

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 October 1983

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

PETITION: ACCOMMODATION FOR INTELLECTUALLY HANDICAPPED

A petition signed by 181 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop the Intellectually Disabled Services Council Incorporated from establishing accommodation facilities for intellectually handicapped persons at 21 Myall Road, Para Hills, and requiring notice in other areas where similar projects are contemplated was presented by Mr Trainer.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions asked in the Estimates Committees as detailed in the schedule that I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

QUESTION TIME

PETRO-CHEMICAL PROJECT

Mr OLSEN: During his talks in Tokyo with the Asahi Chemical Company, did the Premier give an assurance that natural gas from the Cooper Basin would be available for the petro-chemical project and, if he did not, will he now do so in view of the announcement yesterday about further proven reserves in the Cooper Basin? During my meeting in Tokyo in July with representatives of the Asahi Company I was informed that negotiations on the proposed petro-chemical project initiated by the former Government had been at a standstill since February because of uncertainty about gas supplies and therefore their inability to proceed to negotiate prices. While the original gas contracts approved by the Dunstan Government reserved 213.5 billion cubic feet of natural gas for the project, I understand that the A.L.P. has a policy which provides that the petro-chemical project may have to be deferred until further gas reserves are proved for South Australia. However, in his announcement yesterday, the Minister of Mines and Energy expressed confidence that sufficient gas would be discovered to fulfil all existing contracts.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question of supply, as the Leader has pointed out, is obviously an important element in the petro-chemical plant proposal, as was the question of price. He quite correctly states that feasibility work has been taken to an advanced stage and the question of an assured supply was obviously a crucial one for taking that to a further stage. At the time I met the Asahi Company in Japan the information that my colleague gave to the House yesterday was not known. Of course, it has always been the belief that there was sufficient gas in the Cooper Basin.

Indeed, in world terms the Cooper Basin is very much under explored and the success rate of the exploration indicated that there would be more than ample supplies available. In addition, the fracking exercises have opened up a greater potential for the reserves we had discovered. It was not until the producers formally told my colleague, as he announced yesterday, of their reassessment of supplies that

we could say with absolute certainty that the supplies existed. That advice has opened the way for the resumption of negotiations on the matter of supply and has brought the possibility of the establishment of the petro-chemical plant much closer.

TEA TREE GULLY FIRE TRUCK

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Premier say what help his Government will give to the Tea Tree Gully Country Fire Services to replace the fire truck that was lost in the Ash Wednesday bushfires this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter has aroused considerable interest and correspondence from the members for Newland and Todd and from the Tea Tree Gully Council. The State Government is willing to advance extra funds immediately to ensure that a replacement vehicle for the Tea Tree Gully C.F.S. is ready and in operation. Following the smooth and speedy disbursement of appeal funds to fire victims, as well as the other arrangements made in respect of natural disaster relief, I am most concerned about the delays in replacing the Tea Tree Gully vehicle and getting finances in order. The C.F.S. Board wrote to the Tea Tree Gully Council on 2 March offering to provide, on an interim basis, the full cost of replacing the fire truck burnt out during the Ash Wednesday fires. The C.F.S. Board took this action because it was concerned to minimise delays in replacing burnt-out vehicles. Similar letters were also sent out to the East Torrens and Gumeracha councils.

The C.F.S. Board received a reply from the Tea Tree Gully Council on 5 August (five months later) indicating that the council had already accepted a tender for the replacement fire truck. The council expected that the replacement vehicle would be available by early October and agreed to meet 50 per cent of the replacement cost (following deduction of the insurance payout on the destroyed vehicle). This arrangement would have complied with the usual policy for funding C.F.S. replacement equipment. I understand that the replacement vehicle will cost about \$105 000 and that the insurance payment is \$23 000, leaving a balance to be funded of \$82 000. However, the council has decided to purchase a fire truck of a higher standard. Unfortunately, these extra costs are unlikely to qualify for funding under the Commonwealth Government's natural disaster assistance scheme, under which the Commonwealth will provide 75 per cent of normal replacement costs, after deducting insurance payouts. State Governments provide 25 per cent of the costs under these arrangements.

In April this year I wrote advising that some of the appeal money might be available for vehicle replacement purposes. However, the Bushfire Appeal Committee, when considering the disbursement of money, decided against directing those funds in this way and said that appeal funds should only be used to assist victims and their families: that is, the appeal money would be used primarily to relieve cases of individual hardship and problems arising from the fire. In the event, those funds were fully committed and could not be applied to this purpose. Because of my concern that fire trucks should be ready, the State Government is willing to advance the total cost of replacing the burnt-out vehicle. That policy had been determined prior to the C.F.S. being advised.

This will ensure that the truck is on the road and able to respond to emergencies. The Government will then recoup, at a later date, the contribution from the Commonwealth and other parties which make up the sum total. Quite frankly, I must say that I have found the delays and the red tape both unnecessary and unhelpful. We had to look at audit requirements in relation to advances of this kind

and it is not a usual step to take, but I believe that it is important to advance the entire amount now in order to allow the Tea Tee Gully C.F.S. to get on with the job.

In general terms, honourable members should realise that this year there was a 30 per cent increase in the Government's allocation to the C.F.S. The allocation for publicity relating to bushfire prevention was increased by 90 per cent, and the allocation to research was increased by 40 per cent. In addition, members will be aware that the bushfire lottery conducted by the 'S.A. Great' campaign—I was involved in the launching of that—raised an extra \$100 000 for C.F.S. training and research. So, certainly massive efforts have been put into that area. That has been supplemented for instance by the S.G.I.C., which is producing a special fire prevention booklet and taking certain other steps. I believe in this coming season there will be a much higher consciousness of fires, their dangers, and how to avoid them, and let us hope that we can get through this season, whatever the weather conditions, without any major disasters.

NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the Premier's attitude to the sharing of future natural gas discoveries with New South Wales? Under what is known as the PASA future requirements agreement, a volume of 1 704 billion cubic feet of gas is scheduled for use by South Australian consumers between 1988 and 2006. According to the figures and information released yesterday by the Minister of Mines and Energy, I estimate that more than 1 100 billion cubic feet of gas still needs to be discovered to guarantee South Australia's gas needs until the year 2006. Under existing contracts, approved by the former Dunstan Government, all further gas discovered in the Cooper Basin is guaranteed to South Australia until the future requirements agreement is fulfilled, now that the A.G.L. schedule A requirements have been met.

In answer to a question yesterday, the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated that negotiations were continuing in relation to sharing of gas supplies with New South Wales. I assume this referred to gas discovered in excess of that needed to fulfil the PASA future requirements agreement. The Minister said earlier that he was confident they would be found. However, the discovery of significant supplies in addition to those needed for the PASA future requirements agreement will be of significant benefit to South Australian domestic and industrial consumers, and I therefore seek information from the Government as to the extent to which it contemplates sharing gas supplies with New South Wales beyond the year 2006.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question is, what is my attitude to sharing gas supplies with New South Wales. That will depend very much on the needs and contractual arrangements that go beyond that year, and of course the overall supply. All of those matters are the subject, as the Deputy Leader would know, of what are necessarily complex negotiations which my colleague referred to yesterday and, as he also properly pointed out, it would be extremely counter-productive if the Government's negotiating posture and progress of those negotiations were a matter of public debate and discussion at this time. Certainly, when it is appropriate, announcements will be made and I can assure the House and the public that they will be kept fully informed.

FLINDERS RANGES

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Tourism advise whether his Department has given any consideration to the

possible tourism potential of the rugged outback Flinders Ranges area around Parachilna and Beltana and, if so, can he advise me what might be planned for that area? I have been approached by a good constituent who assures me that the area is a very good example of Australian outback ruggedness, and he believes that, with a base at Parachilna, it could lend itself to four-wheel drive type tourism of some significance. I understand that the question of adequate safeguards in respect of the area's environment will have to be given some consideration.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government is very committed to promoting the Flinders Ranges as an ideal tourist destination, because it is one of the most magnificent sections of South Australia not only well known to South Australians or Australians but overseas. If anyone were to doubt my enthusiasm for the Flinders Ranges, I would suggest that he take the opportunity now to visit that area and look at the Flinders Ranges under its carpet of wild-flowers.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Before the off-road vehicles arrive.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes; it is a carpet of velvet. I know that some people do not like salvation jane or Paterson's curse. However, at present it adds to the attraction of the area. We work very closely with the Flinders Ranges Tourist Association to promote the various resorts and attractions within the ranges. However, I should point out to the member for Whyalla that we would be very concerned to have an influx of four-wheel drive or any off-road vehicles running uncontrolled through the area. Any visitors to the Flinders Ranges should stay on the main roads and stick to the approved camping spots because it is a very fragile ecological area, and could be very easily destroyed if there was uncontrolled visitation by tourists. So, in co-operation with the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Environment, the Department of Tourism is very anxious that what we have in the Flinders Ranges remains not only for this generation but for centuries ahead.

It is the responsibility of this Government and the people of South Australia today to ensure that the Flinders Ranges are so protected. Therefore, in answering the honourable member, I can assure him that we are very well aware of the Flinders Ranges and the various attractions. I am very sympathetic to the member's elderly constituent, because I have many elderly constituents in the area of Port Augusta and Port Pirie and, as I come from Quorn, in the middle of the Flinders Ranges, I know the love that the older people in that area have for those Ranges; it is shared by the young people. So, I appreciate his view and his desire to improve tourism in the Flinders Ranges. However, I would suggest to the honourable member that he advises his constituent that there are better controlled ways of promoting tourism in the area rather than to open it up for four-wheel drive vehicles. Of course, the Parachilna and Brachina area, right through to Beltana, is, as the honourable member pointed out, some of the best ranges country in South Australia, and I intend, as Minister, to do my best to see that it stays like that.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Is the agreement that the Premier has signed for the Adelaide railway station redevelopment contingent on a start to the project by July next year and, if not, what is the latest starting date contemplated in the agreement? I am not asking the Premier for details of the heads of agreement, which he is, I understand, considering releasing to this House. I am asking is it contingent upon a start by July?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the question of general details, I hope to be able to give such details, after my consideration, to the House next week. The agreement does contemplate a start before July 1984. The whole concept of the project is built around having a facility ready for operation in 1986. Obviously, if the starting date is much later than that there would be problems. If for some reason a start cannot be made before July 1984, then the whole matter will be up for renegotiation.

LAND SUBDIVISION

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning urgently review the current procedure for subdivision of land, introduced by the former Liberal Minister for Environment and Planning, for the purpose of speeding up the whole subdivision procedure? I have been contacted by a number of constituents who are involved in the housing industry and who have raised with me the question of the procedure for subdivision of land in the metropolitan area.

Certain constituents have expressed concern because considerable delays have occurred with the subdivision of land in which they have been involved, causing them great anxiety and tying up a great deal of money in the industry. They have been informed that the procedure introduced by the former Minister has caused a doubling in the time period applicable from the date of application to the time at which a subdivision is legally declared. I have also been informed of several cases in which the period has been up to seven or eight months from the date of application to the completion of the subdivision. I understand that the old procedure took no longer than three months, and it is considered that there ought to be urgent review of the process so that money that is tied up in subdivision development can be released for the creation of other jobs and other employment.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will be glad to hear that such a review has taken place. It has been completed, the results will be available to the honourable member and to all members of this place, and indeed to the public generally, in a day or two. A very brief history of this matter I think is in order. The Planning Bill passed by the previous Parliament among other things had as an objective the expediting of the processing of subdivision applications. The philosophy behind that was that the one-stop shop approval system should lead to a considerable speeding up in the processing of applications. Following the passage of that Bill there was concern on the part of local government and some of the lawyers practising in the relevant jurisdiction that in the early stages of the life of the legislation this might not happen: first, because they were concerned with certain aspects of the new procedure which might not operate in the way that they were intended; secondly, because, of course, there was a learning process through which we all had to go, that during that learning process people might not be able to work the mechanism as expeditiously as was intended, and that therefore no matter how good the mechanism nonetheless there would be delays.

In the light of this, members will recall that I suggested in October last year that indeed there should be no proclaiming of the legislation for a six-month period, to allow people to better educate themselves as to the new piece of machinery, and also so that there could be some modifications to the regulations if needed. That advice was not followed, and the previous Government proclaimed the legislation on the Wednesday prior to its going out of office. Very soon after coming into office the present Government decided that it should set up a committee to review this whole procedure. That committee has been in existence for

some time and it recently delivered to me a report which I placed before Cabinet last Monday. It is no secret that there have been problems in the processing of such applications because of the way in which the regulations operate, and also because people are learning. Mr Brian Turner, who, of course, is extremely well known and respected in the planning community and who was one of the members of the committee, in speaking to a public meeting some time ago indicated that, in his judgment, both as a person operating in the industry and also as a result of his experience on the committee, the effect of the new system had been to prolong the time of approval rather than to expedite it. Cabinet has approved the release of the report for public comment.

At this stage, Cabinet has not approved the recommendations therein, though it is obvious that a large number of them will eventually be approved. Many of them, of course, incidentally do not raise large issues of policy but make interesting suggestions in relation to the mechanics of the system, which should considerably improve it. I would hope to be in a position before this session ends to legislate, because there is a number of amendments which are recommended by the committee. There is a considerable number of recommendations for amendments to the regulations and also to the procedures followed through under those regulations.

As I say, the report will be available to honourable members, along with a briefing for anyone who would request one from my officers, in relation to this matter. The public will be invited to comment. In terms of the time table we would set I hope that an appropriate amending Bill will be placed before us before we get up at the end of this session of Parliament.

OVINGHAM ACCIDENT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I ask the Minister of Transport a question relating to the level crossing accident that occurred this morning at about 8.20 at Ovingham. What action has the Minister taken to prevent a recurrence of events that led to that level crossing accident at Ovingham this morning? Will the Minister inform Parliament whether railway staff were aware that vehicles were driving around the malfunctioning but lowered boom gates? If so, what action was taken to alert approaching trains?

I understand that when a previous train went through the Ovingham crossing the boom gates came down, the lights flashed and the bells rang. But, I also understand that the boom gates stayed down after the train had passed and were malfunctioning there for a considerable time. As a result of that, vehicles waiting to go over the crossing were held up for a considerable period.

I am not sure whether or not the lights were still flashing and the bells ringing, but vehicles certainly were driving around the lowered boom gates because there were no trains in sight. Then along came a train and hit one of the vehicles actually crossing the track. I have asked the question particularly in relation to public safety. It is important that this House be told whether or not railway staff were aware that the gates were malfunctioning and what action was taken to alert any approaching trains to the fact that vehicles were apparently crossing the crossing around the boom gates. This accident apparently was seen by a large number of people.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I heard about this accident this morning on the radio. I have not seen any report from the State Transport Authority at this stage, nor have I been given any details. I do understand that a full inquiry is being undertaken and I will be quite happy to obtain that report and present it to the House when it is received,

which I expect will be some time this afternoon. I point out that the Chairman of the State Transport Authority is on leave at the moment and that the Manager of the Authority is also absent today. But, I will bring down the report immediately I receive it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SHIPPING TRADE

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Marine inform the House of any initiatives or developments which may help to stimulate shipping trade to South Australia, given the importance and value of Port Adelaide shipping to the State? We have heard much about Japanese negotiations recently. However, I would appreciate any information the Minister can provide on any other developments.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am pleased to be able to advise the House that South Australia has gained another direct shipping service with a decision by Atlantrafik Express Service to include the Port of Adelaide in its around-the-world monthly schedule from December this year. The Atlantrafik Express Service call was negotiated by its agent in South Australia, South Sea Lines. The first Port of Adelaide call is set down for 20 December, and the vessel would start loading on the North America east coast on 9 November for the north-bound run. Although the service has been negotiated to handle tuna exports to the Italian port of Leghorn, with about 300 containers of tuna due to be shipped out between December this year and May 1984, it will also provide invaluable access to North American East Coast ports. As well, it would give entry through Spanish ports to feeder services to North Africa, Southern Europe and West African ports.

One of the most important aspects of this new around-the-world service is that it will provide direct links between North American East Coast ports. Until now we have been forced to ship through the port of Melbourne, involving both exports and imports, with all the heavy costs and time penalties that that involves. From December, the port of Adelaide will be within 32 days of St John, Canada, and the United States East Coast ports of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk and Savannah. As a substantial meat exporter to the United States, South Australia will then be able to reach directly its markets in that region. In addition, of course, a much wider range of South Australian exporters and importers will be able to use the new link to expand their activities across a much broader spectrum. I want to pay a tribute to the efforts of the South Sea Lines principal, Mr Bryon Farrelly, in obtaining that direct call to the Port of Adelaide.

CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Is the Premier aware that the lead time for planning international conventions is four years and for national conventions three years, and that on that basis the development of a marketing strategy for the proposed international convention centre should already be under way if bookings are to be obtained for the centre as soon as it opens in 1986? Is the Premier also aware that the Victorian Government has allocated more than \$1 million for marketing its proposed convention centre due for completion in 1986? Will the Premier assure the House that funds will be made available and a marketing strategy developed in consultation with the South Australian tourism industry as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matters are well in hand. It must be remembered, of course, that 1986 is the Jubilee 150 year, and many conventions, international sporting events, and so on, are to take place during that year. That year has been under plan effectively for about five years. Members might be interested to contrast that with planning for Victoria's 150-year celebrations which are starting at the end of next year; they have had all sorts of problems getting their act together.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Until the new Director of Tourism was appointed they had some major problems. The committee had not got going, and the honourable member is quite correct: that has certainly helped. I can assure the honourable member that the sort of planning that is necessary is under way. Obviously, we must look at the financial support that is required in these instances, and I think that the last Budget demonstrates that we are placing priority on tourism and tourism-related activities. I hope that we will have the capacity for that priority to increase and, despite the criticisms of the Opposition and its opposition to our revenue measures to give us that capacity, we certainly intend to increase the priority. The Victorian exercise is an interesting one. I would appreciate the honourable member's comments on that, because there has been a fairly major hitch in the planning and development of that project.

It has been based around the difficulty in getting approval for the establishment of a casino. I know that the honourable member may think that that is admirable, and she is probably feeling sorry that South Australia, unlike Victoria, is to be sullied by a casino. It was interesting, however, that the absence of a casino in Victoria, following the findings of the Connor Committee, has meant that the convention centre proposal has had to be downgraded from a 3 500 centre to a 2 500 centre or a centre with a capacity of even less than 2 000. This has caused considerable replanning and rethinking in Victoria, and there is considerable controversy over the matter. I assure the honourable member that our planning is well developed and well ahead of that of our rivals.

SCHOOL STAFFING

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Education comment on the contents of a circular letter, dealing with school staffing and dated 7 October 1983, sent by the South Australian Institute of Teachers to all members of the State Parliament? In part, the letter states:

I write in relation to possible reductions in school staffing in your electorate. The Education Department is currently involved in a displacement exercise which will reduce staffing in up to 200 schools in all parts of the State. Reductions will range from a fraction of a salary to up to seven or eight staff in some high schools. It is likely that approximately five schools will be hit in your electorate. Unfortunately, SAIT has not been provided with specific information on which schools will be affected.

The letter then goes on to urge members to seek various kinds of information from the Minister of Education or his Director-General. The letter concludes:

SAIT is informing the parent and school committees of the threatened cuts and of the need for educational resources to be maintained and improved.

I realise that some comments by the Minister on this letter appear in today's *News*.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was concerned that the Institute of Teachers chose to write this letter to most members. Interestingly enough, the member for Salisbury has not received a copy yet. I found it most unfortunate that the Institute chose to raise fears in the minds of many people about what would be happening in South Australian

schools next year. The letter contains some inaccuracies. For instance, I understand that members are told in the letter that there are five schools involved in each district (that is, that the number of schools is the same for every district), whereas I know that at least two members who have received the letter have fewer than five schools in their districts, so I do not know how the figure was arrived at.

Then there is the implication that, in fact, the Institute will not be provided with a list of schools where the displacement procedure will apply. That is not correct. The displacement procedures followed by the Education Department are the subject of negotiation between the Institute and the Department. That was the case under the previous Government, and it is still the case under this Government. We have renegotiated the displacement procedures this year, and we believe that they are better this year than they were last year. That is indicative of our willingness to discuss this matter with the appropriate employee association (the Institute), and indeed we will be making available a list of schools where displacements are to take place when the list is completed, as I am reported as saying in this afternoon's *News*. I stand by that commitment. It is right that the Institute should be given a list of schools, and for the Institute to imply that it has been refused such a list is incorrect.

Further, the Institute indicates that, as a result of the displacement exercise, staffing will be reduced in up to 200 schools. The complete list is not yet available: we are awaiting one more region to provide information on this matter, but it is clear that the number of schools where displacements will take place is only about half the 200 referred to by the Institute: it is about 100, which means that only one in seven schools throughout South Australia will be affected by staff displacement.

Interestingly enough, this Government has the policy of maintaining teacher numbers in the education system. We spelt that out before the last election, and I am sure that all members agree that we have achieved this in the Budget most recently debated in this House. That, of course, in a situation of declining primary enrolments, means there are more staff available per student in the primary sector than otherwise would be the case. The projections are for next year that nearly 250 schools in South Australia will actually have more staff as a result of the extra staffing resources available. We have had a rediscussion on staffing formulae for the various sectors of education in which the Institute of Teachers was involved, and they clearly show that in the vast majority of cases schools are maintaining their staff position or are better off than they would have been had the old formula been applied. So, I have to say that it concerns me that that letter has been sent to members of Parliament. I know that it has also been sent to parent and school committees. I am informing members now that it is inaccurate, and I hope that they will take the opportunity, when meeting with school councils with which they are associated, to inform them of the inaccuracies of the contentions made in the letter.

LIGHTBURN AGREEMENT

Mr BAKER: Will the Premier say what Government moneys have been provided by way of grant and interest-free loans for the purchase of the Lightburn property at Novar Gardens by an overseas investor, and under what conditions were such moneys made available?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have those details in front of me, but the incentives offered in the case of the Lightburn agreement were those encompassed within the ordinary incentives given by the Department of State Development

under our various industry incentive schemes. One of the great features of the Lightburn purchase, of which I am glad the honourable member is aware, is that it represents a success for the Government in terms of the business migration scheme that the Commonwealth Government introduced. There were a number of options as to the future of the Lightburn company: in its present operation it was in receivership and would have closed, with nothing left except the real estate that surrounded it. A number of propositions were put forward for the redevelopment of that property, but none as good as the one received from the Malaysian businessman, Mr Varghese, to take it over as an operating concern, pump some capital into it, and get it on its feet again. It was a very welcome investment indeed.

Mr Varghese, in making that investment, was entitled, as is any business in this State, to apply for various incentive assistance from the State Government, which he received. Of course, time will tell whether that has been successful, but certainly it indicates the value that that scheme has for industry restructuring and the injection of capital, where it cannot be found from local sources, and where an overseas investor is willing and able, not only to invest, but to make his residence here and bring with him his capital, can only benefit the State of South Australia.

LAMPS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide information concerning a range of new lamps currently available and which appear likely to offer savings in costs as compared with the conventional incandescent globes currently in use? Recent advertisements in the press indicate that lamps of a much lower wattage rating can be used to give the same amount of light and thus enable an energy saving to be made. Will the Minister investigate the considerable savings which can be obtained through the use of those globes in Government instrumentalities in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member is referring to a globe or lamp which is now available and is in effect a miniature fluorescent type light. The structure is such that it contains an encapsulated ballast and starter. The point to note is that, comparing them with incandescent lamps, certainly an energy saving can be made because the given amount of light from a globe might be perhaps of the order of a quarter of that of an incandescent light, that is, the energy being expended or consumed. However, if one compares the new type of lamp with the low-energy normal shaped fluorescent lamp which is available, the position is somewhat different and it is less likely that an energy saving could be made.

Notwithstanding that, at least one brand of this lamp now available is such that it will fit in most cases in standard light fittings which have been using incandescent lamps. Accordingly, it may be to the desire of the consumer to make such a saving. I think that the honourable member also asked me a question in relation to possible savings that may be made in lighting in Government buildings. I believe that most of the lighting in Government buildings is fluorescent these days, anyway, in the more modern buildings. Perhaps the energy savings he seeks would not be available because, where low energy fluoros of the standard type are available, they can, of course, be used in a similar fitting. I have only the knowledge that I have given to the House so far, and I will peruse the honourable member's question more carefully and make sure that, if there is any additional information, I will obtain it for him and the House.

BIRTH, DEATH, AND MARRIAGE CERTIFICATE RATES

Mr EVANS: Will the Premier introduce a scheme whereby people wishing to trace their family history can acquire copies of birth, death and marriage certificates at a reduced rate? An opportunity has been given to people who wish to trace their family history to submit that family history to the committee which he is setting up in relation to the Jubilee 150 year celebrations to publicise that history. The cost of certificates has recently risen from \$6 to \$10 and, if people are looking for, say, 20 or 30 certificates to trace their family history accurately (and I might say that extracts are no good: it has to be the full certificate), it runs into many hundreds of dollars.

Will the Premier consider a scheme (and it will need to apply only until December, because that is the cut-off date for people submitting their family histories to the committee) whereby a reduction can be made so that people in poor circumstances (and it is not only the rich who wish to trace their family histories) are able to do so within their monetary constraints?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The suggestion which the honourable member raises is an interesting one and worthy of examination, and I will undertake to have it considered.

SPORTS GRANTS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport give the House details of grants recently made under the Government's equipment subsidy programme for sport? I was advised recently by the Minister that four such grants were made to sporting bodies in my electorate. Those were: \$500 to the Woodville District Baseball Club; \$400 to the Henley and Grange Youth Club; \$300 to the Henley and Grange Amateur Swimming Club; and \$240 to the Y.M.C.A. West Gymnastics Group. Will the Minister inform the House of the total number of grants that were made and the purpose of those grants?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am happy to provide details for the honourable member and the House, because even though the amounts mentioned individually may seem small, in total the equipment subsidy scheme plays a very important part in assisting sporting clubs throughout the community. Two issues of grants are made a year, and recently I approved grants totalling some \$37 000, while in April of this year I approved grants totalling about \$12 000, making a total of about \$50 000 for the year.

Mr Becker: It is not enough.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I know that it is not enough: we would like to be able to provide more; nevertheless it is playing a very important part in providing equipment to small clubs. We usually like to assist developing clubs and new clubs and teams by providing them with equipment to enable them to promote their sports. The total amount paid for grants is about \$50 000 a year. For the information of the member for Henley Beach I point out that the grants are usually given through the relevant State sporting organisation, following an application to the Department of Recreation and Sport.

TAMA PLAZA, JAPAN

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Was the Premier or his staff involved in the collection, acquisition, freighting or displaying of Australian products sited at Tama Plaza, Japan, a location which the Premier visited during his recent overseas trip? If so, will he say whether either he or his staff

were responsible for any part of the obtaining and/or displaying of Fosters beer on the produce stand? If the Premier or his staff were not involved with the displaying of that Victorian-based product used to prop up South Australian Berri fruits and Barossa wines on the produce stand, can he tell the House who was responsible for the placement on the stand of that Victorian product?

A rather irate executive of a South Australian based company has reported to me that a number of Australian-based products were indeed displayed on that occasion, and he drew my attention to a report identifying the products associated with that display. I have a copy of that report. Although I will not refer to it now in detail, I believe that the concern of South Australian based companies is justified in this instance. Whether or not the Premier or his staff were responsible for the displaying of that Victorian product is one thing, but whether the Premier had any opportunity to take a South Australian beverage of that kind overseas and have it displayed there is something that is of concern and, indeed, of interest to the company that contacted me. An explanation from the Premier about this rather unusual situation as reported would be very much appreciated by industry representatives and me.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think there is any real mischief about it. Certainly, neither my staff nor I had anything to do with the fact that Fosters lager was available at that exhibit. The occasion was, of course, the first anniversary of the opening of a very large regional shopping centre in Tokyo called Tama Plaza, and as part of the promotion, it was decided to make it an Australian occasion. But, more particularly because of the efforts of SAPRO, the South Australian Wine and Food Promotion Organisation, which is a combination of Government and private companies promoting South Australia in Japan, SAPRO was able to induce the Tama Plaza promoters to make a special display of South Australian products, particularly wine and South Australian foods. Berri fruit juices, of course, is one thing that has been referred to, with canned fruit and various other things.

My purpose in taking part with the Australian High Commissioner in that promotion, which got very wide press coverage in Japan, and Tokyo particularly, was to promote South Australian products under the auspices of SAPRO. When I arrived at the display (in fact as part of the promotion) someone said, 'All Australians like beer,' and steered me towards this pile of Fosters lager cans. I beat a hasty retreat and immediately moved to the wine bar, where South Australian wine was being served. In fact, the promotion was very much conducted around the South Australian product section.

The member's question gives me an opportunity to say that SAPRO has been quite successful. It is a fairly long-term project. It was commenced under the previous Government. I certainly congratulate that Government on the efforts it made to get this organisation, in association with the private companies, going.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: They didn't promote South Australian products so much on this occasion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They did not have control of particular aspects of this exhibit, which was part of an Australian promotion but they had been successful in having a specifically South Australian wine corner set aside in the wine shop in this plaza and in a number of other areas, the significance of that being that it specifically talks about South Australian wines and displays the wines of South Australian companies.

Our marketing purpose, of course, in Japan, is to try to get Australian wine seen very much as South Australian wine and a South Australian product. That is the purpose of the SAPRO organisation. As to the company that the

member has been contacted by—and he has not named it—I suppose if one is talking about Fosters lager one could guess the company or companies involved. I sampled both their products and enjoyed them. I am sure they could find a market in Japan. I suggest that if they are not already part of the SAPRO organisation they should look seriously at it. If the honourable member would like to put them in touch with me I will certainly be able to provide them with some details.

STORM WATER DRAINAGE

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Local Government tell the House whether there are any proposals to amend existing local government regulations to give councils the power to control stormwater run-off other than from the roofs of buildings? I have been contacted by many residents coming from three of the local councils within my electorate who have had problems in recent months with continual flooding. On investigating what sort of action could be taken in respect to the councils concerned it became apparent that there was no section which would cover this particular problem. If we look at the Local Government Act, 1934-1972, we see that section 665 talks only of controlling run-off from the roofs of existing buildings. What action is being taken to control stormwater run-off?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this question. Control of stormwater run-off from buildings on to land in other occupations is a very complex issue. My Department has received many complaints from councils and from the occupiers of the land complaining that present controls do not give councils sufficient power effectively to ensure that stormwater from land in one occupation does not detrimentally affect land in other occupations. My officers are presently discussing with the Local Government Association amendments to the building regulations to control future building works and the drainage from those works and in addition what amendments are necessary to the Local Government Act to cater for the period between 1978 and the present to ensure that where errors have been made in the past they can be satisfactorily corrected.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

Mr LEWIS: My question is also directed to the Minister of Housing. Was the particular officer in the Attorney-General's Department whom the Minister said vetted his pecuniary interest return the same officer who was made available to all members to advise on their returns and, if not, is the Minister prepared to name the officer who vetted his return?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The answer to the first question is, 'No', and the answer to the second question is, 'I am not prepared to name that officer.'

TAPEROO BEACH

Mr PETERSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what specific action he intends to take to restore the foreshore and beach at Taperoo? An officer of the Coast Protection Board has told me that \$8 000 is set aside this year for work on the beach at Taperoo and \$13 000 is set aside to restore a car park. I believe that spending \$13 000 at the moment on a car park at Taperoo would be an absolute waste of money because the beach—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is debating.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, I was referring to the fact that \$13 000 has been allocated for work on a car park, even though there is no access to the beach at the moment. The expenditure of \$8 000 would barely provide access to the beach. Some recovery of the beach resulted from the recent pumping and dredging work that was necessary to maintain access to the North Haven harbor, but this has barely covered one end of the beach. At the moment people cannot get access to the beach because the area is full of mosquitoes, and snakes have already been seen there.

At the time of the last State election a pamphlet was circularised prominently in my district in which the A.L.P. candidate and the Premier were highlighted in a photograph, and an undertaking was given by them that the beach at Taperoo would be restored. That implied undertaking has been pointed out to me over and over again by my constituents. Could the Minister please tell my electorate whether that undertaking will be honoured?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A little over a year ago I can recall that the Premier and I inspected this area, and we certainly realise that there is a problem with it. Can I take it that what the honourable member is saying is that he would prefer the whole \$21 000 being spent on the beach area at this stage?

Mr Peterson: It would be better than wasting it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: What I should do is to suggest gently to the honourable member that he invites me to go down and look at the area. With the improved weather I am sure we could have a barbecue on the beach. If he would like to provide the meat, I would provide the Coca-Cola.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This sounds rather like McNamara's picnic, and it should cease.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Mr Speaker, I am constrained to remind you that McNamara had a band. I will give the honourable member an opportunity to persuade me that the expenditure should be modified in the direction that he sees as being desirable.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REGISTER OF INTERESTS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr EVANS: When I completed my pecuniary interest return I omitted one item of interest. I have informed the Clerk of that interest, which is a piece of land that my wife and I purchased about 30 years ago. We intend to occupy that piece of land permanently in the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the picnic atmosphere ceases, we will proceed with the business of the day. Just so that I am clear, other members have indicated in a way that they might want to make personal explanations. Before calling on the business of the day I will put the formal question. Does any member wish to make a personal explanation?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you for the opportunity, Mr Speaker. I did intend to make a personal explanation but, following your amendments to the initial copy, I do not seek leave to do so.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The **SPEAKER**: Call on the business of the day.

TERTIARY EDUCATION AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. **LYNN ARNOLD** (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Tertiary Education Authority Act, 1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. **LYNN ARNOLD**: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes that the Tertiary Education Authority Act, 1979, be amended so as to:

- (1) Provide that there shall be not less than seven nor more than nine members of the Authority.
- (2) Repeal the provisions of the Act relating to the Accreditation Standing Committee.
- (3) Make certain minor alterations with respect to financial reporting and to the name of the Department of Technical and Further Education.

The Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia was established in July 1979. Its membership appointed by the Governor is:

Chairman—full-time
Deputy Chairman—full-time or part-time
three members—part-time
The Authority's functions are:

- to co-ordinate the activities of the universities, colleges of advanced education and institutions of technical and further education which form the tertiary education system;
- to advise the South Australian Minister of Education, Commonwealth agencies and relevant educational institutions on the nature and scale of tertiary education required by the State, the resources needed and the efficient use of those resources.

The Authority is empowered to accredit (i.e. certify the suitability and quality of) courses offered in the advanced education sector and many of those given in the TAFE sector. Its Act specified that in considering accreditation of courses the Authority must have before it the advice of the Accreditation Standing Committee.

During 1981-82 the operations of the Authority were reviewed by an independent committee. That committee concluded that the Authority's functions should be largely unchanged. It considered, however, that the Authority's membership should be extended and that the Accreditation Standing Committee set up by the Act was no longer necessary. In both respects the Authority and the institutions of tertiary education concurred with the committee of review.

1. Composition of the Authority

As the agency responsible for the co-ordination and effectiveness of the tertiary education system as a whole the Authority must often deal with issues where the interests of particular institutions or groups do not coincide. While it always consults involved parties and seeks expert advice, the Authority must ultimately take impartial decisions within a reasonable period of time.

It is therefore appropriate that its membership should be relatively small and should not include representatives of the educational institutions, staff associations, student bodies and others whose interests may come before it. Nevertheless, the present membership of five has been found to limit the range of expertise and experience available to the Authority in evaluating the advice of its various committees and

secretariat. This is particularly so if a member is absent for any significant period. It is proposed therefore to augment both the number and capacities of members by adding up to four more part-time members.

It is intended that the additional members would be selected on the basis of knowledge and experience of one of the three sectors but not as representatives of institutions. Members of governing councils or distinguished persons who are knowledgeable of but who no longer have connections with particular institutions would be appropriate. Comparable agencies in other States are similarly constituted.

2. Accreditation

The second major amendment arises from developments in accreditation procedures which have occurred since the Authority's establishment. At that time it was thought necessary that accreditation of courses should be based upon wholly external evaluation by the accrediting agency (i.e. the Authority in South Australia). Such arrangements were introduced throughout Australia in 1972-73 with a view to enhancing the recognition and status of the qualifications of the then newly established colleges of advanced education. It was thought appropriate in 1979 that the Authority should be seen to be advised by a formal committee established under its Act.

More recently it has been widely argued that the institutions are now sufficiently mature in their educational standards and organisational practices to be entrusted with the evaluation of their own courses. The role of the external accrediting agency would then be one of ensuring that the institutions do in fact follow appropriate procedures in developing and evaluating their courses.

The Authority in line with developments in all other States is developing procedures for developing course assessment to the institutions while retaining the actual power of accreditation. Under such arrangements a 'visible' statutory advisory committee is unnecessary and the incorporation of its membership and functions in the Act is an impediment to efficient operation. The Authority which will itself include a greater range of expertise when it is enlarged will continue to seek expert and impartial advice on academic issues but without the unnecessary constraints of the provisions in the Act.

3. Other Changes

There are also minor amendments which should be made to the Act. At present the Authority is required to report each year on its activities in the preceding calendar year, and the report must include its accounts. Consequently, complete accounts must be prepared twice each year: first, for the financial year, as for Government departments and other Government agencies, because of the need to access grant levels for the ensuing financial year; secondly, for the calendar year, to be audited for incorporation in the annual report. The effects of this include:

- an inefficient use of resources without the gaining of any useful additional information;
- potentially misleading audited statements due to the 'reporting' year being six months out of step with the 'funding' year;
- the Auditor-General's Report to 30 June each year includes a statement on the Authority's finances which is six months 'older' than the other statements in the report.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends a reference in section 5 of the principal Act to 'the Department of

Further Education', which is now called the Department of Technical and Further Education. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act, increasing the membership of the Authority from seven to nine members. Clause 5 makes consequential amendments to section 11 of the principal Act. Clause 6 repeals sections 17 and 18 of the principal Act. These sections established the Accreditation Standing Committee and provided its functions. Clause 7 amends section 25 of the principal Act by providing that the accounts included in the Authority's report to the Minister shall be in respect of the financial year preceding the submission of the report. Clause 8 makes an amendment to schedule three similar to that made by clause 3 to section 5.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill be extended to 17 November 1983.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1212.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to use this opportunity to explain some of the history that had led up to the present dilemma of the Government, of the Samcor Board, and of all persons involved in the operation of the Samcor works at Port Lincoln. That works has operated for about 55 years. An old works, it has been the subject of many Government inquiries and investigations to assess whether it should remain open and whether it provides for the general community a service sufficient to justify the expenditure of taxpayers' money to retain it.

Over the past fortnight, the future of the works has again been brought to public attention. During the Estimates Committee debate, reference was made to the strong rumours circulating in the meat industry (that is, among exporters, producers, processors and employees in the meat industry) that the Port Lincoln works would close. Apparently, the fear that the Port Lincoln works was to close was common conversation among meat industry employees not only in my district but throughout the State, including Murray Bridge. I am concerned about this fear for the future of the works, as are the operators and the employees there. If ever anyone needed a boost of confidence with this continual threat of closure hanging over such an operation as Samcor, it is now.

Some years ago when this matter was raised I took up the question with the Premier of the day (Hon. Des Corcoran). Mr Corcoran said to me, 'If we had to consider this operation on a purely dollar-and-cents basis, it would not be viable and therefore should be closed. However, many other factors must be considered, including the employees, the effect that closing would have on the local community, the unemployment problem in the area, the employment opportunities that might or might not be available to people displaced by the closure, and the spin-off effect on the town

of Port Lincoln and the local community from the generation of income.' In other words, Mr Corcoran said that the question was not simple but complex.

That was a fair assessment and it represented the genuine belief of most people. During the term of the Liberal Government, the Minister of Agriculture called for another report on the Port Lincoln works. Subsequently, he received a report recommending that the works be upgraded so that the standard of hygiene there would be sufficient to satisfy the United States Department of Agriculture export licence standards. Incidentally, that standard is amongst the highest in the world. With the higher standard operating, processed meat from this works would have access to any market in the world, because it would satisfy any standard of hygiene. The Government of the day challenged the local producers and processors to demonstrate that they wanted the works kept open. A comment was made (quite justifiably) that the producers had not been patronising the works to the best of their ability. It was also said (equally justifiably) that the exporters and the processors were not giving of their best.

Under the threat of the then Minister of Agriculture that, if locals did not support the works, it would have to close, the future of the works was in doubt. The locals have responded to the challenge in a way that reflects great credit not only on the State organisation of the United Farmers and Stockowners, but also on the entrepreneurial capabilities of the local Samcor Manager (Mr Peter Hubbard) and on the many other people involved in trying to ensure that the works operated efficiently. So, there has been a tremendous uplift in the Port Lincoln Samcor works and its operations.

In 1977-78, the deficit on the operations of the works was \$1.3 million, whereas last year that deficit had been reduced to \$537 000 on the overall operation of the works and to a working deficit of \$330 000. That is a marked improvement since 1977-78, especially considering the dramatic inflationary effects on wages and costs and operational costs generally that have been experienced. So, there has been a tremendous response by the producers, by the producers' organisation, and by the processors at the Port Lincoln works.

When these latest rumours began to circulate, those persons who had, to put it in the vernacular, busted their boiler in doing their best for the works were obviously insulted, and with good reason because they had taken up the challenge issued by the previous Government and done their best to promote the works. Having succeeded to the best of the Government's expectations, they were virtually told that they were not pulling their weight.

There was an element of insult associated with the remarks made about the closure of the works and the lack of operation. It is all very nice to tell the producer organisations that they must support the works but, the moment a contract of sale is signed for any stock, that stock is no longer in the control of the producer: it becomes the property of the buyer whether that person be a meat processor, an agent or anyone else. The moment that the stock becomes the subject of a contract of sale a producer loses any right to direct where that stock shall be processed. He can make a request or take a penalty rate with a view to having stock go through certain works, but he cannot direct that that shall happen.

For the Government of the day to point the finger at producers and say, 'You are not supporting the works; you must do so, otherwise the works will close,' is being a little unfair. One should look at the efforts of the processors in their patronage of the works. I would like to add a word of praise particularly to the proprietors of Freez-pak and Matador Meats who have been very loyal to the Port Lincoln meatworks. Freez-pak has operated out of its principal base of Port Lincoln for many years and has allowed an outlet for much of the old stock on the peninsula. Freez-pak has

operated the boning rooms and taken the aged mutton off the chains of Samcor and processed the boneless mutton from those works. That has been a tremendous service to the community. What would happen to that stock if there was not an outlet and an entrepreneurial exporter able to develop that sort of market? When that is taken into account, one must add a word of praise to that organisation.

However, a matter coming into the category, one might say, of a disaster involves Matador Meats, which started operations in South Australia on Monday 2 October: on 6 October a suggestion was made that there could be no guarantee that the works would continue. For a new company having just commenced its operations and committed between \$30 000 and \$40 000 of its own money to be told, four days after the commencement of its operations, that the works may close down was indeed a tremendous shock to that company, to put it mildly.

On that basis there was a problem area where we had an enterprising Melbourne-based company. Port Lincoln is the only place in South Australia from which that company operates, and it does so only because the manager of those works can provide outstanding service to that company, and Samcor at Port Lincoln was the only place in South Australia which could provide boning facilities. So, through the efforts of the local manager a new company was brought to South Australia to operate in the meat industry where facilities were able to be provided on that basis. If the Port Lincoln works should close, and I sincerely trust and hope that it does not, Matador Meats would pack up its bag and leave South Australia, because there is no alternative open to it. It would go to Western Australia or New South Wales, because nowhere else in South Australia can facilities be provided at this stage. So, Matador Meats was concerned about that suggestion.

I could ascertain from a number of other processors their views on the Port Lincoln works. Lincoln Bacon Specialists, ancillary to the works, has been operating for as long as the works have been established, and that company has processed much of the pig meat produced on Eyre Peninsula. I must declare a pecuniary interest in this matter, because I am in partnership with my brother in the production of pigs. With the exception of two injured sows, the entire production from our little piggery has gone through the Samcor works, not just through Lincoln Bacon Specialists but through a number of operators who kill through those works. I say that because I do have a remote interest as a producer in the works as well as an interest in the overall community.

Another interesting sideline to the Samcor operation which members may have noted from the limited press coverage it has received is that the Port Lincoln operation has been relatively efficient, so much so that a trial shipment of 550 lambs from Western Australia was road freighted, processed in Port Lincoln, packed in chiller vans and transported back to Western Australia, and this was done more cheaply than the statutory marketing authority in Western Australia could do that itself. That has angered the Western Australian operator, but needless to say, ridiculous as it may sound, it was due to the entrepreneurial and enthusiastic action of the local manager and his operators. It was through his contacts that this sort of additional business was able to be negotiated, and I believe there is potential for much more through that avenue.

Furthermore, Freez-pak has the avenues available. It has had trial shipments to assist in the beef chain production, and hopefully some further improvement will occur there. These works provide a service. They were developed some 54 or 55 years ago and designed with an over-capacity to be able to provide a service to the community, so that in the event of a drought or fire, or some other natural disaster which would require the slaughter of excessive numbers of

stock, that facility would be available in South Australia to handle it. All the animal liberationists would be on our backs if some sort of facility was not available to do that in the State. Can one imagine in the event of the next drought—we all know the next drought must come in the not too distant future—with dying stock in paddocks, whether from starvation or any other cause, farmers having to shoot and bury such stock wherever it should happen to fall, not being able to process it through any facility in the State. By forfeiting the right of any service works to operate in this State, that situation would develop.

We come then to a commercial operation which can be expected to operate on a commercial basis throughout the year, but that cannot occur because of the peaks and troughs of production throughout the year. It is fair to say that there is not the killing capacity in South Australia at this very moment to cater for the flushes of the season if the Port Lincoln works did not exist. I put this to the Minister yesterday in a deputation we had with him as to the situation regarding the flush of the lamb season in South Australia should Port Lincoln cease operations. I know what would happen to our lamb season: it would be devastating. Lamb prices at the Port Lincoln market are about the same as those available at Samcor, Gepps Cross. If killing facilities were not available at Port Lincoln, those lambs would have to be road-freighted to Adelaide at a minimum cost of \$2.50 a head and up to \$3.50 a head for the larger animals.

Mr Becker: Or ship them over.

Mr BLACKER: They could be shipped over, as the member for Hanson says, but if they come by road they are 12 to 14 hours on a truck. So, a producer is faced with paying \$2.50 minimum per head of stock that was on a truck for 12 to 14 hours, a factor that would knock off the bloom of sheep \$1.50 to \$2 a head.

Mr Becker: How much weight would be involved?

Mr BLACKER: I could not say, but one could estimate possibly three or four kilograms. However, I would not buy into that because I do not know the specifics. In any case, we are talking about several dollars a head lost to the producers if stock has to be processed through Adelaide and not through a facility which is available, that is, if in fact there is killing space available. Some of the operators working out of Port Lincoln now try to do killings through Gepps Cross, Adelaide, and are unable to do so. One operator this week wanted to get 800 lambs through Gepps Cross but could only get less than half that number, and this is the dilemma. Therefore, any Government which says or even suggests that the closure of the works will assist Samcor or an operation elsewhere is not being completely true concerning the overall effect.

So far I have been talking about only the meat side of the Samcor operation. Samcor provides a number of other facilities such as refrigerant to Kraft, I think, in connection with its fish processing. It provides chiller space for three of the tuna companies and also, on the manufacturing side, it handles the fish meal of the waste products from the fish factory. Therefore, there is an overall effect involving more than merely the fat lamb, pig or beef industries.

When one gets back to the real crux of the matter, that is, the employment side, we have a very serious situation indeed. There are 205 people employed at Port Lincoln in the Samcor works and its directly associated ancillary industries. By that, I mean that there are 120 people on the floor at Samcor, the office staff, 35 involved in Lincoln Bacon Specialists, 30 involved with Matador Meats and Freez-pak, and some eight or 10 in the skin and hide section. Therefore, approximately 200 people are employed on a permanent basis. During the flush of the season, that 200 rises to just on 300. So, to have employment opportunities for 200 permanents and another 100 casuals disappear from the

scene will have tremendous ramifications for a city the size of Port Lincoln. I think that we can all appreciate that because, should a company employing that number of people in the metropolitan area cease operation, it would certainly hit headline news. With the compounding effect of a small city, the situation becomes even more serious.

In an endeavour to get some assurance from the Government, I arranged a deputation with the Minister of Agriculture, which met yesterday, and I must say that we got a good hearing from the Minister. He gave us an hour and three quarters of his time, and we put to him all the ramifications of a potential closure of that works. I believe that he took the matter very seriously, and he indicated to that deputation that it was not his desire to close the works, but he had to meet a bottom line (for want of a better term) or a level at which the taxpayer could reasonably expect to cover a deficit in funding. I believe that much of the discussion that took place was designed around a very real objective of keeping the works operational. The Minister left no doubt in anyone's mind that he expected the producers, the processors and the exporters to patronise the works to the best of their ability, and I think that that was a fair statement.

However, I believe also that some of the information given to the Minister about the works was not complete, because I do not believe that some of those entrepreneurial activities which I explained to the House earlier (and there are many others that I could relate) have in fact been relayed to the Minister. I am concerned that there is some element within the Samcor operation itself, be it at board level or some other level, which is not particularly concerned about whether Port Lincoln survives or sinks. It is on that basis that I express the greatest concern, because very genuine efforts are being made by most—the producers, processors, exporters and employees—who I believe deserve on this occasion the highest commendation. I believe that, as their product hits the Sydney market, or wherever it is going, the knife work on the carcasses will receive high commendation. To that extent, the people concerned deserve a pat on the back and, more particularly, some encouragement for their efforts in trying to make the works the best operational works that they possibly can.

We get back to the overall problem: Port Lincoln was established as a service works, designed for an over-capacity which would never be met in any conceivable way. There is no way in which the producing sector of the Eyre Peninsula community could breed, bring in and fatten the number of stock to provide a 12-month guarantee of throughput: that would be an impossible situation. Therefore, the dilemma for the Government, and I guess for everyone else involved, is where to draw the line between what is a reasonable expectation of the extent to which the Government should subsidise or assist by way of deficit funding and where the commercial operations should lie. I maintain quite strongly that there is a very sound case for a service works to be operated by the State Government in South Australia, even if it is to cater for only the disaster years we have occasionally, although we would like to think that we would never have them.

It has been suggested that the service works of that lost carrying capacity should not necessarily be carried by the Government. However, it is also fair to say that, if we do not have a works with such service capabilities, the cost to the Government would be many times higher on a year-in year-out basis. By that I mean that, in the event of a drought, surplus numbers of stock would go on to the market which are unable to be processed. Therefore, they either die or are destroyed in the paddock and buried, and the Government pay-out to drought-affected farmers of 50c or \$1 a head plus the cost to councils of burying (and we

have all seen and heard of those programmes) would work out to much more than the \$500 000 paid in deficit funding for that works.

I believe that it is not unreasonable to say that the cost of drought-affected stock on Eyre Peninsula alone would average out, on a year-in year-out basis, to much more than \$500 000 to Government instrumentalities. The Minister and his colleagues would know the amount of money paid out for water cartage and other contingencies, including hay and fodder, involving merely drought sustenance levels. If stock could not be destroyed, obviously those figures would be higher or the pay-out to destroy would be higher.

The bottom line is really this: does South Australia need or want a service works? Do we believe that there is a humanitarian aspect about the disposal of stock, or not? It is my very firm contention that there is that need in South Australia, and that need should be met. The following people were at the deputation to which I have referred: the Mayor of the City of Port Lincoln; two representatives from the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union (A.M.I.E.U.); the proprietor/manager of Freez-pak; a board member of Lincoln Bacon Specialists; the State General Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association; Mr Milton Stevens, who is the representative to Samcor from the U.F.S. on Eyre Peninsula and also a private agent. I believe that, among that deputation, there was a wide cross-section of the community with a very strong interest in the continuation of that works.

Next Friday week the Minister will be visiting Port Lincoln to inspect the works, for which I am very grateful, because I believe that if the Minister were there he could discuss the matters with the employees on the floor (and better still, his visit will be much more beneficial if he can be there on a market day to see the number of stock that goes through, the areas from which they come and some of the overall operations of the export operators who operate through that works) and he will have a greater understanding of the needs of the works and the benefit of that works to Port Lincoln.

I believe that the Minister has not been fully briefed on some of the entrepreneurial activities of the management, the exporters and the processors at that works in their endeavours. Their endeavours have resulted in a reduction of the deficit from \$1.3 million in 1977-78 to \$500 000 in 1982-83. That effort must be applauded by Governments and all other persons involved in the industry. One can only hope that with the continued enthusiasm of those people the deficit may be able to be reduced even further. However, as the Minister said, the deficit will be higher next year, and so we get back to the question of there being a need for a service works: the deficit will be higher next year because there will not be the throughput of stock, because farmers are going around the markets now buying up old ewes which normally would be processed through the works, so that they can breed up again and restock their farms. Therefore, stock will be coming on to the market again in 12 or 18 months after they have had their lambs, and again will generate production.

Whilst next year requirements for killing of stock will not be as high as it was last year, in the year after it will be considerably higher. The situation fluctuates, which makes it difficult for any Government to maintain and sustain a plan. I trust that the Government will look very seriously at the situation and do its very best to assist. Producers must be encouraged to use the works to its maximum capability having regard to stock that is available so that the works can be kept as a service works, providing a service for the local industry, as a means of assisting primary producers to maintain reasonable stock prices and, generally, to assist the community all round. After all, if the stock

industry and the grain industry are going well, so do all the service industries that provide ancillary services to the towns and communities upon which we all rely.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Each year following the Estimates Committees I have a little bleat about lack of access for members to those Estimates Committees. For the past three years since the Committees have been in operation I have protested about this lack of access. We all have an interest in certain aspects of matters covered by the Estimates Committees, and there are certain committees on which we would all like to serve. There are certain things that I am particularly interested in, such as marine matters (because my electorate is very much geared to that), fisheries, and I am always interested in tourism, about which I will make one or two comments later. However, access is restricted. During the two weeks when the Estimates Committees debates took place I had the opportunity of asking only seven questions. Further, two Committees sit concurrently, and so one can attend only one of them at a time. I found that when everyone else had finished, I perhaps might get a question in. We are all elected to represent people of the State and we should have equal rights to get on the Committees. At least the Opposition allowed the member for Flinders to sit on the Committees considering matters of particular interest to him. He served on the Committees which examined the Agriculture and Fisheries Budgets.

I attended the sitting of the Committee considering the fisheries lines to ask what I thought were pertinent and relevant questions: I got only one question in, and then the Committee adjourned at 6 p.m.—not at 10 p.m., as was previously determined. Access was denied on that Committee. Whether individual members have an opportunity to serve on a Committee is not significant, but I think it is significant that elected representatives of this Parliament cannot get access whenever he wishes. That is a denial of the right of a member of Parliament and the people that he represents. I think that is wrong. I realise that Parliament was not originally set up to operate under a system in which Parties could dictate, but the Party system has been established, and this now occurs. Even in 1857 there were interest groups involved. Since the turn of the century Parties have taken over and they now dictate absolutely what happens in Parliament. That is a sign of the times and it is part of the pattern of the present day but it is not the way it is meant to be. Elected members should have a representative voice on Committees and in Parliament. My presence here certainly indicates that members of the major political Parties do not have exclusive rights to this place.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It takes a good man to overcome the system, doesn't it?

Mr PETERSON: One certainly has to overcome a big obstacle when one gets here to achieve anything that one considers to be worth while. The Estimates Committees are a prime example of that. The Parties dictate who sits on the Committees and who does what. I would also say that many of the people sitting on the Committees from my observation really do not want to be there. It appeared that many of them had no real knowledge of the subjects being discussed and no real interest in them. As a matter of fact, on some of the Committees either one side or the other asked no questions of any significance at all. The Committees are open to observers and to the public. It is to be hoped that the public will come along and watch the proceedings. What really worries me is that if you had a particular interest in a matter that you want to put to a Committee, one is denied access. I do not think that is democratic or right.

It is interesting to refer to the amount of time that is now spent on Budget Estimates Committees. When I was first

elected to this place in 1979 we had the Parliamentary Committee stage consideration of the Estimates. At that stage I thought that the process took too long and I can recall pointing that out at the time. I referred back to figures pertaining to the time that was spent on examining the Budget in those days. Ten years ago, in 1973, the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill took 11 hours 25 minutes; in 1974 it took 8 hours 28 minutes; in 1975 it took 11 hours 15 minutes; in 1976 it took 21 hours 47 minutes, and in 1977 it took 18 hours 41 minutes. On average, the time taken each year from 1973 to 1977 was 22 hours 42 minutes. In 1978, the year before I was elected to this place, the Committee examination took 31 hours 9 minutes, which was a fairly significant jump on the average time taken previously. In 1979 it went down slightly to 29 hours 10 minutes, and in 1980, which was the final year of the Parliamentary Committee system (rather than the Estimates Committee system) it took 29 hours 25 minutes. That was a relatively long time to consider the Bill. Let us look at what has happened since then. A change has occurred in the system. We have brought in the 'yellow book', which has caused more confusion than it is worth because it does not relate to the matters we are discussing. In 1980-81 the Estimates Committees took 83 hours 32 minutes.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That's counting contemporaneous committees.

Mr PETERSON: I refer to the Estimates Committees A and B specifically, rather than debates afterwards. In 1981-82 it went to 100 hours 10 minutes; in 1982 it was 97 hours 37 minutes. Committees A and B this year went to 93 hours 1 minute. We have trebled the time we have spent on Committees—for what? Apart from that, all members have been denied access. One can only be on one Committee at any one time. Members such as myself have been denied membership of a Committee. I do not believe that is democratic. I hope that some move is made to improve that situation. In point 6 of the sheet distributed before the Estimates Committee relating to members it is stated:

The members to serve on each Committee shall be nominated by the mover, but if any one member so demands they shall be elected by ballot.

Next year I will call for a ballot. I do not know whether it will make any difference or not, but at least I will have a go. If there was a provision that members could be substituted on Committees if someone wished not to continue or had some other business to attend to, that would then allow me to attend. I register that complaint for the third or fourth year, because it is an anomaly in the system and a denial of the right of a member of Parliament.

I now wish to raise a couple of significant points which I have mentioned to the Minister of Fisheries, who has given me an undertaking that we can speak about them either in his office or with any of his officers at any time, which I appreciate. It is not his fault directly, nor the Chairman of the Committee's fault that this has occurred, but it is the whole Committee structure that has caused the problem.

These matters particularly relate to the fisheries industry and to the provision of boats in the St Vincent prawn fisheries. I have previously raised the point about size limitations of launches. I do not know why such a limitation applies. These vessels are surveyed annually for seaworthiness. There is now a triple trawl system with three nets behind instead of one on 45-foot boats. Eventually something will go wrong with one of those boats which may cause someone to be killed. I mentioned the other day that one of those boats, 20 years old, sank at its moorings. It was an old vessel but its poor condition was not detected in the survey. She would have gone down had she been in the middle of the gulf. There could be loss of life. It would

only need a line to break off a triple trawl and it would tip a boat over in a minute.

When the *Joseph Virgo* was upgraded that was simply to improve the accommodation for Fisheries Department officers who only spend part of their time on that vessel for survey reasons. Yet, these people who go out consistently into the Gulf to do their fishing are not allowed to have a vessel that is suitable for changed fishing conditions. They have undertaken to meet any catch requirements, any regulation or restriction which the Fisheries Department wishes to put upon them. That is not acceptable to that Department. I will stress that that is wrong as long as I am here in Parliament. On the other hand if that limitation was raised and they were allowed to buy larger vessels they would be entitled to a bounty from the Commonwealth Government.

That would also create work in Port Adelaide and the State generally. Materials would need to be supplied. We mentioned before that Colan shipyards put off 92 men in one batch and more went later. These men will not find employment in this State in their trade because the work is not there. We should be doing something about generating work for them. This is one aspect of allowing these people to improve their vessels; it would create work in the shipyards around the State, not necessarily in Port Adelaide although I would hope that work would come to my area. Boat builders in the industry generally are also concerned.

It was my privilege recently to assist in the formation of the Marine Contractors Association of South Australia. The members of that Association build the boats and supply the material for the boats for the prawn fishing and other fishing industries. They were so disappointed by the reaction from the Government about the help they wanted that they found it necessary to form an association to make approaches to Government and Government departments on their behalf. This industry is thriving. One boat builder is thriving because he is making boats for interstate buyers. He is building vessels up to the Australian standard and selling the boats as fast as he can get them off the slipway, but boatbuilders in South Australia are not allowed to build boats for our own industry. I will be stressing this point when I do get to meet the Minister and I hope he can make some headway.

I am continuing to receive reports from industries inside and outside of my district about the subsidies given by other State Governments to local industries. New South Wales is notorious for giving such subsidies. This gives New South Wales firms an advantage when they tender for contracts outside their own State. When they tender for contracts interstate they can allow for what they know they will be subsidised by their own Government. Many industries in this State would benefit from a review of the State tendering system. Even a moderate edge in tendering would help them. I have quite a few examples of companies which have moved out of the State recently. It is significant to note that after A.C.I. moved interstate it ceased to buy its soda ash from I.C.I. at Osborne. It now buy its soda ash from overseas, and I have not been able to find out why. Steel Mains Proprietary Limited have moved out of my district in an attempt to keep going. A paintworks in my district has moved interstate because it could not get enough work in this State. We must protect our own industries.

An example of the difference in the attitudes of State Governments was given recently when I asked a question about State and Commonwealth assistance given to keep the container terminals operating in Melbourne. Some months ago, I asked the Premier about State preferences and he said that no preference was given in Victoria and South Australia because it would make for better trade between the States. However, since then this agreement has been reached. I wish to state that the figures I quoted in my question on 15 September were slightly wrong, but the

Minister has confirmed by letter that the concessions given by the State Government of Victoria, a private company and the Commonwealth Government amount to \$90 per 20ft container being unloaded or loaded in Melbourne. The letter addressed to me by the Minister states:

I refer to your question in the House on 15 September 1983 regarding the discount on container traffic through the Port of Melbourne. I am very much aware of the existence of the discount package, a matter to which I referred in my Ministerial statement to the House on 4 August 1983.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Did you say who it was from?

Mr PETERSON: It is a letter from the Minister. It continues:

The package applies only to South Australian cargo to and from destinations served by the Australian Northbound Shipping Conference (ANSCON) and is made up as follows:

Seatainer and Australian National Line Terminals	\$ 40
The Railways—	
Vicrail	22
Australian National	8
Port of Melbourne	20
	—
Total discount per container	90

That rebate is given just to keep the business in Melbourne and to starve South Australians. Only today the Minister spoke about a new shipping line. That is good and we should get all that we can. However, we are losing Japan, which is one of our major trading partners. The vast majority of Japanese cargo to and from this State goes through Melbourne. The 20ft container has produced a revolution in shipping, but it has put South Australia at a disadvantage. There is no way in which a State such as ours can match a \$90 rebate: that money is just not in the trade.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That subsidy works out at well over \$1 million a year.

Mr PETERSON: Easily. That is a rebate to the shipping line and not to the customer, the importer or the exporter. The \$1 million is given back to the shipping line just to use the facility in Melbourne. We cannot match that. I doubt our ability to drag the Japanese ships past Melbourne. Even if we gave the shipping line a rebate of \$90, the ships must still stand here and pay double wharfage and double pilotage charges. Victoria, which after all is a Labor State, is screwing South Australia dry and we cannot match it. We have a terminal that has operated since 1972 and, even though it has been struggling and the crane has had only about 3 per cent operating time, it has rendered outstanding service. The container transfer rate at our terminal was (and I believe still is) equal to or even better than that of any other Australian terminal. We have a far better back-up system with more room to move and to store containers.

One of the early problems concerning containers was experienced in Melbourne because the containers there were stacked six deep and it took three or four months to get a container out of the terminal. Here we have an efficient system whereby only one lift is needed to get a container out. There is no better system than the single stack system, but we cannot have that because it costs too much in land space, although it is used when land is available. Under such a system the cost of lifting is kept to a minimum.

We must also consider the standard rail link that runs from anywhere in Australia into the container terminal. Even if we tried, we could not convince a shipping line to have its vessels call here. How can we match the \$90 rebate, and then there is the added cost to which I have referred? We have been told that the States between them have a system under which they will not cheat or try to beat each other, yet this is happening. I hope that the European Conference Line finds out about this rebate and asks the operators in the Port of Melbourne for a slice of the action. If they

do, rebates will have to be given to the European operator, because there is not a shipping operator in the world who has a soft heart. The shipping operators screw what they can out of the trade, and the Conference Shipping Line has proved that in Australia over the years. The shipping operators have chopped Australia up into sections and screwed this country for over 100 years, although this has assisted us in many ways. We now have a situation where we can guarantee shipments in and out of our port. That is the good part. However, they have also gained a quid from it, too.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think this puts in danger a European service to South Australia?

Mr PETERSON: I think that we must consider the capacity of interstate terminals, especially with the current down turn in trade, in relation to the rebate system. Botany Bay had the capacity to handle the entire Australian trade. It must not be forgotten that the concept of containerisation in Australia was originally linked to a central port system, known as the Centra-Port System, and a land bridge system. There was a single port for the exchange of containers, which were then transported out of the port. We are moving closer to that situation day by day, especially with the rebate system.

The rebate system takes a significant amount of money out of pay packets. I do not think that it is fully understood how waterside workers are paid. I am referring not to wharves but to other labourers on the waterfront (and there are quite a few classifications). The largest group of workers on the waterfront are employed by the Association of Employers of Waterside Labour. If those workers are not working and generating money, a tonnage levy is placed on ships that are working to pay workers for idle time. In that situation the tonnage rate rises. It is much more efficient and less costly for workers to be employed five days a week, rather than have them work two days on and three days off, because in the three days off the tonnage levy goes up to pay for the idle time. Therefore, workers are paid on a day rate whether or not they work. If they do not work the tonnage rate goes up to pay them.

I have been out of the industry for some time, but I recall that the tonnage levy was significant and, in fact, at one stage amounted to more than a workers usual rate of pay. The tonnage levy was a 100 per cent levy on the man hour rate, to be used to pay for idle time. The rebate works against that. That means that the people of South Australia must pay an added levy for shipping costs. Obviously, waterside workers are entitled to their pay—I do not disagree with that. However, it will mean that a levy will be paid on every tonne of cargo going in and out of the port to pay for idle time. That situation has been created to some extent because of the rebate deal interstate.

As I have said, I was under the impression that the Trade Practices Act had been breached. I read the Act some time ago. I have spoken to the Minister about this matter and he said that it was being investigated. I believe him. He said that the Trade Practices Act is not applicable, and I believe him. However, I am surprised that that is the situation. I read the Act some time ago in relation to another matter, and I thought that it would be applicable in this case. If that Act does not apply, how do we overcome this situation? Do we simply accept it?

South Australia is now looking at providing a second container crane. I am not sure what a new crane would be worth, but I think that even a 20ft equivalent crane would cost about \$5 million or \$6 million to stand down on the wharf. How do we justify the purchase of a new crane, and will it have enough work to do given that Victoria is giving a subsidy amounting to almost \$90 a container, which is a significant amount. How do we get it here? South Australia

does not have the capacity to justify a similar subsidy. The Minister has not explained about the Victorian subsidy.

If we want to obtain this work we must come up with a counter offer. However, we cannot offer a monetary incentive because we cannot afford it. We must look for some other way of overcoming this situation. I know that the Minister and the Acting Director of Marine and Harbors is concerned. I only hope that we find a solution. Victoria's action amounts to a surcharge and a tax on everyone in South Australia. This matter should be investigated by the Minister, and I hope that the Premier takes it up, too, because it is just not right.

Quite a bit was said about tourism during the Estimates Committees and since then. Last week I had the opportunity to visit as a guest the Electricity Trust's Northern Power Station and the Leigh Creek coal mine. I must say that I was most impressed. The work being carried out there and the visual impact of these pits is something that could be linked into a tourist package in that northern area. The Minister of Tourism earlier today spoke of the Flinders Ranges and Blinman. It is beautiful country in its own way, but I think a tourism package further up into Leigh Creek is well worth consideration. I have not seen it in a tourist promotion yet but it should be there. In other parts of the world one pays money to get on a bus to see that sort of thing: in many parts of the world one can pay money to get on a bus to see less. If we are talking about tourism (and we do little in terms of action), we should seriously do something to bring that about.

I return now to Taperoo beach, a matter that has been going on since 1972, when the North Haven breakwater was established. I have repeated time and time again that the beach south of that breakwater is an absolute disgrace. The Coast Protection Board is short of money and although it does its best on a State basis this is an area that must receive some significant attention, not part-time or second-hand attention as happened with the pumping programme which was done only because it had to be done for another purpose. We got the sand: it did some good, I am not knocking that, but we need a positive approach to the problem. There are areas where a man or child would disappear if they walked down on to the beach.

As I mentioned in a question today, the \$13 000 to be spent to restore a car park which will hold many hundreds of cars is an absolute waste of money whilst there is no access to the beach. At the moment there is no access; there was a path, but it was torn up by contractors working for the Coast Protection Board. I have spoken to officers of the Board who assure me that the path will be fixed, but the rest of the area must be dealt with. It is in truth a health hazard, in my opinion. It is a breeding ground for mosquitoes and several times a year the area must be treated to kill mosquitoes. There was a brown snake in our street last week (I live down that way). I know this, because my wife told me, it passed her, so I can swear that it was there. This should not be allowed in society today. Millions of dollars is being spent creating North Haven.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I congratulate the member for Semaphore for once again giving a very well thought through—

Mr Peterson: It's not the kiss of death!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: No, it is not the kiss of death. The honourable member will be there as long as he wishes to put his name forward for the seat. I genuinely congratulate him because, whether one sits on the Opposition or the Government side, by way of question or contribution to the debate, the honourable member always thinks through

what he wants to say, and leaves members on both sides of the House cause for reflection on what he has had to say. Quite apart from the public announcements of recent times which have concentrated on his bald patch and his good behaviour, this further accolade is deserved.

Concerning the Estimates Committees, it has finally come to the question of what is the value of Estimates Committees, if in fact there is any value. The member for Semaphore would have one view because of his unfortunate experiences of being virtually on the outside. Whilst provision was made within the Sessional Orders giving him, as it did any member, the opportunity to question, I fully appreciate the difficulties that arise for a member who is not one of the official Committee to get his spoke in.

I recognise how difficult it is if, in fact, members of the Government, who have direct access to the Minister to get their questions answered, involve themselves at great length in the Estimates debates. I would not deny any member of the Government the right to question. It is the right of any member who stands in this place on any occasion; he is here for that purpose. However, regrettably, in some circumstances the involvement of members of the Government with Dorothy Dix and Party-political questions destroys the true value of the Estimates Committees.

I will refer to that at a later stage. I still genuinely believe that the Estimates Committees programme evolved over the past four years is a decidedly better programme than that which prevailed when I first entered this place. It was a case of everyone in and it went on for days and days. A member might get in three questions and be able to come back to the same subject perhaps the following day. There was no continuity of effort or recorded information in *Hansard*, so that anyone who was unable to give time to reading the total record would not be able to have an indication of the detail of the Estimates. So, in so far that it allows a greater period of time, it is an advantage. In so far as it is poorly divided in some of the lines, it is a disaster. I will say more about that later as I would hope that, when a post mortem is held on Monday of next week into the conduct of the Estimates Committees, these points might be given some consideration. I genuinely believe that implementation could be of assistance to the next series of Estimates Committees.

The other problem arising is the ability or the preparedness of a Minister to respond. Without wanting to create any great difficulties, I point out that I had the privilege of sitting on three of the Committees. Two of the Ministers—the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning—were quite expansive with the information they made available. They consulted their officers and allowed those officers to provide information. As I understood the situation, they were not greatly involved in the prior preparation of a whole series of Government questions. Regrettably, however, when it came to the Minister of Housing and Minister of Local Government, the position was completely the reverse. The Minister did not or would not understand questions, sought to make cheap political points, and took from his own people a large number of questions which had been written out for them. Those questions were read verbatim and then received a reply read verbatim. In fact, at the end of the day, there was still a file of unasked and unanswered questions—many of them with a political twist in the tail.

The officers accompanying the Minister of Housing, when given the opportunity to provide information, did so very concisely and in a practical form. They showed a great deal of professional knowledge of their subject matter and I congratulate them. More is the pity that they had to be marshalled by somebody who showed a complete inability to recognise the importance of the occasion. What is this

importance of occasion to which I refer? I will give one or two examples. The examples are quite extensive throughout most of the day. The member for Peake commenced questioning in relation to the Housing Improvement Act, and I do not deny him that right. The Minister, in reply to the member for Peake, stated:

Because of the nature of the District of Peake, many homes in that area are subject to the Housing Improvement Act. The honourable member was concerned when the previous Government gave the responsibility for that Act to local government. I understand that many members of the previous Liberal Cabinet were asked why the Government of the day made that decision. Most of them said (I assume truthfully because I always work on the principle that, despite politics, a Cabinet Minister should tell the truth) that they knew nothing about it. I understand that the shift of responsibility for the Housing Improvement Act from the Housing Trust to local government went ahead without the full approval of Cabinet. I believe that my predecessor was responsible for that action and I bitterly attacked him in the House. I described it then (and describe it now) as an act to appease his shark landlord friends. As a result, local government could not police the Act: and it would have had to employ more staff to do so.

And it goes on further. There is no equivocation in that: there is a very clear statement that the former Minister had taken an action that was inconsistent with normal Cabinet practice of bringing documentation before Cabinet and obtaining the proper approval for its passage. I discussed this matter with the former Minister, because I felt that the allegations made by the present Minister of Housing and of Local Government were quite improper and quite apart from the course of action which the Minister was outlining in his reply to the member for Peake.

The former Minister has shown me the Cabinet document that was prepared and presented to Cabinet and, whilst the document which is his copy of that preparation for Cabinet does not bear the Cabinet approval stamp, because it was from his own record, subsequently there is a memo to the former Minister from the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust acknowledging that the document prepared for Cabinet and approved can and will be fitted into the programme of the Housing Trust. One issue which arose and which was identified in the original document was that, because local government was to be given greater input and involvement, it might be necessary to undertake some subsidisation of local government activities.

Indeed, after the decision had been taken, discussions were taking place, and there is documentation to support this, which I am quite happy to make available to the member for Peake. There is documentation apparent of the results of those discussions and the manner in which the matter was to proceed. In the event, there was an election and no action was taken to subsidise local government, because it was not proper for a Government which had been defeated to seek to implement a programme that was in contemplation.

The position was clearly set out in the documentation—that there would be a quite considerable financial benefit to the State from the course of action being contemplated. A sum of the order of \$350 000 was to be saved, some of which was to be injected into local government to carry out this sort of activity at the local level, but having due regard to local demands. The balance of the money, in excess of \$200 000, was to be injected into the emergency housing operation.

Mr Plunkett: You didn't tell the council about that. They knew nothing about it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member will find, on looking at the available documentation, that he is quite incorrect in saying that. I make the point to the member for Peake, who needs a little education on this matter, that in these matters local government is represented by its association, of which every council is a member. In

discussions with Government on a general basis, as opposed to discussions with Government on a particular basis, local government is represented by members of the Local Government Association. This is the point I want to make clear again to the honourable member, who does not want to hear, or does not want to understand.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: There were considerable discussions, a recognised trade-off and an involvement of local government with local knowledge. There was an injection of funds which otherwise would have been lost to the emergency housing organisation. I could read at length the full documentation, and will do so on another occasion if it is necessary to do so to satisfy the honourable member for Peake. It was apparent from the Minister's reply to the honourable member that all he was interested in in having that Dorothy Dixier put to him (notwithstanding that the member for Peake was interested in that area of operation) was having a shot at the previous Minister by saying that he was 'involved with land sharks'. On behalf of the previous Minister, because he is not in the House to defend himself, I deny that allegation, and all the available documentation would support that denial.

I note that on a number of occasions during the course of the debate in respect of housing in the Estimates Committees hearings the Minister was keen to denigrate the name of the Executive Director of the Housing Industry Association. The Minister showed his ignorance of the facts in the attacks he made on Mr Cummings. He indicated, for example, that Mr Cummings had said that a \$3 000 increase in housing costs would arise from a 25 per cent increase in wages. That was foolish, because in no way would \$3 000 be the figure. The Minister did not go on to say what had been publicly stated by Mr Cummings, that there would be a \$3 000 increase in housing costs arising from a 25 per cent increase in wages leading to a 10 per cent overall additional cost for housing.

We also saw an attack by the Minister on the Executive Director of the Housing Industry Association in relation to statements made by him and by the executive of that Association in respect of the additional costs which would be incurred for housing because of the compulsory unionism clause, which will become effective from the sixth call of the 'design and construct' programme. I point out that at present housing, whether it be for Government purposes, developers or individuals is being constructed using a figure of \$210 to \$220 per thousand bricks laid. On-site confrontations have been reported in the press, a number of which have occurred due to brickies being told, 'Join the union and we will get you \$242 per thousand bricks.' An additional sum would be very nice to have, but there are people in the industry quite happy to accept \$210 or \$220 per thousand bricks as the going rate, providing them with adequate return for their labours. However, they are being told, 'Join us and we will get you \$242.' The additional amount of \$32 or \$22 per thousand is obtained at the expense of the finished product.

Likewise, recently some confrontation has been occurring in respect of plastering. In one case a plasterer undertaking work in relation to ceilings and walls on a group of home units was able to clearly demonstrate to the contractor for whom he was working as a subcontractor that there would be an additional \$3 500 on 16 units as between union and non-union labour claims. That amounts to a difference of an additional \$200 plus per house.

If we consider a home built with 6 000 or 7 000 bricks costing an additional \$32 per thousand that amounts to an additional cost of about \$200. So, the costs start to increase. I have referred to those matters only because they were

called into question by the Minister. If the Minister really understood his portfolio he would have been able to acknowledge (decri if he had wanted to) the true facts.

Another matter concerning an attack on the Housing Industry Association was that the industry and the Executive Director were being referred to in the press every two weeks as making statements about housing and causing mischief. The Housing Industry Association is assisting the Government in a \$150 million expenditure this year in regard to an increase in Housing Trust stock of 3 100 units. Its legitimate job is to promote the industry and to draw to the attention of Government, whatever its political persuasion, matters where it considers that the Government might be going off the rails in relation to its approach.

What the industry has indicated to Government, and what many other people in the industry have said to Government is that whilst the industry would like to see a massive increase in housing it would like to improve the situation progressively and that entering into a boom or bust (it was suggested that any figure beyond a 10 per cent or 11 per cent increase in the building sector would create a boom or bust) would produce an end result that was likely to be of distinct disadvantage to building authorities and the population at large.

I believe, from the involvement that the Premier has had with this industry and his knowledge of what it has sought to do to guarantee the position of young people buying their first homes with their Government-approved, inbuilt insurance policies, that they recognise that these are people who speak authoritatively and in the best interests of the populace at large. One could go on in a number of other areas of that nature.

I refer to one other aspect of the discussion that came out in respect of housing and local government, where I totally endorse the attitude that came from the Minister. Whilst I have been critical of a number of other areas of his involvement, I totally endorse this attitude: his agreement that there should be no tied grant situation associated with funds from local government when those funds are forthcoming from the Federal sphere.

We witnessed during the period 1972-75 the real dangers of a centralist attitude through the DURD programme and the effect that it had on local government. On the Friday preceding the Estimates Committees debate in this place, it was clearly pointed out to a seminar at the Parks in the electorate of the Premier, which sought to come to grips with some of the problems of the western community, that future funds from the Commonwealth would have a major element of tied grant application. This was rejected by the majority at that meeting and has subsequently been rejected by the Minister and by officers associated with that matter. However, it was fanned into having some degree of credibility (which it will unless the Government and the Opposition stand up and criticise it) by the fact that the Federal Minister responsible for local government, the Hon. Mr Tom Uren, was the guest speaker on that same Friday evening. He left no doubts in the minds of people attending the seminar that it was his intention that funding for local government from the Commonwealth would be greatly involved with the direction of the Federal Government.

In the most recent issue of the *Australian Municipal Journal* (volume 63, No. 964, of September 1983, at page 67), where it talks of the Federal Budget, it says that the Canberra/local government relationship needs a new rationale; the point is taken that the politicians may as well admit that they are mainly public relations officers for the bureaucracy. This was in regard to the relationship with local government.

I am one politician—and I hope that there are 46 others in this place—who will tell the bureaucracy and the Federal

Minister that there will be no interference with local government, which this State very clearly put into the forefront of governmental interaction by recognising it in the State Constitution. We were the first State (I believe that I am correct in saying this) to do it; other States have followed. We recognise that there is a very positive inter-relationship between Federal and State Governments and local government, and in that inter-relationship there is a degree of equality which is essential rather than a degree of progression downwards from Federal via State to local government, which is abhorrent to members on this side, as I believe it is abhorrent to members on the other side.

That was fortified by the response that I was able to get from the Minister on the occasion of the Estimates Committees. What could we do—and I adverted to this earlier—in respect of a better approach to the Estimates Committees? I acknowledged that I believed from a Sessional Orders point of view, which may eventually become involved with the Standing Orders, we should accept the general thrust of the experience of the past four years. But, there are several areas where the breadth of the vote or the breadth of the consideration is too great.

Too many Ministerial assistants or too many directors need to be on hand all at once and there is fragmentation of positive discussion relative to particular issues. It is very apparent in the health budget, where there were only two votes for a whole day's deliberations. It was apparent enough in relation to the housing and local government budgets, where there were only three votes for the day. However, if we take the general line for housing and local government we had the housing component, the local government component, the libraries component, the waste management component and a series of other quite major subgroups within that area.

The Committee accepted the responsibility of separating the housing component from the total so there could be deliberation on the local government aspect which, unfortunately, included libraries and waste management. I take that as a case in point. There should be a way, without disturbing in any major sense the Treasury's requirement for the passage of Supply and of the Budget, to allow for a grouping of the major areas of involvement in each of the Ministerial areas so that members can approach a particular subject, dispose of it and move on to the next one. I believe that it would be beneficial to the Estimates Committee system and I believe that in the post mortem that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, will be attending next week, that may be a matter that will be given some consideration for the benefit of future Estimates Committees.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This debate has finally drawn to a close. It has taken a long time and a lot of words to do so. The purpose of the debate on the Estimates is to allow members to raise matters of financial policy which could not be discussed in the context of a detailed consideration of the Estimates and to make general comments on the Budget following the opportunity to question Ministers and officials on the administration of their departments. The idea is that, having been able to directly question Ministers and officials, the Opposition is then able, in using that information, to raise questions or make constructive suggestions about the administration and financial allocations in the various departments.

One would have thought that the contributions in this debate would relate very much to the specifics that had arisen in the course of those Committee inquiries. I acknowledge that a number of speakers have indeed done just that. There have been a number of contributions in which those specifics have been raised and particular points made. Some of those points will bear consideration by the Government. We certainly are prepared to consider them. While I obviously would not agree with all the points made, I recognise that that is what the purpose of this Parliamentary examination of a Budget is—to examine and criticise the Government's Budget and suggest alternative approaches. I think it is also recognised that this way of considering the Estimates is not perfect but it has so far been an improvement on the traditional method and, if nothing else, gives individual members of Parliament more opportunity to question Ministers more closely.

I have said that most members entered this debate with a view to making constructive comments and criticism. Unfortunately, a number of members treated it just like another grievance debate. It is as if the Estimates Committees examination did not happen at all. In this respect I would suggest that there is none more open to the charge than the Leader of the Opposition himself. As Leader of the Government, I intend to devote this reply to his contribution in particular because, as the lead speaker and representative of the Opposition in this State, he should have been able to pull together the various threads in the Committee proceedings and deal in particular with those votes in which he was actively involved, one of which was my portfolio, which he purportedly is shadowing. By so doing, he should have crystallised what the Opposition had to say about the material that came out of the Committee stage and expound the Opposition's alternatives.

In fact, we got probably one of the poorest speeches in the course of this debate—that is really saying something. I thought the speech was well reported in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 19 October in which the reporter summarised the Leader of the Opposition's speech. The report was published with those points of the speech which obviously were seen as most significant in the sense of being new or interesting material. The House will find that just about every single one of those points that the Leader of the Opposition made was an attack on individual members of the Ministry—a very personal and negative attack, a very unconstructive approach. It is as if the Leader of the Opposition got together all the little bits of pieces of abuse he could find and then set out the names of various Ministers and proceeded to try to attach the things that he felt were wrong to particular Ministers and laced that with plenty of abuse.

It was totally negative and unproductive. Unfortunately, it was typical of the approach of the Leader of the Opposition. If that report was an inaccurate representation of the tone and level of the speech, perhaps there would be some cause for complaint from the Leader of the Opposition, but it was not. If one examines the full text, one finds that that is exactly the way in which the speech was structured and how it was continued—totally unconstructive criticism based around personalities and particular abuse.

I would think that any member of the public trying to get the flavour of what the Opposition is about in this State reading that report (and, if people decide to find out a little more, they can go to the full speech) will find that we have a sorry Opposition in this State. I suggest that people go further and try to think of the reasons why this is so. The reasons the speech was couched in those general terms, the generalistic and personal abuse-type terms, is basically that in the Estimates Committees processes the Opposition has totally failed in its purpose of attempting to educe major

problems, scandals or other pieces of information to be used in the debate.

There are various reasons for that, the most fundamental reason being that, by and large (despite the problems that any Government has to grapple with), this Government has been doing a good job: the Budget itself is a sound and well constructed document, and this will be borne out as the financial year develops. I can understand the Opposition's having some problems in picking holes in it, but the lack of chapter and verse reflected in the summary speeches was very much a consequence of the sheer inability that most members of the Opposition displayed in the way in which they asked the questions and the sort of matters that they pursued in the Committees. For most of the year we have been told that the Government has grossly overspent its Budget, that the Budget is badly founded, illconceived, that we have employed thousands more public servants and that there are all sorts of problems involved in these key areas of Government, particularly as it relates to the central departments.

When given the opportunity to question me and officers of the Treasury, the Public Service Board and other areas of Government the Leader of the Opposition did not seem to be able to frame any inquiry which could prove his assertions to be correct. He obviously believes it is better to make these assertions in the press or in general debate in the House than to try to pursue the concrete information that might support those allegations. The fact is that he did not pursue it and the fact is that that sort of information does not exist, anyway. It is interesting, in illustration of this subject, to look at the priorities the Leader and his colleagues gave to the Estimates of the Premier's Department, on the day in the House that I spent with the Leader of the Opposition (who presumably is shadowing my portfolio with the exception of the arts) and to see the priorities accorded to the questioning.

It is obvious from reading *Hansard* that far more time was spent on the lines relating to the House of Assembly, the Joint House Committee, the Parliamentary Library and the Governor's establishment than was spent on the Public Service Board, the Treasury and the State Development Department. That is a quite extraordinary allocation of priorities. As this Opposition and its Leader have been talking about the taxing measures and the financial problems of the State Government, one would have thought that they would have spent a considerable proportion of the time asking questions and attempting to adduce information about the Treasury lines. In the printed weekly *Hansard* the consideration of those Estimates covered 47 pages, yet only seven pages relate to time spent on questions on the Treasury lines and Estimates. One could contrast that with 10 pages spent in questioning on the Joint House Committee, the House of Assembly and operations internal and domestic issues, not things of great consequence or moment to the State, important perhaps to members of Parliament in terms of their duties, but an extraordinary priority to afford it.

A further 19 pages covered the questioning of the area of the Premier and Cabinet and their organisational and administrative structures. I am not suggesting that questions should not be asked in that area. Of course they should, but an inordinate amount of time was spent on it when one sees that we had gone well past the luncheon adjournment and well into the afternoon before we got anywhere near the Public Service Board and the Treasury, which are the two areas the Opposition has been criticising. When one realises that the Opposition has been criticising our management of the Treasury and the State's finances, our management of the Public Service generally, staff levels and things like that, one would have thought that they would have spent some considerable time questioning those lines,

yet only seven pages are devoted to the Treasury and a mere two to the Public Service Board. We then came to the area of State Development, the economic future of the State, the Government's strategy for economic improvement in South Australia. Again, only two pages were devoted to it. If one adds together the seven pages on the Treasury, two pages on the Public Service Board and two pages on State development, it will be seen that only 11 pages out of 47 pages were devoted to questions on the Premier's Department against 10 pages devoted to the internal workings of the Parliament.

I think that that priority indicates just why this debate has been so sterile and why the Opposition has had to resort to such negative tactics. The arts was fortunate enough to get a look-in right at the end. I suspect that was because the shadow Minister (the Hon. Murray Hill) appeared in the gallery and had obviously been given some undertakings that a few questions might be asked about his area but by then we had reached the end of the day. For most of the day we chivvied around, time was wasted on useless questioning in areas of low priority. Little wonder that the ensuing debate revolved around the trivia and personality attacks that we have had.

Certain of the allegations and claims made by the Leader could be answered, but I do not know that there is much point in wasting the time of the House by going through them in detail. He referred to the poor performance of Ministers and the Government, yet he did not refer to the way in which the Government and its activities have been accepted in the community. There is considerable evidence that this Government has the broad and high support of South Australians, that it understands the problems with which it is grappling, and that its efforts in tackling those problems are appreciated by the people of this State. It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition has suggested that there is abroad some kind of feeling that the Government is simply not doing its job. However, that is reflected neither in the attitude of the public nor in the performance of the Government. The Leader was responsible for some carping criticism. Although he grudgingly acknowledged that my visit to Japan and elsewhere was a necessary exercise, when talking about the various aspects of my journey he made certain statements that do not bear examination in the light of the actions and statements of the Tonkin Liberal Government.

The subject of the size of the Public Service has been dealt with by the Leader, who quoted from articles in the *Advertiser* that dealt comprehensively with the Public Service, the departments and their roles, and some of their problems. It is always interesting when the Leader is drawing to our attention the record of the Tonkin Government in putting work out to the private sector without sacking anyone in the Public Service. In one of the press articles someone in the private sector commented that the Public Buildings Department did not work at full performance and that under the Liberal Government people were sitting around on their hands and that the management style and work practices were not really different from those in private enterprise.

This Government has taken up the challenge of not having people sitting on their hands, which resulted in paying twice for the one job: first, by paying the employees in the public sector who could have done it and, secondly, by paying to have the job done by the private sector. If that is a job creation scheme, it is mighty expensive and unproductive. Our purpose is to ensure that the private sector gets its share of the work, but also that those in the public sector are productively and usefully employed in an efficient way that benefits the taxpayer.

Little can be said, in summary, on this debate. The evidence is that, in terms of their priorities and when put to the test, the Opposition, especially the Leader, simply cannot deliver the goods. Otherwise, how does one explain the incredible waste of time on the day when the key departments were being considered by the Estimates Committee? A mere few minutes was left to question those two areas about which all the speeches and grandiose statements had been made. It is a sad commentary on the Opposition that it can go through that exercise and so misuse its priorities and then find itself at the end of it simply having to resort to the sort of personal abuse that the Leader injects. Fortunately, his tone was not reflected by all the other speakers in this debate. As I said at the outset, we will take note of the constructive suggestions that have been made. Indeed, I believe that that is one of the purposes of this debate, so we will take those constructive suggestions into account during the ensuing financial year. I commend both the motion and the Bill to the House.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 31 August. Page 656.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports the Bill. The original Historic Shipwrecks Act of 1981 was recognised as mirroring the Commonwealth legislation of the same name: it provided for the protection and preservation of shipwrecks and relics situated within the territorial waters of the State. This amending Bill will extend the application of the legislation to inland fresh water areas such as the Murray River. I certainly support that move.

It has been recognised for quite some time that there are significant wrecks and relics in the Murray River and in other fresh water areas of the State. The legislation is supported by the Opposition but, at the same time, I point out, as I have done in the House on two previous occasions, my concern about the State Government's failure to properly administer the South Australian Historic Shipwrecks Act. The fact that there has been little action makes the legislation a complete farce.

The parent legislation was introduced by the previous Government and was proclaimed in December 1981. To this day, only one person is employed in the Department for Environment and Planning to administer State and Commonwealth historic shipwrecks legislation. The lack of resources allocated by the Government in South Australia to marine archaeology, I suggest, is a disgrace. The South Australian legislation was introduced to protect historic shipwrecks and maritime relics lying within State waters. More than 350 ships are known to have been wrecked around the South Australian coast, with the majority located in the St Vincent and Spencer Gulfs. These shipwrecks are an important part of South Australia's heritage.

Many of the ships were involved in the early exploration of the State's coastline, while others were part of the vital cargo trade which was initially the State's lifeline and later the key to its growth and prosperity. It is impossible for the Government to administer the legislation with only one person carrying out the responsibility. Recent press reports

have been critical of the Government's handling of some of the wrecks.

In fact, one report on the *Geltwood* indicated the lack of support that the Government was providing under the legislation. Another example is the locating of the wreck of the Government cutter *Waterwitch*. The *Waterwitch* is of significant historical importance to South Australia because, as well as being engaged in early surveys of South Australian waters, it is also reported to be the first boat to navigate through the Murray mouth. Before its loss in 1842, the *Waterwitch* was also directly involved with the famous explorer Edward John Eyre.

The Government must accept its responsibilities under the provisions of the Act to properly administer the maritime archaeology programme, but the present Government is failing desperately in relation to that responsibility. During the term of the Liberal Government the Department of Environment and Planning in South Australia hosted the second southern hemisphere conference on maritime archaeology with visitors from overseas and interstate. It was an excellent conference and much was gained as a result of the papers presented and the discussions that came out of that conference.

Some months later another seminar was organised jointly by the Department of Environment and Planning and the University of Adelaide to coincide with the declaration of the legislation. It is not good enough. I presume that the Minister will stand up, as he has before in this House, and say it is all very well for the Opposition to say that only one person in the Department carries out these responsibilities, because that was exactly the same situation in relation to the previous Government (the present Opposition). Before he does that, let me point out that the previous Government did the spadework in introducing the legislation and informing the public of its significance. It is now up to the present Government and the Minister for Environment and Planning to properly administer the legislation and to protect those important wrecks which, as I said earlier, are a very important part of our heritage.

During the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister a couple of questions relating to the historic shipwrecks legislation. I indicated that I had previously expressed concern in the House about the backlog of work with regard to historic shipwrecks. I asked what resources had been provided in this regard; how many people were on the staff dealing with this matter; as a result of the present Budget, how much money would be available for the next 12 months; and whether any financial assistance had been received from the Commonwealth Government to help administer the Commonwealth legislation.

The Minister stated in reply, as I said he was likely to, that the number of staff was the same as when the Liberal Government was in office. We did the spadework, and it is now up to the present Government to take some positive action as a result of that. The Minister also indicated that \$45 000 had been set aside for the provision of a boat. That is pleasing to note because, until this time, they have been tearing around in a rubber dinghy which I believe had a hole in it for most of the time. That is really helping the maritime archaeology programme in this State and the investigations that need to be carried out. I received, as part of the answer, a statement which the Minister gave to the Committee, as follows:

We have a system of voluntary wardens, and about 60 people have accepted appointment under that particular system. So, I share the honourable member's concern and I do want to do something about it as we go along, but at this stage the provision in this Budget, apart from that additional capital item that will be useful, is for the provision of the same level of resources as occurred in the last Budget.

I would like to question the matter of the voluntary wardens. The Minister either made a mistake or perhaps misled the Committee in his statement about wardens. I would like the Minister to clarify the situation because, as I understand it, there are no wardens employed under the Historic Shipwrecks Act although provision exists for the appointment of inspectors. If the Minister looks at page 10, Part III of the Act, he will find that that is the case: there are no voluntary wardens or inspectors. The Department of Fisheries and the National Parks and Wildlife Service have agreed to the appointment of their personnel as inspectors. However, I believe the only people to have received the correct identity cards validating their appointment as inspectors under the Act are Mr Jefferey and Mr Womersley, from the Department of Environment and Planning. The Department of Fisheries people were assembled for a photograph for that purpose but I heard that it did not turn out and so the cards—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Why did they photograph them?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They were photographed to make it look as though we had a lot of wardens rushing around to ascertain where the wrecks are and to decide on action to be taken. Unfortunately for the Minister the photograph did not turn out. It has probably gone to the bottom of the harbor. I would like the Minister to clarify the situation of voluntary wardens.

I have also been given a list of wrecks that was supplied to the Underwater Historical Research Society. I suggest that that list demonstrates the backlog of work that the Department of Environment and Planning is unable to tackle. Obviously, the backlog needs immediate attention by the Department. I suggest that, if the resources would allow only one person to be responsible for this activity within the Department, as is the case, the Minister should look at his priorities and rearrange them to enable more than one extra person to be transferred.

I also referred earlier to the fact that, up until the most recent Budget, they have only had one rubber boat. I understand that they have had to tear around the State without the motor working most of the time. I presume they got out the rubber boat and rowed their way around these areas. I would hope that, with the money the Minister assures me is in the lines (although I have still not been able to find it)—

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The \$45 000?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The \$46 000. The Minister assured me of that amount but I have not been able to find it. It was to be used for an extra boat. In all seriousness, that must assist the situation, but it has taken a long time for the Government to realise the importance of the situation and to provide some funds. Now we only need the provision of some funds or a rearrangement of priorities. I suggest that the Minister should be doing that to provide more staff in the area.

Quite a number of these wrecks are in Commonwealth waters. I understand that the Commonwealth has contributed nothing at all to the administration of the Commonwealth Historic Shipwrecks Act in South Australia. Two applications for funds have been made and, I understand, rejected by the Commonwealth. Again, in the Estimates Committees, it was pointed out by the Minister or one of his officers that a further submission had been sent to the Commonwealth asking for special consideration in the way that extra funding is given. No indication was given at that time by the Minister or his officers of the period of time it would take the Commonwealth to determine its attitude on the matter.

I hope that the Minister will continue to make representations to the Commonwealth to have it accept its respon-

sibility. Having said all that, and having said earlier that the Opposition would support the legislation, I reiterate the Opposition's concern about the lack of action taken by the Government to improve the staffing situation within the Department and to take a more active role in the protection of the historic shipwrecks and relics in this State because, without reiterating what I said before, we certainly recognise the importance of those wrecks and relics to the significant heritage of this State.

Therefore, I hope that the Minister is able to clarify a few of the questions I have asked today and that the Government will take more seriously than has been the case in the past 12 months the responsibility that it has in regard to the protection of historic shipwrecks.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to make a few comments on this Bill, because I have seen cases where the Historic Shipwrecks Act has applied in the coastal areas of South Australia and had a detrimental effect on the livelihood of some fishermen. Considering that this legislation is for fresh water historic wrecks, I hope that it will not cause the same problems that it has in certain cases in the past. The classic example I wish to bring to the attention of the House concerns the *Zanoni* wreck, which is in St Vincent Gulf. It was in the headlines earlier this year, first, after it had been officially located and, secondly, when it was found that various fishermen would have their livelihood severely curtailed as a result of the provisions of this Act being applied. I believe that the unfortunate thing is that the wreck was located originally by a fisherman who had informed several other fishermen where it was, and this fisherman and several others in latter months found it an excellent fishing spot.

One person apparently had been fishing it for many years (in fact, I believe that 20 years is not out of the question), and it was obvious that other fishermen also knew, but have not disclosed it to date. The whole idea of the Historic Shipwrecks Act is to preserve such shipwrecks, and I can only agree that there is possibly some merit in that. However, when it was found by divers that there had been no discernible damage to the shipwreck, the *Zanoni*, in all these years that the fisherman had been fishing the area, then to apply the guillotine, so to speak, to stop any further fishing with the threat of severe fines, seemed very unreasonable.

The fishermen certainly appealed, and it appeared that their appeal would be successful, but after virtually having the belief that they would receive letters in the mail saying, 'Yes, you people can fish it,' the letters actually stated, 'No, you cannot fish in that area,' which was very upsetting. Why should this be the case when no damage had been done to the wreck over all these years? It is also unfortunate that, because the wreck had been identified, many amateur fishermen apparently went out there regularly from the time that it was first announced.

The professionals then had to sit back and watch because part of their fine would involve confiscation of all equipment whereas an amateur if caught would simply face a fine. It would not unduly upset him or her to be caught. What disturbs me is that this Bill to amend the Historic Wrecks Act will apply in the fresh water zone. Are we going to see the possibility of professional fishermen having their livelihood limited as occurred in the case of shipwrecks in seawater? I believe that this matter will have to be considered more carefully. The very fact of identifying the matter brings it to public attention. People who have the least to lose, such as amateur fishermen, are possibly the ones who will take most advantage of a good fishing spot.

It was interesting to hear the member for Murray point out that at present there are few personnel available to police this Act. This was the case in respect of the *Zanoni* wreck—the amateur fishermen were not caught because the

area was not policed, but the professional fishermen had far too much to lose to risk fishing there. I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments about the matter. I emphasise that I hope that nothing will curtail the livelihood of any person, especially at a time when unemployment is so high.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): First, I thank Opposition members, and the member for Murray in particular, for the support given to this straight-forward measure. Secondly, I compliment the Opposition, and particularly the member for Murray, for the enthusiasm displayed in regard to this important part of the State's heritage. However, I do want to ask just how long standing is this enthusiasm? The member for Murray predicted one or two of the remarks that I might make in rejoinder to certain statements he made and that prediction was quite accurate (I wonder whether I should take him on my staff as a speech writer). The point is that it is not good enough to simply say, 'We laid down the spadework and now it is up to the present Government to provide the expanded staff that we were not able to provide.' There was nothing to prevent the honourable member, when Minister, from finding five officers to undertake this responsibility (or 10, 15, 20 officers, or whatever). The plain fact of the matter is that when I came to office I found that, to do this work, I had one officer and no boat. As a result of the Estimates we have just carried, I will have the same officer and a boat, so things are improving. They are not improving nearly as quickly as I would like them to improve, certainly, but additional resources are being put in the field and will continue to be placed in the field, because the whole concept of the heritage of shipwrecks both around our coast and in the inland waters of the State is of particular interest to me as Minister.

The honourable member asked a specific question about authorisations. I am afraid that I partly missed that question because his colleague, the member for Mitcham, was attempting to assist me with some drafting at that time. However, I will take the *Hansard* record away with me and provide him with a specific response in writing. The honourable member, in chastising me in relation to this matter, mentioned the *Waterwitch* as a wreck which required protection and a good deal of work. I simply remind the honourable member that that is the reason for the amendment. It is hardly valid to say the Government is ignoring the *Waterwitch*, when by the passage of this legislation we are securing the power to be able to address the problems concerning that part of our heritage. That statement from the honourable member seems rather odd. My reference to drafting related to a matter which had been raised informally with me by the honourable member's colleague and which I think I have sorted out. No amendment to the Bill before us will be necessary in view of the way the definitions operate in the parent Act. We may wish to address that matter when we come to the relevant part of the Committee stage. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Prohibition of certain action in relation to historic shipwrecks and relics.'

Mr BAKER: I refer to a matter that I raised informally with the Minister for Environment and Planning concerning the reference to territorial waters in subsection (1) (d) of section 13 of the Act, and whether that was consistent with the proposed amendment to subsection (2) of section 13 of the Act, as I did not think that the matter was appropriately covered by the amendment to subsection (2). I understand that the Minister has now sorted out that matter.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The situation, as I am advised, is that when one looks at the parent Act one finds that the definition of territorial waters as referred to in section 13 (1) is given as:

- (a) waters within the limits of the State; or
- (b) waters adjacent to the State being waters to which the Commonwealth Act does not apply.

So, there are no problems in relation to protection of relics in Lake Alexandrina, Lake Bonney or the Murray River system generally, or even Lake Eyre, I guess, should anything be found there while the area is covered by water, as occurs from time to time. However, the problem is that subsection (2) goes on to refer to the sea bed and the subsoil of the sea bed, and that is where we run into trouble, because the wording of that subsection obviously rules out the possibility of the provisions of section 13 (1) being applied to inland waters. The fact that there is a reference to territorial waters of the State does not in any way preclude the Murray River system or any other inland water from being encompassed in this legislation, but it is section 13 (2) which provides the problem and hence the reason for the amendment we have before us.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 August. Page 656.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill. However, there are alterations that were made by the Minister in another sphere which are of concern to the Opposition. Although there are aspects of the measure that require attention, we believe that this is not the place to process them. Reference to a debate earlier this afternoon will clearly indicate the misunderstanding that the Minister has in relation to that matter, but, that apart, the proposed alterations here give a form of wording which enhances quite effectively the management of the Act as it is structured under the present Government.

New clause 52 may be more understandable and more presentable to the public and those who are directly involved with this matter. New clause 60 is certainly spelt out in more detail and is something for which local government is applying in other areas. The Local Government Association, when requested for information as to the amendments which are contained under the Housing Improvement Act and as to whether there would be an impact on its activity, indicated in a letter on 29 September that the Association had been involved in discussions on the forthcoming amendments to the Land and Business Agents Act, and the major portion of this amendment relates to that Act. The position here is that local government is progressively becoming more involved with the need to provide factual documentation for the purposes of sale of properties. One of the real difficulties which has occurred in recent times has been in checking whether a Housing Improvement Act direction still exists.

More specifically, I refer to a case within the Corporation of Gawler where the Corporation, having been advised of a Housing Improvement Act commitment back in the early 1960s, subsequently inspected the property, cleared it so far as the council was concerned, offered no resistance whatsoever to the sale of the property, and issued the necessary documentation. A sale was effected and, some years later, when one of the parties sought to raise funds on that house

it emerged that there had been a Housing Improvement Act commitment on that property, the existence of which had been forgotten. The Housing Improvement Act personnel had not been near the place for years and years. The owner, because earlier there had been direct involvement between the Housing Trust and the local government building officer, accepted that the alterations carried out were deemed to have been adequate. The major problem related to the continued belief of the officer of the Housing Trust that salt damp continued to exist and that the form of treatment had been inadequate.

I raise these points not to debate the issue so much as to highlight the fact that the liaison that ought to exist between various authorities which have an impact on the saleability of a property (to wit, the local government body, through its health and building functions, and the Housing Trust, through any action that may have been taken by not perhaps liaising with council as to which properties in the council area at the end of any year or of any five-year period are still subject to the existence of a Housing Improvement Act commitment) requires further strengthening.

However, the arrangements which are now entered into will go some way towards rectifying perhaps necessary dialogue upon that matter. Upon accepting the passage of this measure on this occasion, I simply make the point that we do not necessarily believe that the matter should end here, and that if as a result of further deliberations—and I will be initiating some with the Minister and the appropriate departments—a changed approach is necessary, then I would like to believe that the Government is going to accept, after proper dialogue and proper consideration, those changes so that the odd case does not become a frequent case, that the lack of continued inspection of properties which have a commitment over them does not cause a changing circumstance or a changing ownership, the husband having been deceased and the widow not recognising the full impact of the documentation which was prepared previously.

I do not want to spell it out in total detail. But I accept the nod from the Minister that he understands there is a need for some further consultation. The problem may arise in some quarters that the simple alternative which allows for the determination of fees by way of regulation is not a hang-up so far as the Opposition is concerned. It has been a frequent method of taking away from a number of Acts the need to bring them back for change. Any action taken in respect of fees is subject to the decision of the House in so far as a disallowance motion is concerned. I raise the point, which is consistent and which members on the opposite side used when they stood in this place quite recently, that the ability to raise fees by regulation is not going to be a means of raising finance for the requirements of the Government.

A classic case has come forward within the past week or two in relation to on-the-spot fines, with a 25 per cent increase. The member for Stuart, the Chief Secretary, would have a very red face over that. I am giving an example of how these things can change with the passage of time. I want to highlight that the Opposition will be very observant of any action which may be taken in that regard. I cannot see that it would be necessary, but we are not hung up on the course of action which has to be taken. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I am pleased to see that the Opposition supports this Bill. It is necessary. The points that the member for Light has made in his speech will be taken into account. I do give assurances to him and to the Opposition that, if he feels there should be some further dialogue between himself and my office, that will be forthcoming.

As to the fee situation, I accept that there is always that view by members of the Opposition, of whatever Party, that the variation of fees could be seen as a revenue raising situation. But, when one looks at the existing fee, and it has not been increased since 5 December 1940, the fee is now at 10c. When one considers that postage is now 30c there is a need for the Government to look at the raising of fees by regulation. But, I can assure the member for Light that this will not be looked at as a revenue raising measure. It will just be enough to cover the cost of administering the particular applications.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Application of rent control to houses.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: One of the points that I sought to make is the difficulty of all parties being aware of the current situation in respect of a statement applying to the publishing in the *Gazette* to declare the house to be substandard for the purposes of this Part. The *Government Gazette* is a permanent document (I am not suggesting otherwise) and is a document which is given some consideration by local government bodies but not necessarily filed as well as it might be. Certainly, it is not a document which normally would come into the hands of the person whose property has been considered. It may be that as a matter of practical application a copy of the gazettal should be forwarded to the person whose home has been declared substandard and that it should become a practice that such a document be sent out on a regular basis every five years.

One might say that a person whose home is substandard should tidy it up in a short period. However, people are not necessarily obliged to do so, as long as they are willing to accept the conditions themselves or are willing to battle on and resist, and they have been able to resist building inspectors of local government and housing improvement personnel in the past. This leads to the unknown, to which I have previously referred. While I do not put forward a form of amendment to the Minister, there appears to be that inherent weakness in the measure as I understand it at present and as I am able to bring positive evidence of application in the field to the Minister's knowledge. This may well stimulate some ongoing dialogue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Light is correct. Notices are placed only in the *Gazette*, and perhaps that is something that I and the Government should look at. I would hope that, because the member for Light has obviously taken this Bill and thoroughly researched it, when we have our ongoing dialogue, perhaps we can come to some happy conclusion so that in future there may be a further amendment to ensure that all people are aware of the particular notices.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Provision as to regulations.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Minister advise the Committee what sum he has in contemplation in regard to the fee?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The sum in mind is about \$3.50. That sum was determined by the Department and the Housing Trust to cover the costs of administering this Act. An increase from 10 cents to \$3.50 represents a massive increase but, when one looks at some of the fees charged by other Government departments for the same service, it is a reasonable fee to ask of people in this situation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: During the course of the second reading debate I mentioned that the Local Government Association had been having dialogue with the Attorney-General in relation to the Land and Business Agents Act. In fact, it pointed out that the Act requires councils to

provide information about all prescribed encumbrances on any properties upon request. The twofold concern of the Local Government Association relates to, first, the liability of councils in relation to that requirement and, secondly, the administrative cost to councils of supplying such information.

I have received an indication that the Association has now obtained a consensus that the limiting of the provision of information by local government to prescribed encumbrances only will reduce the potentially unlimited liability of councils. Therefore, it has been able to consider bringing the fee back to a maximum of \$10. I raise this matter because we could have a situation where \$10 will apply in one area and \$3.50 somewhere else. The \$10 that I have mentioned is not yet law and it may not become law. It is fairly important that we do not provide a situation where the additional costs to prospective purchasers or to the real estate industry, which is responsible for amassing some of the material, get out of hand. The \$3.50 appears not to be unreasonable. If it only involves a simple certificate, that is the maximum amount that the Opposition would like to see. I hope that the Minister does not change his mind in a short time and make it \$5, because there may be some resistance.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 September. Page 1039.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill, which has two simple aspects: first, an opportunity for the Trust to deploy its additional or surplus funds into areas of higher interest (consistent with an opportunity that has been given to other statutory bodies), and that is completely satisfactory to the Opposition; secondly the repeal of the section that requires publication of audited statements in the *Government Gazette*. The parent Act provides for an audit to be undertaken by the Auditor-General and, as a result, it is identified on every occasion in the Auditor-General's Report. The Opposition is quite happy that it no longer will be necessary for independent gazettal. Similar action has been taken progressively in a number of other areas, and I suggest that it could be implemented in relation to those Acts where the Auditor-General is responsible for auditing. That is pulling the bow a little long, but it is a view which might be taken on board in relation to any of the other statutory bodies associated with local government bodies or, indeed, in other areas of Government action. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 October at 2 p.m.