training area.

- Staff members are being used to review and rewrite resource material for the Education Department.
- Oaklands Park will be the centre for the bassinette hire scheme, initially administered by centre staff.
- In principle approval has been given to start programs for pre-licence training of motorcyclists. As these start, other courses will be dropped.

Consideration is also being given to making better use of the whole site. The skid pan is no longer used and costly plans to refurbish it have been dropped. Likely needs for a motor registration centre (to replace Marion) and a second vehicle inspection station are being considered. It seems likely that, at an appropriate time, it may be possible to relinquish some of the land at the centre.

We are trying to make the road safety centre more effective and relevant. Although its role will not change in general terms, some specific tasks will change in line with the information I have given.

Mr INGERSON: Page 444 of the yellow book states:

Prepare in conjunction with the Highways Department and State Transport Authority a major new data base.

When will it be completed? Why is it necessary—as opposed to updating the old one? How much will it cost?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I shall ask Dr Scrafton to reply.

Dr Scrafton: It is an updating of the existing system. In the mid 1960s we had the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study, which was the first big data base. We updated it in 1976. It is a 10 year review rather like the census, although that is now down to five year subreviews. To some extent, we do the same. The review is the biggest activity of the transport planning division this year. The reviews have cost \$500 000 previously, but we felt that to undertake another similar review this year would cost perhaps more than \$1 million, which the agencies simply do not have and could not justify. We have therefore put together a joint program of all three agencies, assisted by the Bureau of Statistics, which has given enormous staff resources and is managing the data collection program for us. Collection will take place in this financial year and we expect the analysis to be undertaken towards the end of this financial year or at the beginning of the next financial year, the data being in place for use by the middle of the next financial year.

It is a big job for South Australia. It involves about 9 000 households. The cost this year is about \$250 000. We will need more money for analysis in the future. That is one reason why we are not hurrying into analysis. Although a lot of the data will soon be available, we cannot afford the analysis. We must strike a balance between the need for data and the effects of economic stringency which, like other departments, we face.

Mr INGERSON: At page 444, it also states that one of the targets or objectives is to implement the fast track package of the National Road Freight Inquiry. Is that fast track a misnomer, because in 18 months we have had the introduction of only one Bill dealing with this matter. When does the Minister expect the rest of the fast track package to come before Parliament?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that the only legislation that remains to be introduced is the graduated licence scheme for truck drivers and that must be passed in order that the scheme can begin operating as at 1 January 1987, so we do have some constraints on us. Once we have completed the requirements under the fast track agreement that was entered into by the Commonwealth Government and States, we can begin to act.

Dr Scrafton: The expression 'fast track package' is, as the honourable member said, something of a misnomer, but it has to be taken in the total context of the recommendations

of the May report which was made to the Federal Government and which sought reform in the area of the trucking industry. In effect, the so-called fast track package is really the first set of recommendations dealing with speed limits and graduated licences. As an indication of how bureaucratically difficult it has proved to implement the package, about eight months ago a committee was set up which was charged with looking at the second set of recommendations (that is, the things to follow the fast track package) and it spent all its time implementing the fast track package, so I think that it will take a good deal longer than the Federal Minister would have wished at the time that he made his commitments to the Federal Government. What has happened recognises the reality of a large number of different State licensing and regulatory structures.

Mr INGERSON: When will the strategic transport plan be completed?

Dr Scrafton: That is also a fairly long-term job. It follows the strategic paper which we released last year and the Cabinet Committee on Resources and Physical Development earlier this year directed the Minister to prepare such a strategic plan. We are in the process of putting together a small team which will consist of officers of the department, together with Highways Department and State Transport Authority officers, to set that program in motion, but we would not envisage actual formal documentation (that is, a formal strategic plan in a report form) being completed before early 1988. It will be based on the principles that are enunciated in the strategic report which I gave to the Minister in December 1985, but it will take advantage of the improved data that is available in all three agencies to try to quantify that and to update it.

Mr TYLER: Under the capital receipts at page 216 reference is made to \$305 000 being spent on upgrading the Victor Harbor railway. Will the Minister supply details of progress on this project?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is progressing very well. Shortly, I hope to be able to sit down with the Australian Railway Historical Society and sign the appropriate documents. Of course, when we are able to do that, an announcement will be made. The \$305 000 to which the honourable member referred is a completion of the funds that have been made available under the Commonwealth Employment Program and by the State Government to bring that railway line up to scratch. It includes resleepering from Strathalbyn to Victor Harbor to bring the track up to a safe standard for a maximum speed of 80 km/h; clearing drains; repairing and repainting the station and other buildings; the provision of a new depot and turning triangle at Goolwa; and reballasting and retamping the track.

It is a \$2 million project which has been funded by a CEP grant and a State contribution of \$775 000, of which \$305 000 has been expended this year. That will be the all-up figure. The project is expected to be completed by 11 November 1986, although the rail services will start when the agreement is signed. There will be no underwriting of the losses in the 1986-87 year, but the underwriting will commence in 1987-88 and for the first three years of the operation the Government has undertaken to underwrite the losses up to \$100 000. That means that if after the third year the Railway Historical Society, or whoever is operating the steam train, still calls upon the Government to underwrite losses, we will have to reconsider it at that time. It is not an indefinite guarantee to underwrite losses forever; it is a three year undertaking and, if at the end of that three years it is shown to be a financially unviable operation, then the Government will be required to consider the future role of the Victor Harbor line.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Does the Minister have any details associated with the workers compensation claims made by those employed on that line? It has been alleged that a significant percentage of those employed (to date, something like 24 per cent) have at one time or another throughout the project been off work on workers compensation. It is bloody outrageous, but I would appreciate having the details.

The CHAIRPERSON: Order!

Dr Richards: The figure quoted by the member for Alexandra is about the right proportion of the number who have been employed who have, for some period of the time, received some workers compensation. This is believed to be somewhat normal for CEP projects and, for that reason, the CEP arranges the workers compensation cover. As I understand it, at the moment the SGIC, which is the insurer, has about \$59 000 worth of outstanding claims.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On that project?

Dr Richards: Yes. According to CEP standards, that sum on a \$2 million project is considered to be quite low, and it is acceptable.

Membership:

The Hon. T.M. McRae substituted for Ms Lenehan.

Mr INGERSON: What is the cost of administering the Motor Registration Division; will the on-line computer system reduce this cost; and, as another supplementary question, is it true that only two-thirds of the building is being utilised, and why?

Mr Collett: It is true that the Motor Registration Centre in Wakefield Street is not fully occupied. However, the Department of Housing and Construction has plans in hand now to establish the Motor Registration Division on the first and ground floors. The second floor will be occupied by the Road Safety Division and there will be a floor available for other departments, or perhaps the Department of Transport from the 12th floor of the State Administration Centre, to occupy the building. The matter is well in hand.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I call on Mr Braddock to comment on the progress of the online computing system.

Mr Braddock: The online computing system is intended to be phased in during the fourth quarter of 1987. That covers the registration aspect to do with motor registration business. There is a further stage which will implement the licence portions. The registration aspects were chosen to come forward because they represent the most significant savings to Government, particularly in terms of staff reductions.

It may be of interest to note that the 1981 report, which originally supported the concept of the online computer, was based around staff savings of 114 people over a then establishment of 444 people; in other words, it was proposing to reduce the Motor Registration Division to 330 people. Our current proposal suggests that we will reduce the staff to 275 people, which represents a saving of the order of 160 people. Some of those savings have already been made.

We are currently down to 362 people as a result of decentralising a lot of work to the officers prior to automation. We believe that by mid 1988 we will be down to the 275 level, which will represent significant savings, not only in salaries but also in terms of reducing the amount of floor space that we require; we will actually condense our requirement to two floors of the Motor Registration Centre.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member asked what is the cost of running the Motor Registration Division. If he looks at the lines they do not show total costs because

not all Motor Vehicle Registration salaries are included in that line. Excluded are sections included in other programs, namely, the towtruck inspectorate, licence review, licence examiners, collection for other Government agencies, etc. I can give the honourable member a total cost, which is \$12.816 million to run the Motor Registration Division receipts from which for 1986-87 will be \$90 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister say how important is the information that people who own cars now have to write on the bottom of their registration disc as a result of changes made, and has he received complaints about the new system? On receipt of a new registration disc the other day I placed it on my car. A couple of days later, I used a very efficient window cleaner to clean the inside of the car and completely wiped off all the information I had written on the disc with a pen. I cannot now get to the registration disc to replace the information required to be shown on the disc, and I have since heard that other people have had a similar experience. I am currently driving a vehicle that does not have the information required written on the registration disc. Either the information is necessary or it is not and there is obviously a problem with material being wiped off in certain circumstances.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have received some complaints, but not all that many. I expect that most members of Parliament would have had one or two. I have not had any at my electorate office; that does not mean that queries have not arisen. I point out that this is not an unusual system; it has large economies built into it. This system has been introduced by Queensland, New South Wales and the Northern Territory, and Victoria is about to introduce the system, so it is not an unusual change in the registration disc.

Complaints have been largely that it would be easy to change a registration disc from one vehicle to another, or from a motorcycle or caravan to another motorcycle or caravan. There have been very few reported attempts of that happening. If anybody was to try to do that they would destroy the disc and would be unable to transfer it. Having said that, I am interested in the problem that the honourable member draws to my attention because that particular difficulty with the registration label has not been mentioned to me before. I will ask the Registrar whether he has considered a similar problem and whether he wishes to respond about that occurrence.

Mr Collett: I have not received any complaints about the ease with which the labels come off windscreens.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is not the labels but the ink from certain pens used to write on the label.

Mr Collett: I have had no complaints about that. A lot of people are not worrying about it; they are not doing it. It is a voluntary action by the member, or others who put that information on. Some I know have typed the information on, as we used to.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Are you suggesting it is not terribly important?

Mr Collett: The important thing about the label is that there is a serial number on it that refers back to the registration paper. They are both recorded and there is a separate file on the computer on the registration label. That is the key to the whole thing. The important document in all of this is the certificate of registration and not the label itself, because the certificate determines whether a vehicle is registered and insured.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I should point out that we discussed this matter with the Police Department, which is aware of what we are doing and which is quite happy that

it has access to the information that it requires in terms of identifying vehicles, etc.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I suggest that a lot of people were under the same impression as I was, that it was compulsory that this writing should be there.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No, the registration disc as received from the Registrar is perfectly legal and appropriate and all that is needed to be shown on the vehicle.

Mr INGERSON: My further question relates to the online computer. I am seeking information about how it will be implemented. Have we purchased any interstate programs or are we writing our own? If so, why is that so when there appears to be similar programs available interstate?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Mr Braddock, in charge of the program, will respond.

Mr Braddock: The short answer is that we are developing our own set of programs. We did extensively visit interstate equivalents to the Motor Registration Centre here and quite clearly at the time of the visits these interstate institutions were in a similar stage of indecision as were we. The systems they currently had in place were not only due for replacement but were actively being replaced. Only Tasmania had relatively recently introduced a system and therefore had a life expectancy that we would expect out of the software once we got it up and running. The Tasmanian system was introduced on a much smaller scale than the South Australian driver base would demand. The equipment itself was much smaller and was clearly not adaptable in terms of taking it off the smaller environment and bringing it up to a much larger environment that the South Australian driver base needs to support it.

Mr TYLER: I refer to program 1, page 125. Provision has been made in the 1986-87 budget for \$512 000 to be spent on taxi services for the disabled. Will the Minister say when the scheme will come into operation and how it will operate?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask Mr John Hutchinson to respond because he has been involved in the preparation of the scheme.

Mr Hutchinson: The intention is that the scheme shall commence operation early in the new year, depending on delivery of specially modified vehicles to accommodate people in wheelchairs. These vehicles have been ordered and will probably be received in Adelaide this month. It is expected that six vehicles will be available for the commencement of operation. In answer to the second part of the question as to how it will operate, in essence the proposal as it now stands, although subject to refinement and acceptance by the Government, is that people who qualify for a subsidy by criteria set close to the criteria in use in New South Wales will be offered the opportunity to ride by taxi and have it subsidised by about 50 per cent of the cost. It is likely that the number of rides in the introductory period will be limited. It will not be an open option—the number of rides per month, for example, will be limited. People will be assigned to vehicles according to their needs. It could be expected that 85 to 90 per cent of disabled people in the community will use ordinary taxis and the remainder will be assigned to special purpose vehicles.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to page 436 of the yellow book which shows a provision for subsidy to local government in regard to buses. Can the Minister advise which local governments will get the new buses?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have two systems—one where we provide assistance for the purchase of community buses and another system where we subsidise the operations of bus services in Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Murray Bridge. We subsidise two-third

operating losses of country town bus services in those towns.

The Whyalla council owns its vehicles and employs drivers and a manager. In other centres contracts are arranged with local bus proprietors. In Mount Gambier a city bus service is operated by McCormick bus service, which I understand is soon to merge with two other operators, Reid and Johnson. The Murray Bridge service is operated by Riverside bus services. The Port Pirie service is operated by the Port Pirie bus service, a private operation. The Port Augusta service is operated by the Port Augusta bus service, and the Port Lincoln service is operated by the Port Lincoln bus service.

The proposed 1986-87 payments for country town bus services are as follows: Whyalla, \$287 000; Port Augusta, \$61 000; Port Pirie, \$47 000; Mount Gambier, \$30 000; Port Lincoln, \$23 000; and Murray Bridge, \$11 000. The community bus scheme was introduced nine years ago to provide a means of mobility for people who have no reasonable alternative means of transport. The grant covers the purchase price of the buses plus the first six months registration and compulsory third party insurance. Councils are given the option of buying a bus or hiring one, using the equivalent grant money paid in three annual instalments.

The payments for 1985-86 under the community bus scheme were as follows: the District Council of Stirling, \$8 400; the Corporation of Burnside, \$24 949; the City of Elizabeth, \$24 600; the District Council of Riverton, \$21 905; and the District Council of Tumby Bay, \$20 146. This year there will not be any allocation to city community bus schemes but the following country councils will receive assistance: District Council of Tumby Bay, \$4 774; District Council of Kingscote, \$25 500; and District Council of Murat Bay, \$69 726.

An amount of \$100 000 was spent last year and \$100 000 is to be spent this year. There has not been an increase in the allocation. There has been a real reduction in moneys available for these community bus services, but that is an indication of the stringencies of the economic times.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to a statement on page 444 regarding evaluation of residential street management techniques for enhancing residential street environment, safety, utilisation and design. Will the Minister advise what is happening in this area?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask Mr Hutchinson to report on the plan.

Mr Hutchinson: Over the past few years the department has, in direct response to Government policy, been pursuing ways in which it could assist local government to develop residential street management programs. A series of seminars and documents have been prepared outlining strategies dealing with problems. They have most recently been consolidated into a manual to be distributed. It is being printed at the moment. It has been developed closely in cooperation with local government, with a high level of input from local government, the Highways Department, the Road Traffic Board (as it was) and the Road Safety Division (as it is). Essentially, together with a few projects, one of which is under way in Unley or will commence within a couple of weeks and another is under way in Enfield, that will bring our contribution in this area to its close except for the evaluation of those demonstration projects. We expect, on the Minister's acceptance of our advice, that that will wind up the program at least in the foreseeable future.

Mr TYLER: What are the anticipated savings to be made as a result of the introduction of five-yearly driving licences?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Five-yearly driver licences were introduced as from 4 May 1986 and, at the same time, eliminated one-yearly licences issued to new drivers with

probationary conditions on them. Under the latter arrangements, a five-yearly driver licence is issued to a new driver with the first 12 months being subject to probationary conditions. As at 30 June 1986, there were 27 000 licensees subject to probationary conditions.

About 800 000 licences will eventually be issued on a five-yearly basis. This means that, eventually, 100 000 less transactions with the Motor Registration Division will be made by drivers. This figure is calculated by dividing 800 000 transactions by three—which is 266 000 per annum, and dividing 800 000 by five—which is 160 000 per annum, which results in 100 000 transactions per annum less. The anticipated savings are mainly in postage, computer time and stationery, and will be of the order of \$100 000 a year. In addition, a staff saving has yet to be determined. Of course, the savings will not be effective until after May 1989.

Mr INGERSON: My last question, and one of the more interesting questions today, relates to the transport policy and strategic planning document. It concerns the organisational future in South Australia of the department. I shall make a few quotes and then ask the Minister to explain the Government's current position. The first and most important aspect of successful strategic planning for transport is that the State Government must be—and must be clearly seen to be—in control. The implementation and development of a sound and rational transport policy depends on the Government's ability to deploy the total resources available in the transport portfolio in a flexible manner and to make changes with a minimum of delay. There is also a need to break down the present system, whereby each agency, department and division of the transport portfolio guards its responsibilities and rightful share of the funds, while at the same time resists changes which challenge the conventional and traditional practices.

The long-term aim should be for one transport fund tied to one portfolio corporate plan, supported by staff of suitable quality. An organisational strategy must be formulated and adhered to, if it is ever to be achieved. To implement a truly integrated portfolio would require a merger of several organisations into one composite body. That would certainly be a major task—a task that has been shied away from since first mooted in 1970. The aim of all this would be to create a unified chain of command, whereby Government policy could be implemented more effectively, with direction from the top when necessary. Does the Minister support this sort of action and does he intend to proceed down this line?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not say that anybody would argue with the desirability of having a very effective and efficient transport portfolio, in which all the departments or divisions are able to coordinate their activities in the best interests of the community. I must say that I have been agreeably surprised at the degree of cooperation that exists in relation to the three major areas of the transport portfolio, namely, the Department of Transport, the Highways Department and the State Transport Authority. I do not think that any of us would suggest that that degree of cooperation has always existed. However, I can speak only as I find: when I assumed responsibility for the transport portfolio, I found that there was certainly a willingness by management in those three areas to work very closely together. I am pleased that that is happening and I can see that that coordination of effort will continue. That will certainly be beneficial in terms of resources and of response to Government policy.

So, all I can say is that the sentiments expressed in the strategic plan are being put into effect, even if in a *de facto*

way because we have not necessarily put in place any administrative structure to arrive at that end result. But, at the moment discussions are being held between the three major agencies—Department of Transport, STA and the Highways Department—to achieve that better cooperation and coordination and to enable the Minister to receive the quickest possible coordinated advice from departments with, in turn, Government policy reflected very quickly by the agencies through that short line of command. I guess that the answer to the question is, yes. I am not too sure just what sort of administrative changes we would need to undertake. Sometimes, if an objective is being achieved one does not have to make dramatic changes. However, if I thought that there was a lack of coordination or that the effectiveness of the transport portfolio was being reduced due to the inability of the personnel within the departments to work together, I would certainly take whatever action was necessary. However, the necessary coordination is being achieved, in any event.

Mr INGERSON: One of the major thrusts of the strategic planning document concerned the setting up of one fund. Is that part of the broad agreement that has been made? As the Minister would be aware, at the moment funds are specifically allocated to several areas. If a system is introduced in principle in line with the recommendation referred to there would not be that sort of system in the future.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: As a result of recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, in addition to general Government thinking, anyway, the Government has been looking at rewriting the Highways Act, and I think we are almost at the stage of being able to present a draft Bill to the Parliamentary Counsel. We are certainly looking at the STA with the same aim in mind, that is, to have a one-fund situation. I must say that I feel that the department is working very effectively at the moment in general. However, that does not mean that one cannot make improvements. Where improvements are proven to be necessary, they will be effected. So, at the moment we are looking at both the STA and the Highways Department, one of the reasons for which is the strategic plan policies to which the honourable member has referred.

The CHAIRPERSON: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—Department of Transport,
\$3 333 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—State Transport Authority,
\$44 600 000

Chairperson:
Ms D.L. Gayler

Members:
The Hon. Ted Chapman
Mr G.A. Ingerson
The Hon. T.M. McRae
Mr M.D. Rann
Mr P.B. Tyler
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:
The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Minister of Transport.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Rump, Chairman, State Transport Authority.
Dr D. Scrafton, Director-General of Transport.
Mr J. Brown, General Manager.
Mr K. Bengler, Financial Planning Manager.
Mr G. McLaughlin, Budget Accountant.
Mr K. Crettenden, Budget Officer.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Rann): I declare the vote open for examination. I draw the attention of members to the fact that they are able to ask questions on the Minister of Transport's line 'Miscellaneous' in so far as that relates to the STA line.

Mr INGERSON: One of the major areas of concern was the STA deficit. The Premier's budget papers said specifically that large deficits in public enterprises must be reduced, and he carried a very strong recommendation to the STA. Further on he made the comment that there was a need to review the STA carefully, its services and cost structures, particularly poorly patronised and costly services, and the need to look at ways of increasing efficiency.

Those comments were made by the Premier this year in the budget papers. In the document headed 'Transport Policy and Strategic Planning', there was in several areas very strong comment on the STA deficit. One of the comments was that the size of the STA deficit and its growth in real terms is the most important strategic issue facing the State Government. There are several other comments, one being that if present policies for the operation of the STA's public transport system are continued without the introduction of measures designed to achieve increased cost recovery and reduced operating costs, it is estimated that expenditure net of revenue received totalling \$1 000 million will be required in the period 1986-87 to 1995-96, comprising an \$860 million operating deficit and \$242 million capital expenditure.

Further on that same document says that, despite the accomplishments of recent years, South Australia still has a transport system which is wasteful in its use of energy, costly to the public purse, uneven in the level of service it offers and which is still based on outdated modal separation of what should be an integrated system. As well as that, I note in the Auditor-General's Report for the year 1982-83 that the operating deficit then was \$77.8 million, made up of the Government injection of \$64.8 million and concessions of \$13 million.

In 1985-86 the Government injection was \$101.2 million, of which the Government placed in \$81.4 million and the concessions represent \$19.8 million. This is an increase of \$23.3 million or 30 per cent over that period of time. We also note from the Auditor-General's Report that the operating shortage has increased significantly from 1982-83 when it was \$75 million to 1985-86 when it was \$99.4 million. Also, in 1985-86 borrowings have very significantly increased by some \$36.7 million. During the early part of this year the Minister promised to review all STA activities and costs. When will that review commence? Who will carry it out? When will we get the report so that action can begin to take place?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I would like to respond to some of the preliminary remarks of the honourable member in framing his question but, to respond directly to his question, there are two studies currently being done within the STA, but they are both related to industrial matters. One is in relation to the rostering system, which has quite a considerable potential for savings; certainly savings industrially, but savings in the cost of running the STA. The second is the industrial relations performance of the STA.

Those two areas are in response to the general motion that was passed at an ALP convention in June last year. Prior to that convention we had already started to do the preliminary work to prepare for an investigation into the STA which would include the size of the subsidy, management structure, levels of service, etc., and public participation in service decisions. Unfortunately, I am not able to announce the inquiry and who will be involved, but I hope to be able to do so shortly.

I am unable to give the honourable member either the time or the personnel involved, except to repeat the commitment of the Government to have this general inquiry. The statistics the honourable member used to frame his question are, I expect, all correct. I do not have total recall but I have no reason to argue with the statements made by the Premier or by the Auditor-General in terms of the public transport system in South Australia.

It ought to be understood that the STA itself has done a remarkably good job in containing the rate of increase of its operating costs. I do not think that is always fully understood in South Australia. The STA is a bit of a whipping boy for anyone who wants to point to the Government and say that such and such department is running a massive subsidy, but it is a public utility, much the same as education, health and a whole lot of services are public utilities.

I think it would be advisable sometimes for the community to look at the STA in that light. Having said that, the increase in expenditure for the 1986-87 financial year is in the order of \$2.5 million or 1.6 per cent, which reflects most favourably against an anticipated inflation rate of 7 to 8 per cent. However, I would like to point out that the authority will operate within a budget in which its operating costs have decreased by 0.6 per cent against an increase in ownership costs of the order of 24.4 per cent.

These ownership costs are those over which the authority has little or no control. The authority has been and will continue exploring ways of reducing its costs. On the expenditure side, operating expenses will have increased over the years 1982-83 to 1985-86 by only 2 per cent per annum in real terms, during the period when, *inter alia*, services have had to be expanded into outer suburbs where they are more expensive to provide; the 19-day four-weekly period for bus operators has been introduced, requiring the engaging of 75 more staff.

On the other hand, the growth in ownership expenses is much more significant—43 per cent in real terms during the same period. These will have an even greater influence with time, because of the infrastructure development which has been taking place in recent years. The deficit is the difference between two elements: income and expenditure. The principal avenue open to the STA to increase income is by increases in fares, which is subject to much criticism.

Income from fares would need to be increased by about five times the rate of inflation if the STA subsidy were to be held at the present level solely by fare increases, and such increases are unacceptable. Only by a drastic reduction in the level of services can a significant impact be made on operating costs, and hence on the deficit. The Government is at present addressing this whole problem of the level of subsidy required for the STA.

The STA, on its own initiative, has introduced considerable savings over the past two years. The Government has required it to find an additional 1 per cent savings and then another 1 per cent savings on top of that.

There is no doubt that an inquiry into levels of service and duplication of services, etc., could recommend further economies, but the STA has performed remarkably well within the constraints on it, contrary to the general view.

It is the servicing of capital debt that is causing the problem. The STA's recurrent operating expenses are reduced by 0.6 per cent, so it is the 43 per cent increase in the cost of servicing capital debt which is putting the burden on South Australian taxpayers. I do not know whether there is a lot that we can do about that in the short term, but whatever can be done will be done.

I do not want to foreshadow other savings that we are considering because they must be examined and dealt with sensibly. We are dealing with the needs of the community, and before any changes are made, they must be investigated thoroughly. We accept the charter given by the Government to be efficient, effective and economic, and we will continue to try to meet it fully.

Mr INGERSON: Page 466 of the yellow book gives a budgeted capital receipts figure of \$46.2 million, but in 1985-86 we received only \$6.4 million. Why is there a \$37 million difference? It appears on the next page that there is a significant amount of capital expenditure whereas it appears that we have not received any money on page 466.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The General Manager, Mr Brown, can respond.

Mr Brown: When the estimates were prepared, loan funds were included in the line on 1985-86. Treasury advised us subsequent to its approval of the sums to take out the loan funds from those columns, and the \$6.4 million represents cash whereas the loan funds are shown elsewhere.

Mr INGERSON: In his statement, the Premier said that additional interest payments associated with new and replacement of assets was \$5.7 million. Why was there a significant increase in interest payments for the replacement of or acquisition of new assets?

Mr Brown: The authority has had to use additional loan funds during the past few years to finance its capital works. This follows on from the previous answer. We did not have cash. Cash was not made available for the capital works programs, so loan funds had to be used instead and there are interest payments on those loans. That explains the difference between the \$6 million and the \$43 million which the honourable member mentioned in his previous question.

Mr TYLER: Has the authority undertaken a review of the effects that the 1985 Grand Prix had on the authority's operations? What plans have been made for the 1986 event?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The authority successfully met the demands of the travelling public during last year's Grand Prix and was complemented widely on its efforts. In terms of the cost, the provision of these services added additional expenditure of \$247 000 whilst raising additional income of \$183 000. The difference of \$64 000 was reimbursed to the authority.

Planning for the 1986 Grand Prix is well under way. Shuttle bus services will run between Adelaide City Council car parks and the Grand Prix track. Some uncertainty exists to the extent of passenger demand and traffic disruption; however, preparations/planning by the Authority are designed to retain maximum flexibility so that necessary short-term changes can be made. The aim is to ensure that visitors to Adelaide are made to feel welcome and are well catered for.

Mr INGERSON: Has the involvement of SAFA had a significant effect on cash balances? Is that one of the reasons why the cash balance is down \$800 000?

Mr Rump: Now that money is controlled centrally by SAFA, we do not have funds which we can invest to gain a return.

Mr INGERSON: What effect has the devaluation of the Australian dollar had on overseas contracts? Which are affected, if at all? Can they be renegotiated or hedged?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We will get the honourable member a detailed answer, but I shall get Mr Rump to give some more general information now.

Mr Rump: Devaluation has affected the price of buses because bus chassis and engines are imported from overseas. In addition, in relation to rolling stock, there are imported components in our new railcars which have been affected by the devaluation. The other major item is the ticketing equipment. The sums of money in dollar terms related to that ticketing equipment run into several million, with like amounts in relation to buses and trains, but the exact figures would have to be obtained, because I do not think that we have the exact amount of money in dollar terms for the buses, the ticketing or the trains to the full extent, but we would have some estimated figures which would be close to the mark which we envisage will affect us based on anticipated deliveries.

Mr Brown: In the authority's capital allocation for this financial year of \$57.6 million, an allowance of \$5 million is included for foreign exchange movements. However, we will not be able to answer the question specifically until much later in the financial year when we know the movement of the individual currencies.

Dr Scrafton: I think it might be interesting to use the North-East Busway as an example of the effect of currency variations. The O-Bahn track is covered by a construction services agreement which goes back to about 1982 and, because the work involves German personnel and equipment, a proportion of those costs are payable in German currency. The proportion ranges from about 35 per cent, for major cost items like construction, to 100 per cent for things like testing and commissioning. The contracts, as would be the case with many of the other contracts mentioned by the Chairman and General Manager, are lump sum contracts with normal provisions for rise and fall, together with provisions for fluctuations in currency values. In stage 1 of the O-Bahn (that is, the section that is open), the impact of the devaluation of the Australian dollar was fairly minor, amounting to about \$111 000 in an overall contract cost of \$3.09 million, but the more recent major fall in the currency will have a severe effect on stage 2. The expenditures for the track continuation are programmed to begin in about mid 1987 and, as the General Manager said, it is not possible to predict what the currency values will be at that time or during the course of the work during 1988.

However, using assumptions of the effect of rise and fall provisions based on current information, and assuming that the Australian dollar retains its present value or thereabouts (that is, there is not a major drop to, say, the mid 50c within the next six months or so, which on present indications is a fairly reasonable assumption, but not one which one should make over-confidently), we have calculated that the outstanding balance due to the contractor will increase from about \$1.2 million at 1982 currency values to about \$2.2 million at current values, which is an increase of \$982 000. That is indicative of the devaluation effect on one of the major projects.

Mr INGERSON: On page 468 of the yellow book the executive, professional, technical, administration and clerical support line has increased by about \$11 million, compared to the proposed expenditure last year of about \$6 million and what actually occurred. It is basically the administrative side. I note that, in the provision of services, there has been a total holding of that line, in that there has

been very little increase in the actual services, but there has been about a 5 per cent increase in administration costs. How has that occurred, and why?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This is the \$5.6 million in interest which appears again. I think that is almost exactly the figure that the honourable member has drawn to our attention. I am quite happy to obtain a more detailed report. I have noticed that under the resource allocation the category of executive, professional, technical, administrative and clerical support includes more than just that. It is a catch-all line, and it includes engineering, stores, superannuation and covers just about the whole of the department's operation. I will obtain a breakdown for the honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: The reason I raised that is that there has been an increase of only four people in the division, but there has been an increase of some \$11 million.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I anticipate that the same question will be asked in relation to the Highways Department, because there is exactly the same problem in connection with classification.

Mr TYLER: For some time now there has been a series of complaints to the authority, to the Minister's office and to members of Parliament about the inadequate facilities for elderly people and the disabled at the Information Centre in Grenfell Street. Has any provision been made in this year's budget for improving those facilities and, if so, could the details be provided?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I agree with the honourable member. Since the centre was forced to move from the previous location, it has been very difficult to find a suitable city location for the authority. I am aware of the problems experienced by the staff and I advise that new premises at the corner of Currie Street and King William Street will be available in late December. The new Information Centre will have facilities which will overcome the difficulties for the disabled and elderly people.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister ensure that the normal tendering process is carried out in respect of the sale of Roadliner buses now that they are surplus to requirements?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

Mr INGERSON: In line with the current commercialisation policy of the Government, what other areas are being investigated; when will they be sold or stopped; and is it possible that catering may be the next area investigated?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Catering and trading.

Mr INGERSON: Is the Minister investigating the option listed on page 17 of the Planning Report which states:

A strong private sector is one basis of economic growth in South Australia and opportunities exist for the private sector to provide services in the metropolitan area within and beyond the STA's operating area. The option of using private sector operators should be pursued in preference to one which requires the authority to provide services which will result in a disproportionate increase in deficit.

Does the Minister support that action?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We currently support the use of private sector buses within the Hills and a number of buses operate right into the city. I do not think that there is any prospect of that changing. We have been prepared to use private sector buses where their use has been warranted. We keep the whole matter under review. To be honest to the Committee, I think that they are entitled to that. I do not have any proposals before me, nor would I wish for any to be put before me, that would change the nature of the STA operation we have at the moment.

If, in fact, the 1990s bring changes within the operations of public transit systems in Adelaide and other cities of the

world, that will be an evolutionary process. At the moment, we are committed to a strong public transit system. Nevertheless, we do use private buses where we feel that they are justifiable.

Mr RANN: An additional demand on STA services this year will be the Papal visit on 30 November. How is the authority proposing to meet the expected additional demand for transport services related to that visit by His Holiness?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The expectation is that there will be huge attendances at the Papal mass and Papal functions. I have no reason, with a name like Keneally, to believe that that will not be the case. The STA will be using the experience and successes related to providing services for the Grand Prix.

The authority will run shuttle bus services between Adelaide City Council car parks and Victoria Park racecourse for the Papal mass on Sunday 30 November; special tickets will be used to speed loading, especially on the return journey, and special prices will apply. At the moment the prices will certainly be adults \$2 and concessional tickets \$1, return. We will be doing our best to ensure that the visit to Adelaide by His Holiness allows as many people as possible to see him and to attend functions where he is present.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Is the Minister of Transport one of the Ministers who allegedly put pressure on the brewing company to sponsor that visit by the Pope?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that that is probably a good try by the honourable member, but I know of no pressure put by anybody on anybody to sponsor anybody, if that happened certainly I was not involved in it. I doubt whether the brewery, knowing the sort of patronage that I give its products, would be interested in speaking to me, anyway—I am not good for their balance sheets. I know of no such incident as that to which the honourable member alludes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister say whether there are any thoughts about closing the Bridgewater railway line, or is the Minister prepared to give a commitment that it will remain open? I have other questions I would like to ask about changes currently occurring at the Bridgewater railway station. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of this, but there are moves afoot to remove the staff from the Bridgewater station and to have them take advantage of the facilities at Jibilla and to use the facilities currently used by the STA bus drivers.

I am informed that the majority of the drivers of the trains, in particular, pass the entrance to the railway station every morning and every night as they come in off the freeway, drive past the Bridgewater railway station and down to the STA station. They then have to be somehow transported back from the STA facility to the railway station to enable them to carry out their work. I want to know why it is necessary to remove the staff from that railway station. It is at the terminus and we are constantly referring to the need to retain the line and upgrade it for tourism purposes.

So far as I am aware, the majority of engine drivers would prefer to stay at the Bridgewater station and for the *status quo* to remain. I am told that a canteen is to be staffed at the bus depot at Crafers. I am also told that, if they are expecting that extra work will come out of that on the part of railway employees, that will not happen because they will not be there long enough.

There is uncertainty about the future of the facilities at that station, particularly with regard to the toilets, which are in a deplorable condition. How in the world we expect interstate and overseas tourists, or local people, to use those toilets I would not know. I know that deep drainage has been brought right to the door of the toilets, but I under-

stand that there is some uncertainty about whether they will continue or not.

I understand that the AFULE wants the facilities at Bridgewater upgraded and is not happy about the moves in hand. I have been told that the only reason that all of this is happening is, in fact, to save money. How in the world that will save money, I do not know, because of the inconvenience it will cause both staff and members of the public. Will the Minister supply that detail?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the General Manager to respond to some of the more specific questions asked. In terms of the condition of the railway station to which the honourable member refers, he is aware that that station belongs to Australian national. I am quite happy to refer to Australian National his view of the condition of the toilets, etc. I have no quarrel with his description. The General manager will talk about the negotiations that are taking place with the staff in terms of security, etc. which might have resulted in the decision to move from Bridgewater. These sorts of moves are not undertaken without talking to personnel, so I take it that the confusion that the honourable member mentions is with the patrons.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The suggestion made by the general staff is that a sweetheart agreement has been reached between the department and senior members of the union, but that the blokes actually driving and the guards do not really know much about what is going on. That is what was put to me.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Knowing the unions and the management involved, I doubt whether there are going to be too many sweetheart agreements between management and senior staff that do not benefit other staff members. The most critical question raised by the honourable member was whether or not I would give a commitment to the future of the Bridgewater line. He is aware that my predecessor and I (early in my term as Minister) did so. I point out that the whole world has changed since then. Those commitments were given at a time when the economy was a lot stronger than it is now and when constraints upon the STA were not nearly as strong. What I am saying is that the Bridgewater service, along with all other services that the STA currently operates in South Australia, will be subject to review. We are committed to providing, as the member for Bragg mentioned earlier, services where the demand requires them to be.

Those services showing considerable losses will be looked at. We will also look at areas where there is a duplication of services. We have areas in Adelaide that are under serviced, with other areas over serviced. We need to be able to look at the level of services we provide. I expect that that could well be part of the inquiry's terms of reference. I am not giving any commitment to anything in the STA anywhere at the moment. To do so would compromise any investigation or inquiry. To bring somebody in and say, 'I want you to look at the operations of the STA, but leave this and that alone', would mean that the consultant doing the work is likely to say, 'Fix it up yourself, its no good asking us if you are going to set all those conditions'. That is the position now. I am not giving any commitment to anything.

Since I have been Minister, the STA services have had to be able to justify their continued operation. That has to be taken in account with the charter of the STA, namely, to provide public transport to all people living within a reasonable distance of the metropolitan area, whilst at the same time holding the growth of the subsidy required. That is a difficult charter but we will attempt to meet it. In terms of movements of personnel, such as workers at Bridgewater,

I am not aware of that but will ask the General Manager to respond.

Mr Brown: The conditions for staff at the Bridgewater railway station are not good. The station belongs to Australian National. It is not prepared to upgrade the facilities, so the authority, using its normal policy of wanting to provide good facilities for its staff, has negotiated with the unions, that is, the AAU and the AFULE, on the transfer of the staff working on the metropolitan trains to the Aldgate bus depot where much better facilities can be provided. It also overcomes a security problem that the authority has recently been grappling with the transfer of the staff from the facilities at Bridgewater to the Aldgate depot will very much improve that security. That is being done in the interests of STA staff.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What about the public?

The CHAIRPERSON: Questions must be addressed to the Minister.

Membership:

Ms Lenehan substituted for the Hon. T.M. McRae.

Mr Brown: The first part of the question was about travelling to and from the Bridgewater station with staff and how we are going to get them to Bridgewater to transfer to the trains. We are currently negotiating with the unions to transfer the staff at the station immediately across the road from the Aldgate bus depot and there will not be a necessity to travel to Bridgewater except for the first and last trains. That will be done by the normal method of transfer by car at the Aldgate bus depot. That will improve efficiency tremendously.

Mr INGERSON: What work practices are being investigated in line with the statements made by the Prime Minister that urgent action must be taken to rationalise work practices? What practices are being investigated and what are being negotiated?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I thought that he was referring to Robe River—I was not aware that he was referring to the Highways Department or the STA. I have not had discussions with him on work practices. Work practices within the STA are continually a matter of negotiation between management and the unions as is appropriate. We are always trying to ensure that we have the best possible work practices that operate in the best interests of the State as well as the commuter and the people who work within the STA. Recently we had a study by the Broomhill committee on the rostering system which involves work practices, and that is soon to report. We are aware that some work practices can be looked at, as is the union. I understand the honourable member's question. If we are going to talk about work practices we should talk about them first within our own organisation. If we do so we will have a greater chance of success. I do not want to be highlighting any work practice except to assure the honourable member that a number of work practices are currently being discussed by STA management and the unions.

Mr INGERSON: Whilst I recognise the statement the Minister has made has to be made in light of the industrial situation, the public is concerned about changes that need to take place in work practices not only as they relate to the STA and the Highways Department but also in many areas. I would have thought that the use of casual staff, the rostering system, timetabling, possible award changes, and the transfer of staff by Australian National and problems in that transfer are matters of which the public ought to have some background knowledge. Whether or not they are changed is surely up to negotiations between the STA and

the unions. I recognise that within the industrial framework in which we operate that that is a realistic set up. However, those issues are of public concern.

Whilst I respect the Minister's comment, those sort of things ought to be put out to the public so that, when criticism of the STA is made or criticism of its operating deficit is mentioned, the public ought to be aware that in fact those matters are being attended to. That is no unreasonable and I know that the Minister's answer was not one of covering up but rather of glossing over. It ought to be made public and I request that.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: All issues referred to by the honourable member are currently the subject of discussion between management and the unions, with the exception of the casual labour issue. The issues of rostering and timetabling have for some time been a matter for discussion between management and labour. I happen to belong to the school of thought that wants to achieve changes, and that can be better done by negotiation between the bodies concerned. It is my experience (the honourable member may have a different experience) that the moment these negotiations are made part of public debate a whole different agenda appears and what is sought cannot be achieved because people quickly adopt an extreme position as they are forced to do so because of the nature of the public debate.

I am into achieving results and I am happy to do that the best way I can. I am sure the people involved would agree that we should continue discussions that we are having between management and the unions. We do not need a whole lot of ill-informed public debate about agreements that have been reached in the past and are now being renegotiated for one reason or another.

In terms of the casual labour—I suppose the honourable member is referring to part-time labour for peak periods—the State Transport Authority operates under a Federal award. In South Australia I do not think we can realistically expect to be able to change the award by acting unilaterally. I am sure the honourable member is fully aware that in Australia there is strong resistance to the use of part-time employees to cope with peak periods.

I investigated this issue when I was in North America and Canada. The experiences of Edmonton and Vancouver are of interest. In Vancouver there was a 12 week strike; the management conceded and the workers won and, so, there was no part-time employment there. However, in Edmonton there was a 14 week strike; the management won and the workers lost, so there is part-time employment there. In North America, where they sit down annually or bi-annually and work out their contracts, the part-time employment is generally part of the contract negotiations and the percentage of part-time employment varies between, I think, 12 per cent in Seattle and about 50 per cent in San Diego. I am well aware—and so are the authority and the unions—that in other parts of the world considerable use of part-time employment is made.

At this stage, industrially in Australia that has not been welcomed. There is a Federal award and until that is changed we will not be able to introduce part-time employment in South Australia. I expect that that award can be changed only with the agreement of both management and the unions, and I think that we are a long way from that. The Government is aware of this issue. It has not escaped the notice of the Government. We are aware of the economics that may be involved in such a system. The authorities that I visited had varying views about the benefit of part-time employment. Some were of the view that it is good, while others were fairly neutral.

Mr INGERSON: Whilst I respect the Minister's comment, there is no doubt that the community at large is concerned with the 'sweetheart' deals that appear to have been made over the years by management and the unions, particularly as they relate to the railways. As the Minister would be aware, the public is demanding more and more that details of these sorts of deals must be made known clearly. It is the choice of management and the unions whether they are to continue, but I believe (and I disagree with the Minister's comment in this regard) that the public is demanding to know more about these deals. I hope that in the light of the open government and open authorities approach that we are hoping to achieve, the information that is required will in future be forthcoming.

Has the cost of the ticketing system that is to be introduced by the STA been affected by the devaluation of the Australian dollar and, if so, by how much? What was the cost to the State of the trip to Paris this year made by union members and STA officials to investigate systems overseas? Did the union involved or the members themselves make any financial contribution to that trip? Further, are there any problems with the introduction of the new ticketing system in South Australia?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I shall ask the Chairman to tell the Committee about the escalation in the cost of the ticketing system as the result of the devaluation in the Australian dollar. The cost of the overseas trip was \$21 805. No contribution was made by the union to the actual cost of the trip, but the union met some of the cost of the daily expenses incurred by the union officials. However, the Government paid for the trip and for the accommodation for the unionists. As to the introduction of the new ticketing system in South Australia, I believe that the trip undertaken by members of the union and the chairman to view the system in operation in France and to ask questions on site was of enormous value to the taxpayer and the community in South Australia. They were able to make recommendations as to changes that might need to be made for the implementation of the system here in Adelaide. I do not envisage that there will be any more difficulties. I think that the benefit of the trip is quite clear.

Mr Rump: In relation to the foreign exchange variation, in response to a question asked earlier I indicated briefly the effect of the devaluation in three areas. One that I mentioned was the ticketing system. The variation there is estimated to be \$3.369 million. It is a very substantial sum of money, arising from the devaluation.

Mr INGERSON: That is almost 50 per cent higher than the original cost.

Mr Rump: That is correct.

Mr INGERSON: It will have to be a pretty effective system.

Mr Rump: There is no doubt that having spent that amount of \$21 805 to show the union representatives the systems operating in Europe will be well worth while. The agreement that we managed to reach was, I believe, well worth while. It is an excellent system, as everyone will agree when it is finally brought into use later next year.

Ms LENEHAN: I note that provision for station upgrading has been made in the current financial year. Will the Minister outline what is proposed and, specifically, can he tell me whether the Lonsdale station is included in that upgrading program? I remind the Minister that I have raised previously the matter of safety and security at the Lonsdale railway station and the facilities that are provided at that station.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government has a program of gradual upgrading of railway stations. I do not know

whether the Lonsdale station is included in that program for this year. However, I will provide a response to the honourable member. It has been policy to upgrade the facilities offered at suburban railway stations. A program to achieve this commenced in 1980-81 and although operating under financial constraints, up to five stations per year have had a complete refurbishment carried out. To 30 June, 17 stations have been completed.

During 1986-87 and 1987-88 the program is being modified to achieve more effective results. The program is now concentrating on the installation of standard low maintenance passenger shelters at suburban railway stations. The benefits will be:

- (1) a real impact on the overall appearance of the rail system, through a more uniform appearance, condition and design standards;
- (2) a significant increase in the number being upgraded—1986-87, 26 shelters at an estimated cost of \$287 000;
- (3) a significant reduction in station maintenance costs; and
- (4) improved public security.

Ms LENEHAN: In relation to security, I have approached the Minister on a number of occasions on the matter of security on the southern line. I understand that recently the Commissioner of Police announced that a security squad will be formed. Does the Minister believe that the establishment of this new security squad in the Police Department will adequately address the problems that have been encountered, specifically on the southern line, with regard to intimidation of passengers, harassment and also vandalism to rolling stock and stations?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Also, intimidation of workers, the staff within the system. We are very concerned about the degree of hooliganism, vandalism and personal attacks affecting the STA, particularly late in the evening—not only on the trains, but on the bus system. Whilst one cannot provide a security system which will ensure that every bus and carriage within the STA will at all times be protected from unruly behaviour, nevertheless, if one is able to strategically use one's STA constable force plus a transit squad from the police, I believe that we will be able to make a big impact on the degree of vandalism. We will see by experience.

We have had an investigation in which the police have been very much involved, along with the STA and the transit unions. The transit squad, I believe, will serve a very useful purpose, and it is certainly my expectation that it will have a dramatic impact upon the behaviour of some of the less desirable residents of Adelaide who take delight in not only threatening and abusing staff and passengers but also destroying property. I am confident that there will be a vast improvement. We will, of course, monitor that and, if we need to take further action later on, we will also do that.

Ms LENEHAN: My third question relates to whether there has been any perceived impact from the introduction of the 20c minimum fare. Has that in any way altered the level of patronage? I think that some people were suggesting it would. I must say for the public record that I was not getting any feedback in my electorate that it was a great problem, and I wonder whether the figures are showing up any trend in that area.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We expected that the increases would have an impact on patronage. Our previous experience has always shown that initially there is a drop in patronage; then it builds up again as people become accustomed to the new fare structure, much like an increase in

any product. We budgeted for the first quarter for \$8 638 000, taking into account the new charges and what we thought the impact might have been. That budget was taken at a time when we thought the new charges would be in a month earlier than they were. Having regard to the fact that there was a delay in the introduction of the new charges, I think it is interesting to note that the actual receipts were \$8 664 000. It was actually \$26 000 more than we budgeted for, but the new charges came in a month later. That would indicate that if there was any impact upon patronage it was very marginal indeed. I expect there had been some discretionary travel by some people, particularly by pensioners but overall, if the number of trips have been reduced at all, they have only been reduced marginally.

I think that it would be foolish to say there has been no reduction. It is still a bit early to get a full report, which is our first opportunity to judge the impact of the new fares, and it seems that people are still using the service. I am not saying whether or not they have accepted the need to pay more: that would be a subjective assessment on my part but, certainly, the figures indicate that if there has been a reduction it has only been marginal.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the head office of the STA. What is the final cost of the project? Is there any overrun in budget and when will it be finished?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Chairman of the board to respond as best he can, but the building does not belong to the STA at all. It belongs to SASFIT and the Police super fund. They are actually building it so, in fairness, I think this is not a matter on which we should be expected to give details. I think that the Chairman can give some idea as to the completion dates, when we are able to move in, etc., which may be of interest to the honourable member and the Committee.

Mr Rump: As the Minister said, the building is not owned by the authority but, from an operational point of view, we are very keen to get into it. The builder was supposed to finish it in May of this year. His current best estimate of the completion date is March 1987. His contractual obligation still is to finish it this year, so he is facing substantial penalties for failure to complete on time. From the authority's point of view, moving into the building will make us more efficient, because at the moment we have staff in the Australian Airlines building, which was TAA House. We have three floors there. We occupy one of the Norwich Centre buildings at North Adelaide and part of the second building and, from the point of view of our efficiency, it is very much a disadvantage not to have got the building as early as we should have—but that is the unfortunate situation with the construction industry at the moment. I should add that the basement of the building and the major portion of the ground floor are not owned by SASFIT or the Police super fund: they are strata titled to the Karidis brothers, so the landlord for the TAB in the basement (which has received publicity) is the Karidis brothers, not the STA.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister say when the STA will move from Hackney: gradually over the next five years beginning this year, as stated by the Premier during the election campaign; within three years, as the Minister said at the Estimates Committee last year; or within five years, as the Chairman said last week?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: At present I am not able to give the detailed response that the honourable member seeks. Because of the present economic situation we have had to stop any plans to move this year. We still hope that we will be able to vacate the Hackney depot within five years. We still hope that we will be able to meet that timetable. That timetable, of course, will be responsive to the resources that

are available at the time. It was originally planned to be a staged move from Hackney to the new depot at Mile End, but it is just one of those decisions which have been forced on the Government because of the tougher economic times. There will be no movement out of there this financial year.

Mr Rump: No, and, in fact, the situation is that we have to first design the new facility and we have not let any contract at this time for the design of the facility at Mile End. We will not be able to commence construction down there until the vendors of the site have moved, and they had a fairly lengthy tenure after the sale of the land to the Government. Bearing in mind the length of time to construct the new depot, the original plan announced by the Premier of a five-year move will be slightly exceeded unless funds suddenly become available so that we get the work done earlier than I anticipate. So, the statement I made the other day that we believe it to be five years, I believe, is realistic, bearing in mind the length of time of construction and design work involved, and the funding that is anticipated.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRPERSON: Order!

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The statements of the Premier and the Chairman were made in the light of the economic circumstances at the time, and any responsible Government's statements would reflect those stringencies. There is no conflict.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister confirm that the unions demanded that a sealed and secure car park be provided in the parklands during building of the new conservatory; otherwise, severe industrial action would take place on the site?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The answer is 'No'—that statement of the honourable member is not correct. No pressure was put on anybody by the union in regard to the car park.

Mr INGERSON: Page 473 of the yellow book states:

Australian National is continuing to transfer surplus rail property back to the authority and much of this property is surplus to needs of the authority.

Why is it surplus to needs and why does the authority have to take it back?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that the Chairman should respond to that.

Mr Rump: The rail transfer agreement provided for land which became redundant from Australian National's point of view to revert to South Australia. The authority disposes of the land. That is financially advantageous to the authority and the State Government. I should add that most of the land is in the country.

Mr INGERSON: I should like to ask about the North-East Busway. The budget papers say that \$6.5 million will enable nearly all of the earthworks in the last section to be completed this year. When will the project be completed? What is the current and perhaps final cost of the project? What is happening at Tea Tree Gully and Darley Road?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government still intends to complete the project by the end of 1988 in line with a commitment given some two years ago. There has been some reduction in funds this year but that does not inhibit our capacity to complete the busway if funds are made available in the financial year 1987-88—before the end of 1988, as already undertaken. The car park at Tea Tree Gully is interesting and the subject of discussion between me, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the local member, when appropriate. We are examining the options open to us. I shall ask Mr Wayte, who is in charge of the project team, to give some detail.

Mr Wayte: Our current estimate of the project, including the buses and the linear park works associated with it, is

about \$98 million. The car park at the Paradise interchange was extended by about 165 spaces some months ago and present evidence suggests that demand still exceeds supply. Recent surveys suggest that that is likely to remain the case with any reasonable further expansion of the car park. There is limited space available for ground level car parking and there are limits on funds for free car parking space in the catchment area for the busway.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We would have no objection if somebody else wanted to build a covered car park in that area.

Mr INGERSON: Is the Minister saying that, if the private sector proposed to build a car park on that site, it might be received favourably?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We would negotiate with them. If local government or a private entrepreneur wanted to build a car park on adjacent land, we would welcome that. We would speak to anybody who wanted to build a car park. The local council would have some problems with a multi-storey car park, but we would be happy to talk to anybody.

Mr INGERSON: Last year, during the Estimates Committee, an honourable member raised the problem of the Darley Road interchange and the turn right from Lower North-East Road into Darley Road. It is a major traffic problem in the morning. It was heralded as such last year. We suggested that a right-hand turn light be introduced for buses.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It might be better if we wait until Rod Payze from the Highways Department gets here before we answer that question.

The CHAIRPERSON: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed. We will leave open consideration of 'Transport, Miscellaneous' until we have finished with Highways.

Highways, \$25 357 000

Chairperson:
Ms D.L. Gayler

Members:
The Hon. Ted Chapman
Mr G.A. Ingerson
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr M.D. Rann
Mr P.B. Tyler
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:
The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Minister of Transport.

Departmental Advisers:
Mr M. Knight, Commissioner of Highways, Highways Department.
Mr R. Payze, Assistant Commissioner (Project Design).
Mr C. McInnes, Deputy Commissioner of Highways.
Mr R. Argent, Acting Assistant Commissioner (Administration and Finance).
Mr B. Atwell, Acting Manager, Finance.

The CHAIRPERSON: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

Mr INGERSON: It has been put to me that a problem was raised in the Estimates Committee last year relating to a major traffic problem in the morning at Darley Road and Lower North East Road. That problem is created mainly

by the fact that it is very difficult for buses and other traffic to turn right at that intersection. It was suggested at the last Estimates Committee that consideration ought to be given to the installation of a right-hand turn light which would allow the buses to move on. It has been reported to me that, in the past week in particular, on three consecutive mornings the traffic built up between 7.30 and 7.45 a.m. for 0.7 to 0.9 of a mile. It was reported to me also that that is a very common occurrence. Is anything being done about that and is the recommendation of installing a right-hand turn light the answer to the problem?

Mr Payze: The investigation completed by the department would reveal that, in the first instance, the problem can best be addressed by changing the lane arrangements on the approach to that intersection, in particular the eastern approach on Lower North East Road, by in fact providing a sheltered right-hand turn lane as opposed to the current arrangement which provides for the right-hand turning traffic to remain in the combined right-hand turn/straight-through lane. Funds have been provided in our current budget for these works which include the installation of a median strip in that vicinity on Lower North East Road. We are discussing these changes with local government.

Mr M.J. EVANS: What changes have taken place in relation to traffic signal maintenance? Over the past 12 months I believe that there has been substantial reorganisation to the sections of the department that handle maintenance of traffic lights and, in particular, changes have taken place whereby the maintenance technicians who formerly handled both preventative and routine maintenance, as well as breakdown maintenance, have now been divided into separate sections, and a number of other organisational changes have taken place in that area of work practice. Can the Minister give some indication whether ongoing monitoring of savings or costs and the effectiveness and results of that change have taken place? What is the trend during this financial year? In other words, can the Minister give some quantification of the benefits which he sees from those changes and perhaps an assurance that they will be monitored to ensure that there are in fact benefits rather than disbenefits from those changes?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The negotiations are still in progress. We have had a trial period of changing the nature of the work practice and it was designed to give greater efficiency and more direct responsibility and accountability amongst the people who have the task of maintaining traffic signals. At the moment we are still in that process of talking with the traffic signal technicians, and I think that the honourable member feels that we are probably a little further down the track than we are. Because we are talking to them about the changing nature of our requirements in that area, I do not want to go further than is sensible at this stage. I am happy to keep the honourable member informed about any progress that takes place, but we have sought to effect changes which we think will be beneficial and we will continue to work towards that end. At the moment we are, in a sense, at the negotiating table and I do not want to take it any further than that. I am certainly conscious of the sensitive nature of these industrial work practice agreements and the danger of talking about them away from where the discussions take place.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I appreciate the Minister's point of view. I want to make sure that in fact the Minister will ensure that over time we could be satisfied that, if those changes took place, there would be a positive benefit. I am pleased that he raised the point about work practices, because I read a comment made earlier this year by an officer from the Highways Department to the effect that it is conceded

that in some areas the end result will be some financial disbenefit, but the department's responsibility to Government and audit regulations is the dominant factor which cannot be ignored. That caused me some concern that, in this case, the work practice might be on the Government's side and not the employees' side, inasmuch as the audit regulations and the Government regulations were in some way restricting the work practices and in fact were requiring the department to adopt a practice which was a disbenefit, when in reality the end result was designed to be something else. Can the Minister assure us that he is looking into that and that the benefits from the work practice changes are really there?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is no desire to change merely for the sake of change. Any changes that we seek to implement would be based on very strong proof that they would be of benefit to the whole community. The Highways Department has constraints as to what it is able to do and these constraints are placed upon it by Government and by legislation, but I certainly take the point. I am not aware of the quote mentioned by the honourable member, but obviously it emanated from the Highways Department. We will have a look at that, but I assure the honourable member that the Highways Department will not cause any disbenefit as a result of any changes in work practices that it requires.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: In relation to the premises occupied by the Highways Department at Walkerville, a couple of years ago I asked a question of the then Minister of Transport as to why that building was lit up like a Christmas tree both late into the night and on weekends. It was explained at the time that it may have been associated with cleaning activities. The building in question is some eight storeys high and it is occupied by between 600 and 700 employees of the department. Night after night throughout the whole year most, if not all levels of that building are fully lit until late into the night and, indeed, on some occasions all night. This matter was also raised by my colleague the then Minister of Transport, Michael Wilson, some years ago. He and I have suggested that the maintenance costs, if that is the activity that is being pursued, would be reduced as a result of having that matter investigated.

On page 132 of the Estimates of Payments I note that \$2.364 million is involved for the current period for accommodation services. I understand that that line applies specifically to the Walkerville department. If one divides the number of full-time equivalent employees into that figure, one is looking at a service cost per employee of something like \$4 000, of which I suspect a significant amount is involved for lighting or power. The department pays no water rates or council rates. That figure for servicing of the open and single space offices in that building constitutes an enormous maintenance cost. Will the Minister investigate this matter, because his predecessors, including the Liberal Minister Michael Wilson when Minister of Transport, were going to straighten this matter out? It is the only public building of which I am aware in metropolitan Adelaide which is lit up well into the night and, on occasion, until sun up. This involves every level and every office. Neither previous Ministers nor I have been able to find an excuse for this happening.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that the honourable member has probably gilded the lily a bit. Nevertheless, he has pointed to a problem of which I am not aware. I know that, as with all public and private buildings, cleaners are present at night who should systematically work through a building. There would be no need for them to have two or

three floors alight if they are only working on one floor. It may be that I need to get a report on this matter.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The new member for Adelaide lives on the other side of Walkerville Terrace just a little way from where I reside short term, and he will support my remarks, as will many of his constituents.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am concerned about the matter that the honourable member has raised. The Government is concerned to reduce costs. Departments are required to reduce electricity costs. I will have the Commissioner of Highways investigate this matter. His advice to me is that it would be cleaners, but I do not know how they organise their cleaning or the times during which lights are kept on. The matter will be investigated.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I return to a question I raised earlier, apparently at the wrong time. It relates to the Minister's position on ferry services and the permits associated with ferry servicing between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island, a matter which has been before him for some six weeks since a deputation from that region appeared before him. We have been awaiting a response to submissions made. Will the Minister indicate what is his view on this matter, or what he proposes to do?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The system to which the honourable member refers, which gives preference to residents of Hindmarsh Island for use of the ferry, except in a case of emergency where fire and ambulances etc., get priority, has been running for some time. In fact, it has regulations to support it, so if I, as Minister, proposed in any way to change that it would have to go to Cabinet.

I had intended to go to Cabinet and seek its approval for a decision I have taken and to then advise the honourable member and the Goolwa council, which would then advise the people on the island of my decision. I intend to recommend to Cabinet that the system of residential permits be discontinued because, at the moment, the preferential treatment given to some people as against others on occasion throughout the year causes considerable distress.

I acknowledge that by abolition of the system some distress will be caused to residents on the Island who feel that they ought to have priority. However, as with all ferries in South Australia, it is an extension of the road system and we do not give preference to one group of people as against another. As I advised the honourable member and his deputation when they came to see me, the ferry to Hindmarsh Island is provided by taxpayers in South Australia. For instance, the people in Port Augusta, where I live, contribute as much to the running of the ferry as do the people who live on Hindmarsh Island, so they might feel somewhat offended if they did not have ready access to it.

That is probably simplistic and not a really fair interpretation of the situation, but I intend to recommend to Cabinet that that system of residential permits be discontinued. Sooner or later that will have to be the decision of the Minister, in whatever Government. I suspect that it will always be resisted quite strongly by the local member, and I must say that the local member has put a very persuasive case for his constituents on Hindmarsh Island, so my decision was taken in the face of that very strong argument.

However, it is my decision alone. I have considered the matter at length, and decided that the permit system that currently applies to Hindmarsh Island should no longer apply. That will be my recommendation to Cabinet. As I said earlier, as it requires a change of regulation, it will have to go to Cabinet, anyway. I regret that I have had to inform the honourable member in this way: I would have preferred to get the decision and then inform him and his

constituents of that decision directly by letter, but I guess that one way is as good as another.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I turn to the matter of the service link between mainland South Australia and Kangaroo Island. I am very disappointed that Dr Scafton is not here, because despite his severing of links with this division of recent times, he has a long association with the State services to both Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln.

Following the release of the Highways report of 1985-86 and the tabling of that document in the House of Assembly a week or two ago, does the Minister accept, after considering those portions applicable to the MV *Troubridge* operation, that he and his department, by pursuing a course of indexing the rates applicable to that ship, are condoning progressively growing crew costs? In the face of the competition that is now being met at Cape Jervis, are the operations of the MV *Troubridge* and its replacement vessel now on an economic disaster course?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not know how one categorises 'economic disaster course'. The Government has a commitment to provide a service. If one describes the *Troubridge* as a road (as one must; otherwise, the Highways Department would not have responsibility for it), we are maintaining that road to service the honourable member's constituents on Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula over to Port Lincoln but predominantly Kangaroo Island, because for much of the transport that the *Troubridge* accommodates the islanders do not have any alternative whereas Eyre Peninsula does, expensive though it might be. There is no doubt that the *Troubridge* is heavily subsidised by South Australian taxpayers. I generally believe that, so long as the taxpayer of South Australia can be assured that we run an efficient and economic service, that rate of subsidy will be accepted.

The honourable member has pointed out that the *Troubridge* has competition from the *Philanderer*. I am surprised to hear him talk about the *Philanderer* in that sense. I did read his recent contribution in the House. Certainly the role of the *Philanderer* as I understand it—and I was closely involved as other members were in encouraging the establishment of the *Philanderer* service—is to carry passengers and small vehicles. I was surprised to see hear comments of the honourable member that a lot of goods traffic is going over to Kangaroo Island by means of the *Philanderer*. I feel certain that that was not the intention of the *Philanderer*. Certainly the *Troubridge* is not likely to be showing a profit in the short term nor even in the long term, but it is a cost that the State and the Government meet in recognition of the importance of Kangaroo Island to the economy of South Australia.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: By way of supplementary question, the Minister in his response expresses some surprise at my raising the issue of the operation of the *Philanderer* in relation to the *Troubridge* services and my allegation of its being on a disaster course. There is nothing negative about my comments in that respect. It is clear, as the report reveals, that the *Troubridge* operation is losing business to the *Philanderer*.

The CHAIRPERSON: The honourable member was going to ask a supplementary question.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My question is a request for the Minister to come back to my original call to him to comment in relation to the economically disastrous course on which the *Troubridge* finds itself—its loss of business and its failure to recognise those business activities that will attract trade back to it, not so much in the light car or passenger area but in the heavy transport loading area. Hence my remarks in recent times about the burden the

Government is now placing on that section of the Kangaroo Island community who have no alternative but to use heavy transport vessel, MV *Troubridge*.

I refer also to my other reference to the discrimination being applied. The island's community is now split in its opportunities to traverse to and from by sea. Some have the opportunity of travelling on the *Troubridge* with a light vehicle and/or as a passenger and they have the other option of travelling on the very good service, the *Philanderer*, whilst the primary producers have no alternative at all. In the process of increasing the costs of operation in the two areas I mentioned, you are placing an added burden on the rural community of the island which has no way in or out with its heavy goods carrying vehicles other than by the *Troubridge*. I am saying that you are doing dough cold, as the report reflects; it is getting worse by the year and, losing business in the meantime whilst placing a heavier burden year in year out on that section of the community to which I referred.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am at a loss to understand where the business is going that the *Troubridge* is losing if in fact that business has no alternative to the *Troubridge*; that seems to be the statement the honourable member has made. The new *Troubridge* was supposed to be a 'no frills' freight carrying service that would meet the needs that the honourable member is addressing at the moment. The honourable member may have been one of those people who influenced the Government to go from a 'no frills' freight only service to a—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN interjecting:

The CHAIRPERSON: Order! The member for Alexandra will cease interjecting.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am prepared to concede that the member for Alexandra coined the phrase 'no frills service'. I was not aware of it but I am prepared to give him credit for it, as it is my nature. A lot of pressure was brought to bear from Kangaroo Island. If by saying that the honourable member was part of it I am doing him an injustice, I apologise. My recollection is a little hazy because at the time I was probably concerned about other matters. It was the intention to introduce a 'no frills' freight only service. That has now been changed to a 'no frills' freight service plus passengers and small vehicles. The nature of the *Troubridge* has changed. It was the intention that the new vessel be able to accommodate the special needs of the honourable member's constituents to whom he draws my attention. I still expect that it will, but I also expect that, no matter what we do, there will be required a fairly significant subsidy for Kangaroo Island on the *Troubridge*.

My recollection is that the people who live on the island say that mainlanders have extensive expenditure on road system that links them to the major commercial centre of Adelaide and the islanders do not and that therefore they are entitled to a subsidy provided by way of the *Troubridge*. The extent of the subsidy is a matter of concern in regard to the freight cost that the islanders have to pay. We have a 'user pays' component whilst acknowledging a responsibility to provide to the islanders—primary producers and industry—access to the major markets, sources of stores and so on. I feel certain that the honourable member's concerns will be met within the design of the new *Troubridge*.

Ms LENEHAN: I address my question to the South Road Darlington intersection commonly known as the Darlington intersection. I am aware that in recent times there have been considerable improvements undertaken at the intersection. I received a letter this morning and was going to put it in the post to the Minister but thought I would like

to share a sentence of it with the Committee. It was written by a constituent who lives in States Road, Reynella. They raised with me a number of concerns about sections on South Road, but I thought that in light of the fact that the Highways Department does not often get a 'thank you' or a bouquet I would share that sentence with them. It states:

Since the Highways Department have changed the situation with the traffic lights at the corner of Main South Road and Seacombe Road, namely, the Darlington intersection, the problem has all but disappeared.

It is a problem of traffic congestion at that intersection. The Highways Department will need to do a fairly thorough examination of some of the things my constituent has raised, so I will not canvass them now. First, can the Minister tell the Committee how much these improvements have cost and whether any further improvements are on the drawing board for implementation in the near future?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Improvements to reduce congestion were carried out recently at both the major intersections at Darlington to which the honourable member has referred. At the South Road, Flagstaff Road and Marion Road intersection extra lanes have been provided on the Flagstaff Road and Marion Road approaches. At Seacombe Road, additional right-turn lanes have been provided at two approaches, with the right-hand turn from South Road to Seacombe Road being banned to help reduce the signal cycle time.

These works cost about \$640 000, a major portion of which was for the widening of the culvert on Flagstaff Road. Traffic operation at both intersections has improved markedly, with the long queues that were once daily occurrences being much reduced, notwithstanding a significant increase in traffic through both intersections. I am certain that the Highways Department was pleased to get that bouquet. As the honourable member says, Government departments are more likely to get brickbats than bouquets, even though quite often the reverse should be the case. Stage 2 of the Darlington improvements to further increase capacity is planned to commence in February or March 1987. The improvements comprise changes to medians and kerbs to provide four through lines in each direction on South Road. Estimated cost for this work is \$400 000.

Mr INGERSON: At page 33 of his Financial Statement the Premier and Treasurer states:

The proposed allocation of \$25.4 million for the Highways Department forms part of the total available for road purposes in 1986-87 (\$213 million). This level of funding provides for a similar level of operations as in 1985-86 after taking into account a reduction in real terms for Commonwealth funded projects.

Will the Minister explain how that figure of \$25.4 million comes about? I was under the impression that the Government was allocating only \$14 million from consolidated revenue to the Highways Fund. How do we get this figure of \$25.4 million?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In short, the \$14 million is capital and the \$25.4 million is recurrent: the \$25.357 million is coming from motor registrations.

Mr INGERSON: The statement made by the Premier is that this level of funding provides for a similar level of operations and yet, in fact, that money is already dedicated to the fund. The statement indicated to me that it was an extra amount. If that is not correct, I want an explanation. My understanding is that the extra amount that was going into the fund was, in fact, the \$14 million which was coming out of consolidated revenue. The extra sum that is going into the fund from motor registrations is almost the same amount. Perhaps that is what the Premier means in that statement, although it does not read that way.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I ask the Commissioner of Highways to respond to that query raised by the honourable member.

Mr Knight: I think that the figure referred to is really the aggregation of the loan funds—the money coming from the Consolidated Account into the Highways Department, together with the increased funds from the increases imposed for motor registrations and drivers licences (that portion coming into the fund).

Mr INGERSON: That does not seem to be right, either. My reason for saying that is that the \$14 million is coming from consolidated revenue, and there is an amount of \$90 million, compared to \$60 million last year, in relation to motor vehicles, which would mean about \$15 million to \$20 million extra from that source. It seems that the two do not add up to \$25 million. It seems to be a lot further out. I will leave it at that. Perhaps the matter can be checked later.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We will check out the matter. There was an \$11.7 million increase this year, and that added to the \$14 million gives the amount of \$25 million, to which the honourable member has referred. From 1985-86 to 1986-87, total Highways Department funding increased from \$195.7 million to \$207.4 million. This is an increase of \$11.7 million or 6 per cent. However, with an inflation rate of 7 per cent, the real level of total Highways Department funding has decreased by 1 per cent. So, I think that explains the amount of \$11.7 million. However, I think that we are getting ourselves into a complex situation and it might be better if I take the question on notice and provide a detailed report to the honourable member later.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the Hilton Bridge. What is the current cost of the bridge as compared to the original planned cost? Can the Minister also provide details of the problems in relation to bridge E which required the use of jackhammers in reconstruction last week and has the safety of the bridge been generally affected? Finally, when will the bridge be opened?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I suppose that it is fair to say that initially the problem that we had with the Hilton Bridge was that it was progressing a lot faster than had been programmed and, in fact, a lot of the payments that normally would have fallen into this financial year had to be made in the previous financial year. The project has progressed very satisfactorily. I ask the Commissioner of Highways to say when the bridge is likely to be completed and what were the problems that required additional work to be undertaken last week. I have been advised on this matter but my recall is not as good as it might be, so I ask the Commissioner to address the Committee.

Mr Knight: Certainly, there were some problems on that bridge. Some concrete placed on the deck proved to be unsatisfactory. We are not too sure what caused the problem; it is still being checked. However, it resulted in some cracking in the deck. Of course, reinforced concrete will always crack, but the cracking seemed to be excessive. We condemned that part of the deck. The contractors have accepted the fact that they have a problem in relation to that work. They have removed the offending concrete and will replace it at their cost. It is thought that it was a problem with the quality of the concrete. It is still expected that the bridge will open in about February or March of next year. As to the question of whether any safety problems will arise, the answer to that is 'No'. The concrete that is going in now will be of the same standard and there will be no degradation in the strength characteristics of the bridge.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister provide details as to cost movements?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In 1982-83 the Hilton bridge project was submitted to the Federal Government at a cost of \$11.6 million; that is \$9.9 million inflated to \$11.6 million. There has been a cost escalation of \$2 million.

Mr Knight: It is not actually an escalation in cost. The cost of \$11.6 million which was given was the actual cost of the construction work but, in addition to that and not included in it, were the accommodation work, services and the various design costs. So, the actual final cost is expected to be very close to the estimated cost if one takes into account rise and fall on the contract and the inflation effect from the time of conception.

Mr TYLER: The Minister will be aware that I have a strong interest in southern transport, and this question is related to the third arterial road. Early last year, the Premier announced that there would be the construction of a third arterial road from Sturt Road to Reynella. It was referred to in a brochure released about this time last year, called the Southern Region Transport Plan, which was followed up in the Government's policy commitments prior to the election. Can the Minister state the progress made to date on this very important arterial link south of Adelaide?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am aware of the interest of the honourable member and also of the member for Mawson: I would be less than human if I were not. The current position is that the emphasis of work on the third arterial road is being directed towards defining in more detail the alternative alignments. Aerial survey and mapping of the land is complete, as is the analysis of a questionnaire survey of drivers' travel patterns. Soil and rock properties have been investigated and valuation of those alternative alignments, taking account of cost, operational effectiveness and the environmental impact is continuing.

Guidelines for an environmental impact study are being determined in conjunction with the Department of Environment and Planning, with the aim of holding a public display in early 1987. An information bulletin was issued to over 1 000 households adjacent to the corridor early this year, and further bulletins will be provided as appropriate. Construction is still intended to commence by 1990, with completion within five years after that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister would be very disappointed if I did not ask some questions relating to the bottom end of the South-Eastern freeway. Is the Minister able to say what will be the estimated cost of the study being carried out by the consultants? The opportunity will be provided for public consultation at the meetings that are coming up. Is the Minister able to say—and I sincerely hope that he is—that the opportunity will be provided at those meetings for comment to be made about the existing road, as well as matters relating to the alternatives which the consultants are currently considering?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The cost of the consultancy is up to \$900 000. This money is part of the Federal Government's contribution to the national highway construction for which the Highways Department of South Australia acts as agent.

The meeting that Maunsell and Partners, the consultancy team, will be convening is on 16 October, and is very much in the hands of the consultants. I have said before that as Minister I have asked the Highways Department to commission the consultancy and we have left the consultants to do the work unhindered by ministerial interference. Certainly, an officer from the Highways Department has had the task of liaising with the consultancy team, but I thought that it was much more appropriate for the consultants to get on with their task unhindered by any political preconceptions which the Minister may or may not have.

So, I have been very careful to remain at arm's length from the consultancy team. Since the consultancy started, I have had one brief meeting with them about a particular matter. I am expecting to be briefed about what they will be recommending to the public meeting prior to that meeting being held. As I understand it, the same option in the confidential matter—because I will be retaining it confidentially—is available to the local member should he wish to avail himself of that in confidence, and the honourable member understands why I say that.

The purpose of the meeting or display is to show the public the options being considered, and explain the methodology used in determining these options; and to gain public input to the planning process so that a preferred option which meets community needs and expectations can be developed. I really do not think that the meeting will be able to accommodate the other need the honourable member sees with the Mount Barker Road, that is, the short-term improvements that need to be implemented.

Our liaison officer is not here so, unless one of my officers is aware of the nature of the public meeting, all I can say is that I expect that it will deal with the long-term major upgrading rather than any short-term treatment. I understand—and this could well meet the needs of the honourable member—that the Highways Department will be advising of the short-term treatment of that road at that meeting. So, there will be a response to that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Opportunity will be provided for people attending that meeting to make comments?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think the very fact that the Highways Department officers will be there advising at that meeting—which I expect will be very well attended—presupposes that those people will have the opportunity for input, to agree or otherwise with the Highways Department suggestion. Even if the Highways Department felt that it did not want that to happen—and that is not the Highways Department's view—I am sure at a public meeting like that it would happen, anyway.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There is much discussion within the community about the alternatives being considered and the question being asked is: once an alternative has been selected, where do we go from there? Have we dates in mind when work will commence once an alternative has been selected? Has any commitment been made by either the Federal or the State Government in relation to funding for work to commence and, if so, when would that funding be made available?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This is a very important question. It is fair to say that at this time there has been no financial commitment to that road by the Federal Government, and it will want to have a look at the work we are doing before that commitment is made.

It has already made a commitment of some \$900 000 to fund the study, so it is aware of what we are doing. No funding has been put in place for the project, which will be federally funded. The State's contribution should be minimal. I shall ask Mr Knight to give some extra information.

Mr Knight: We expect that it will be about July 1987 before the planning process and environmental impact statements have been prepared and commented on. Having got approval, we would take about one year to do the detailed design—it is a fairly complex piece of country there. Construction could start after July 1988. Between the design stage and construction we would have to conduct negotiations with the Federal Government on funding. It will not approve construction funds until after the planning and environmental phases have been completed. On a fairly optimistic time frame, January 1989 would be the time to

start construction. The project would then depend on whether funding was forthcoming. One would hope that that section of the road might be completed by the early 1990s, but it all depends on the Federal Government's funding.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I feel like a cracked record. I understand the practicalities, but I cannot help thinking about other problems associated with the road and whether they are as simple as a recent article in the *Advertiser* suggested. It said that the problem was due to excessive speed and people not acting responsibly. I agree that that is a major part of the problem. That is why many people ask why we are considering spending millions of dollars when the problem goes back to people's irresponsibility. There is tremendous anxiety in the community about the interim period.

Colleagues on the other side of the Chamber are obviously satisfied with action on the South Road in their electorates, but I should like to know what is happening in mine at the corner of the Old Noarlunga turn off and the Seaford crossing. I have written twice to the Minister about this matter, which is one of major concern. I know that there are likely to be changes as a result of development at Seaford.

I hold my breath every time that I drive out of Old Noarlunga on to the South Road and for elderly people or those towing trailers or caravans it is hell. It has been proposed for some time that traffic lights should be installed there, but the Minister recently said that that was not practicable. It is an absolute death trap at the moment.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: When I said publicly that the Highways Department studies showed that a significant number of motorists who used the Mount Barker Road exceed the speed limit, I was not suggesting that that was the only problem. We acknowledge that that section of road is not up to national highway standard and that it should be upgraded or replaced. The current study will help to determine which. It is a relatively dangerous road which should be treated with respect, but not everybody does treat it with respect. It is also a difficult section of road to police.

The Government will take short term action, but we cannot be involved in massive expenditure on the existing alignment if we are to build a new one or decide massively to upgrade the existing one. We will address that problem. Many of these issues will come out in the meeting on 16 October.

Mr Payze: The intersection in question is that of the main South Road with Patapinda Road/Seaford Road. My department has examined the location several times, but it is difficult to identify the specific problems. It has been suggested that traffic signals which would simply control the right of way would solve the problem, but I suspect that they would not and I have recommended to the Minister that it would be inappropriate to install signals there now. There is just not sufficient volume of traffic to justify that form of traffic control. We suspect that the installation of traffic signals would substantially increase the number of accidents there.

The problem seems to be one of judging speed or the gap between traffic on the main road. We have provided for storage in the middle. I have to concede that a person towing a caravan will have difficulty because he will not be able to store both vehicles in the middle of the road. Perhaps such a person would choose a safer route. We have provided storage and an indication of that facility in the middle of South Road to enable people to cross in two separate movements.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I think that we know what the problem is—speed, especially by heavy traffic travelling

down South Road. That is the general feeling of those who have consulted me.

Mr RANN: The Minister will be aware of the concern felt by the member for Ramsay (Hon. Lynn Arnold) and me about congestion in the Salisbury area, especially the Park Terrace part of the Salisbury interchange. We are also worried about continuing congestion in the area despite efforts by the STA to speed up movement through the crossing. What progress is being made on works to solve traffic problems in Salisbury town centre? The Minister will be aware that the member for Ramsay and I recently suggested interim measures and asked for plans for the over or under pass which are to be made public later this year.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am well aware of the representations made by the member for Ramsay and the member for Briggs. I have as a result directed the Highways Department to undertake some minor roadworks on the Salisbury highway and at Park Terrace to provide some relief. The works will be commenced this financial year. This is another example of our having to decide how much money to spend in the short term when long term resolution demands massive reconstruction in the Salisbury area.

Modifications to the traffic signals and the addition of another lane on the Salisbury Highway approach to the intersection with Park Terrace are proposed. The cost of the work is estimated at approximately \$130 000. A major road improvement proposal to alleviate the Salisbury centre traffic problems in the longer term is to extend Salisbury Highway over or under the railway line to meet Gawler Street north of the town centre and bypassing it to the west. These proposals which were prepared by the department and of which the honourable member is aware will be presented to the Salisbury council on 20 October, with the public display comment phase commencing on 29 October.

As to the construction work on that major improvement, I have announced that it will start in the 1989-90 financial year and the estimated cost is about \$13.5 million. It is a major program, but I do not expect that the short-term actions that are needed both from the STA and from the Highways Department, will overcome all the problems that the increasing traffic flow causes, but nevertheless they will go a long way towards providing a freer traffic flow for the honourable member's constituents. I understand that the STA changes to the signalling equipment have been effective and I am certain that the short-term measures taken by the Highways Department will be equally successful in alleviating the traffic problem.

Mr TYLER: Turning to Flagstaff Hill, I am interested in the building of Reservoir Drive at Flagstaff Hill. Is this on schedule; when is the first stage of the road due to open; and what impact is likely to be made on the other local roads, namely, Black Road, Chandlers Hill Road and Flagstaff Road, in particular?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Originally, the project was planned to extend from Black Road to Manning Road at an estimated total cost of approximately \$4 million. Subsequently, the project has been extended to Chandlers Hill Road, at a total estimated cost of \$6 million, inclusive of design costs and land acquisition. The honourable member would be well aware of the changed planning. The Federal Government will provide \$4 million for this project under the Australian Bicentennial Roads Development scheme. State funds will be allocated to ensure completion in mid 1988. Total expenditure to 30 June 1986 was \$1.703 million and proposed expenditure in 1986-87 is \$2.180 million, leaving approximately \$2.1 million expenditure in 1987-88. The total completion to Chandlers Hill Road will occur in

mid 1988. The first section from Black Road to Manning Road will be completed in early 1987.

Mr TYLER: What impact will the opening up of the first stage (and in the long term right through to Chandlers Hill Road) have on Flagstaff Road? I understand that there is likely to be some easing of traffic on Black Road and Chandlers Hill Road. Has the Highways Department looked at the overall impact on the other roads?

Mr Payze: It is not possible to quantify precisely that impact in terms of numbers of vehicles, but the primary object of Reservoir Drive in the section from Manning Road to Black Road was to provide a more direct facility for people living in and around the Aberfoyle Park area, so quite clearly the initial impact will be to reduce the traffic on both Manning Road and Black Road. I suspect that it would have very little effect on the traffic using Flagstaff Road, because the same people would use Flagstaff Road.

In terms of the extension of Reservoir Drive to Chandlers Hill Road, there could possibly be an exchange of traffic that now uses Chandlers Hill Road and South Road to get to Darlington Road. People may tend to use Reservoir Drive and Flagstaff Road. That would be a route choice and it is impossible to determine the extent of that shift, but we suspect that it would be of the order of only several thousand vehicles per day.

Ms LENEHAN: I refer to the intersection of Fullarton Road, Dequetteville Terrace, Wakefield Road and Kensington Road. Recent media articles suggested that there is a serious road safety problem at that corner, known as Britannia Corner. What action does the Government intend to take to address this matter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This intersection has been the subject of considerable public debate over the past couple of weeks. It is a difficult intersection, complicated by the number and direction of its approach roads, of various traffic movements through it and its proximity to property which precludes extensive land acquisition. It serves traffic movements both into the city and around it. It is not a straightforward crossing of two traffic streams, as the turning movements are exceptionally high.

The Highways Department's original planning investigation included an assessment of other alternative options; namely, traffic signals and grade separation. The decision was taken to develop the larger roundabout on the grounds that it was the most cost effective and environmentally acceptable option. The decision was endorsed by the then Department for the Environment and the three relevant local government authorities at that time.

In view of the most recent accident statistics, as the responsible Minister, I have sought a detailed report from the Commissioner of Highways. He has advised me that his investigation will include a total review of the traffic operations and accident history. It would therefore be premature at this stage to prejudge the conclusion of this review by making statements as to the actions which should be taken to address the alleged problems in more definitive terms.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to the South-Eastern Freeway and any future major capital project, what other methods of funding is the Government considering to fund that sort of project? In the future, funding from both the Federal Government and the State Government will be very tight. Is any consideration being given to toll roads or management and construction by the private sector?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is a very good question. We are very concerned about the reduction in funds available to the Highways Department to meet the responsibility with which it is charged. I think it is fair to say that some

10 years ago the Highways Department would construct some 400 kilometres of new road in South Australia per year. This year it will be able to construct only 40 kilometres of new road. Of course, the reason for this is two-fold: first, there are constraints upon the funds that are available to the authority; and, secondly, massive road building was undertaken 10 to 20 years ago, so the maintenance of that asset is now upon us.

We now have to spend enormous amounts of money to maintain the asset. That is in fact where the major effort of the Highways Department is directed at the moment, and not to do so would cause enormous problems for future Governments and future generations. We are concerned about the movement of Federal funds, because they have been reducing quite significantly in real terms. To some extent the State Government has tried to pick up some of those funds, but the Treasurer has made it quite clear that it is not his intention and that he does not feel that the State is able to meet the shortfall that has occurred as a result of the reduction in Federal funding. At this stage I have not considered, nor have I asked the Highways Department to consider, the possibility of a toll road, so I would not want anyone to feel that we had that prospect in mind.

We are well aware of toll roads and how they operate, particularly in New South Wales. I know that they were not so successful in Victoria. We do not have any proposition at the moment to introduce toll roads, but it is an option for a future Government to look at. I am advised that volumes of traffic in South Australia are so low as to make that proposition really non-viable.

At the moment, the majority of the construction work that we are doing, particularly our national highway program and some of the arterial roads and some ABRD work, is required to go out to the private road construction companies. So there has been a tremendous shift in recent years from a day labour work force in the Highways Department to private construction of our national highways.

This has been a policy followed by Federal Governments of both political persuasions. It causes considerable problems for me as Minister in charge of the Highways Department to see decreasing funds available for roadworks that we can do by day labour when we have a high day labour force. This is the reason why, over the past few years, there has been a significant reduction in employment in the Highways Department right across the board.

Mr INGERSON: With the progress of the third arterial road and the possible route of that road, what is the Government's intention with regard to flowing traffic further down that corridor? With the probable third arterial road, that traffic has to flow somewhere. What is the planned intention for that flow? Does it involve widening of the South Road, or is it a consideration of a corridor of some kind? Where will the traffic go with the development of that third arterial road?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The third arterial road itself will not generate any new traffic; it will just take traffic off the Main South Road and Lonsdale Road, resulting in more evenly distributed traffic flow. It will, in a sense, accommodate new developments in the south. There will be significantly more traffic in 10 years than now. I think that that is the point that the honourable member is making. Traffic will be distributed within the existing road grid.

Improvements will be made to South Road, for instance, and we will be looking at other major roads in that area. This Government, or future governments, will be able to keep options open sufficiently long enough to determine the transport needs that exist within that area at that time. I would not want to preclude any option. It may well be using

the existing road grids, or there may be a need for improved alternative transport, or provision of alternative transport modes. These decisions are best made closer to the time when the need exists. At the moment, all I can say is that we have plans to feed traffic through the existing traffic grid using the major arterial roads which do have, with some improvements, an unused capacity at the moment.

Mr INGERSON: The inference contained in that answer is that the Highways Department is not selling off, and does not intend selling off, properties in that old corridor described as the north-south corridor.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That decision has been made: those properties will be sold. Of the options available to any Government in the 1990s that will ultimately have to determine the mode or preferred traffic resolution of the problem, it will not have available to it the north-south corridor, because I have instructed the Highways Department to dispose of the land that we currently hold in the north-south corridor.

Mr INGERSON: We can say, then, that in two or three years there are not likely to be any properties left in that corridor?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That would be right. We certainly hope so, because a large part of our budget depends upon our ability to sell properties from Anzac Highway through to north of Sturt Road.

Mr INGERSON: Or Anzac Highway in the south?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

Mr INGERSON: Has the property owned by the Highways Department that is currently proposed for the entertainment centre been sold by the Highways Department, or does that involve an internal transfer? Is there a change of hands involving money?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That land has been sold to the Lands Department.

Mr INGERSON: For what figure?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will get that detail for the honourable member, but it was at market value.

Mr INGERSON: In one section of the yellow book there is mention that 65 per cent of jobs are now going out to tender. Does that 65 per cent relate to Federal funding or is it 65 per cent of construction work done by the department?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Commissioner to answer that question.

Mr INGERSON: The reason for asking the question is that there is a lot of comment coming from the private construction industry that at the moment there is less work going out to the private sector than there has been in previous years from the Highways Department.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am surprised at that comment, because I spoke to the Heavy Construction Federation and gave it an indication of our future road construction plans and the federation seemed fairly happy with that, although there are a couple of major programs which have already been committed and which will take up enormous funds in the next year or so.

The amount of work that goes out to the private sector, particularly in terms of Commonwealth funds, is increasing because the recent allocation of funds has been directed more towards national highway construction rather than local and arterial roads; this means that that will go out to private tender. I do not think that the construction industry in South Australia need concern itself about that. In South Australia we continue to put a higher percentage of our work out to private tender than does any other State in Australia, so the industry is very well looked after here in South Australia—much better than in other States, partic-

ularly (interestingly enough) Queensland and Tasmania. However, I think that Tasmania, which has traditionally been the major contractor for Federal road construction, is this year looking at private tender.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to a comment which has been made by the Local Government Association and which has also come to me from several small country councils. They are concerned about the lack of forward planning by the Highways Department as it relates to the contracts that local councils deal with on behalf of the Highways Department. Because they have only small gangs they are concerned that they do not know future plans and have asked me to question the Minister on whether quicker planning can be done so that they know whether they can hang on to those gangs now or in the future.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I acknowledge their concerns and am well aware of them. One of the difficulties is that our budgeting timetables in a sense coincide. We cannot advise local government authorities what funds are available to them in debit order work until we know exactly what are our funds from both State and Federal sources or until we have decided what debit order work we are able to allocate. We tried to have that ready prior to the Estimates this year, as I was criticised last year for not having it. I do not have it ready because, before I can make that public, I need to take it to Cabinet for general Cabinet information and approval. It is only a couple of days out because it will be in Cabinet on Monday. We are trying to do this as early as we can.

Local councils should not today or in the future rely upon the Highways Department funding to maintain its work force. We are in difficult times. We have our own responsibility to our own work forces, which we are reducing. There will be significantly less funds available for local government this year than last year for debit order work. There will be little debit order work, but I hope to be able to advise local councils of this early next week.

The answer to the general question as to whether or not we can do our planning is 'No'. The only way it can be sensibly addressed is for local government to do its budgeting later, but it has constraints. We have a problem. The best I can say to local government at this stage is that, in terms of debit order work, there is little of it and in future years when it arranges its budgets and work force it should do so without the expectation of the Highways Department being able to fund the maintenance of that work.

Mr INGERSON: The PAC made recommendations in relation to the new Act and, in particular, in regard to the Highways Fund. At what stage are those recommendations?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have been processing the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. We are in the process of drawing up a completely new Highways Act. Everyone agreed that the previous Act needed to be rewritten as it was cumbersome. It is not a small task. We have a draft Bill. The committee to review the Highways Act comprised of Derek Scafton, Director-General of Transport, Michael Knight, Commissioner of Highways, and Peter Emery, Deputy Under-Treasurer. That was established early this year. It has met several times and sought advice from other people including the consultant to the Public Accounts Committee, Mr Clark, in its examination of activities of the Highways Department, and officers of Crown Law. The next meeting in a week or so will consider a detailed document setting out requirements for a new Act to replace the Highways Act. I expect that the committee will be in a position to discuss its draft report in November or early December. It is progressing satisfactorily.

Mr INGERSON: As our road base has been decreasing for years and maintenance has often been deferred in favour of new roads, if road funds continue to decline at the current rate, what is the Minister's five-year estimate of the percentage of road funds given over to maintenance just to preserve what we have at the moment?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I would need to take that question on notice, but inform the honourable member that the priority has moved from new road construction into maintenance; otherwise we are building up horrendous problems for ourselves. We had a large construction program between 10 and 20 years ago. That road asset is now coming into need for maintenance. The priority of the department is moving away from construction to maintenance and, unless additional funds are made available specifically for road construction similar to what has happened in relation to the Mount Barker Road, the trend to maintenance as against construction will continue.

For 1986-87 the figure for maintenance and replacement construction accounts for approximately 57 per cent and improvement construction for 43 per cent of total maintenance replacement and improvement construction expenditure. For 1985-86, maintenance and replacement construction accounted for approximately 50 per cent. So, it is going up from 50 per cent to 57 per cent this year. My feeling is that that percentage will increase, but I will look at the question in detail.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to the 30 per cent drop in motor vehicle registrations. Since a significant amount of the highways fund is a dedicated fund, is the Minister concerned about the sums that have been placed into that fund this year?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will have to check out that matter. My understanding was a 30 per cent drop in new registrations and not re-registrations, so overall the registrations are consistent. Funds that will be available for high-

ways construction this year from motor registration are considerably in excess. I do not have the figures but will obtain them for the honourable member. It is the new registrations that are of concern and not re-registrations.

Mr INGERSON interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am satisfied with the funds going into highways from State sources because we have maintained our real effort in funding of roads. The area that has dropped in recent years is the Federal contribution, but there has been a need to take \$14 million out of consolidated revenue. The Highways Department has to service that debt—it is a capital loan. We are concerned about the funds available to us and it will remain a matter of worry for Ministers and the Highways Department until adequate funds, if ever again, are provided. The trend has been to reduce funds available for highways construction and maintenance. That is a trend all around Australia, because of the cost of maintaining and building highways grows at a rate faster than inflation.

The CHAIRPERSON: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—Highways Department,
\$17 200 000—Examination declared completed.

Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous, \$85 704 000—
Examination declared completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.56 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 9 October at 11 a.m.