

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 September 1984

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

## PETITIONS: FIREARMS

Petitions signed by 215 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence fees for the promotion of sporting activities were presented by the Hon. Peter Duncan and Mr Meier.

Petitions received.

## QUESTION TIME

## COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**Mr OLSEN:** Can the Minister of Emergency Services say whether the Government intends to replace the Board of the Country Fire Services, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee, and does it intend that Mr Lloyd Johns remain as Director of the CFS? The Opposition has been told this morning that the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee are causing great uncertainty within the Service at a crucial time as it gears up for another fire season beginning in eight weeks time.

It is particularly the case that volunteer CFS members (the backbone of the Service, as I am sure the Minister will agree) are looking to the Government to make prompt decisions following the PAC report, and particularly in relation to the Board and the Director. I therefore ask the Minister to say when the Government intends to respond to the Committee's conclusions and recommendations, especially those relating to the Board and the Director.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** Currently, the PAC report and the recommendations contained therein are still being analysed. Of course, the report is very lengthy, as the Leader would know. Personally, I think that to act upon that report without giving the Director of the CFS and the Board itself, through its Chairman, the right to respond to the recommendations, would be a denial of natural justice. So, this morning I wrote both of them a letter, which they would have received by now, asking them to respond, and also making sure that they had a copy of the report.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** The Chairman did a pretty good job on *Nationwide* last night.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I did not have the privilege of seeing *Nationwide* last night.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** It's doubtful whether it was a privilege.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** He must have been saying something about you. I did not see *Nationwide* but, returning to the Leader's question, I have given the Board and the CFS Director seven days in which to respond to the report. I think that is a reasonable time. I do not think it is delaying the matter or that it is too short a time for that organisation to respond to the allegations. In my view, to act impetuously on this matter without giving people an opportunity to respond would be, as I said, a denial of natural justice, and I am one who believes and has always believed in natural justice.

It is important that I put on record, while I am on my feet, some of the actions that I have implemented in the

few short months that I have been Minister responsible for emergency services. My first responsibility was to receive the corporate review commissioned by the CFS Board on which I sought public comment. It took some time to get the answers from people who were interested in it. Of course, that was spread right throughout the community, including the volunteers. The next matter to digest and come to terms with was the Coroner's report into the bush-fires themselves. I have established the Davies Committee into the co-ordination of fire services; I have also now referred the funding question to that committee. Cabinet made that decision on Monday.

I will not go into the reasons publicly why that decision was made, but if someone wants to know privately I will be only too pleased to tell them. I took it upon myself on 4 June to appoint Mr Dennis Mutton to the CFS to provide senior management expertise, and at the same time I appointed an accounting officer to assist him. All those people involved with Dennis Mutton's administration welcomed that decision. I receive weekly reports from him, and to the best of my knowledge things are being put on track in a proper managerial situation in the CFS.

I have also arranged for the Public Service Board to prepare a detailed computer needs study to recommend appropriate steps to automate CFS accounting systems and volunteer registration of standards of fire cover. I have sought recommendations from the Public Service Board on what steps the Government should take in respect of the general reorganisation of management and control of the Country Fire Services. Members will readily see that in the past few months, during my period as Minister, I have been very active in this regard. Many matters need consideration, in addition to those matters about which I have spoken. On top of that we now have the Parliamentary Accounts Committee recommendations to digest. As I said, I will be in a position within seven or eight days to make final decisions about this matter.

## CENTENNIAL PARK CEMETERY

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister of Local Government take such action as is necessary to ensure that the desecration of a site of interment of remains of deceased persons at Centennial Park Cemetery ceases? This morning I was contacted by a constituent who told me that when she returned from holidays on Monday this week there was a letter for her from the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust which informed her that she had until Friday of this week (14 September) to advise the Trust as to whether: first, she wanted the remains of her aunt and uncle removed and replaced in another part of the cemetery; or, secondly, whether she wanted the ashes back because she would be refunded the \$500 it had cost to have the two containers of ashes interred in the rose garden.

When she told the Trust that they were not to be moved, she was told that a road was to be built over the remains. I contacted another person to whom I was referred and whose husband was interred there in January 1981. She has had the same experience and was advised in the middle of last week that she had until Friday of this week to make arrangements. It seems to me that this is a denial of people's rights and it is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman is debating the matter.

**Mr GREGORY:** Thank you for your assistance and guidance, Mr Speaker. It is upsetting to these people, and it is very distressing. All these people are aged and retired, and most are very concerned to ensure that when their relatives and loved ones are interred their remains are not disturbed.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As Minister in charge of the Local Government Act which covers the cemeteries in South Australia, of course, I was very interested in the controversy that has arisen because of the actions of the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust, and I have called for a report. This is, as the honourable member has said, a very sensitive and understandably a very emotional issue for those whose relatives and friends have been cremated and interred at the Centennial Park Cemetery. The first result of my investigation was to show that the Local Government Act does not cover the ashes of a cremated person, so there is no legal status for the ashes of a cremated person in South Australia.

The other States do cover these ashes and currently a review is being undertaken by the Attorney-General. That will be due very soon and it may recommend that similar action be taken in South Australia, but at this stage I am unable to say whether that would be the result. However, as a result of what is happening currently at the Centennial Park Cemetery I think that there is good reason for controls to be included in the Local Government Act. We have tried to make contact with the management of the Trust and have been unable to do so, but an officer of a public relations company rang back and contacted my Department, speaking on behalf of the Trust.

I have been given a bit of background that I think I ought to give to the House in fairness to the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust. This is in no way excusing what I believe to be quite an appalling lack of public relations and a lack of contact in what it is doing to the people concerned. I understand that the Trust has decided to erect in 1985 a new chapel and crematorium, which may cost \$3.5 million to \$4 million, and my advice is that the plans and specifications are not available. The work would necessitate the relocation of 1 600 containers of ashes in the rose garden section and they would be relocated to a new and identical site which I have been advised is approximately 100ft away. So, 1 600 urns will be relocated if these plans go ahead.

To date, the Trust has contacted only 190 of the legal representatives of the persons whose ashes are interred. That means that 1 410 relatives, friends and legal representatives (if one wishes) of people whose ashes are interred have not been contacted at all; so, in a sense it is the tip of the iceberg. The Trust says that there have been very few complaints, but honourable members know that complaints are feeding through to members of Parliament. As the member for Florey has pointed out, the people with whom he has been in contact are understandably very upset about the decision of the Trust to move these ashes.

Although I do not have the power under the Act to take any action, I will nevertheless contact the Trust and the two councils involved—the Mitcham and Unley City Councils—to see whether this action can be stopped and whether perhaps they can complete the new crematorium and chapel (with which I do not disagree) without interfering with the sites of the 1 600 interred urns. As the member for Glenelg points out, people have a lease, which I think is normally for 50 years, although I am unsure of that.

**Mr Mathwin:** Twenty-five years.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am not sure. However, it is a serious matter, and I believe that the actions of the Trust, and of the councils to whom the Trust is responsible, have not dealt sensitively with this very important issue. If they need to construct a crematorium and chapel, there must be a way of doing that without interfering or upsetting so many people in South Australia whose friends, relatives, parents and children are interred there. I will do what I can, in response to the honourable member's question, to

resolve the matter in the best interests of those people who have such a vital and understandable concern about it.

## COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Premier say why the Government refused to introduce programme performance budgeting in the Country Fire Services, and will the Premier accept the major responsibility for what the Public Accounts Committee has called 'a lamentable lack of action over the problems of the CFS'? Much of the public comment so far about the report of the Public Accounts Committee has referred to its criticisms of the Board and the Director. However, the report also makes some significant criticisms of Government inaction.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Wait for it. The report reveals that the Auditor-General twice, in March 1983 and in March 1984, made special reports to the Premier about financial management within the CFS. However, the Auditor-General commented in his second report that budgetary and cash control and financial management reporting had deteriorated in the 12 months since his first special report. The PAC Report also reveals that in December 1982, the Director of the CFS raised with the Government the question of the introduction of programme performance budgeting, but this was rejected as unnecessary, and instead the Government decided to supply financial management advice to CFS headquarters in a limited fashion through the Woods and Forests Department. The Committee has called this a 'serious mistake'. In conclusion 12 of its report, the PAC has found:

That the deterioration of financial management control in the Country Fire Services was aggravated by the failure of central Public Service agencies, such as the Public Service Board, to provide prompt and continuing assistance on financial/accounting procedures.

While the Auditor-General had recommended in March 1983 that a proper budgeting and reporting system be designed for the CFS, it was not until June this year that a senior officer of the Department of the Public Service Board was seconded to the CFS Board on a full-time basis. It has been put to me that the Government must accept responsibility for the breakdown in financial management within the CFS and that it is necessary to ensure that morale within the service is not totally destroyed.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not accept what the Deputy Leader has said. In fact, the situation in the CFS was one which the Government inherited, and one might recall that the deficiencies—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The deficiencies and strengths (and I put on the record 'strengths') of the CFS were highlighted in that extraordinary crisis situation of the Ash Wednesday bushfires. It became apparent that obviously the whole range of fire emergency service in this State, particularly the Country Fire Services, would have to be looked at in some depth—not just financial management but the total organisation.

If the Deputy Leader had been listening to the reply given by the Deputy Premier a moment ago, he would have heard of the arrangements that have been set in train as a result of that. He would also have heard the Deputy Premier refer to the corporate review that had been commissioned by the Country Fire Services and the fact that the findings of the Coronial bushfires inquiry were also relevant to these questions. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that following receipt of the Auditor-General's Report certain things were set in train and they were in train in the CFS. They proved to be inadequate, as the Committee rightly

pointed out, and as a result of that second report we immediately commissioned to the CFS added assistance in terms of financial management and accounting.

So, a lot of actions have been taken, a number of which were detailed a moment ago. I can assure the House that the Government has been in no way derelict in terms of its responsibility to ensure that the CFS is well managed. We have done that in the context of that whole area of service being under major review and the subject of a considerable number of reports. I cannot remember the precise details about the programme and performance budgeting exercise, but I suspect that that would simply have compounded the problems because it would have tied up resources within the CFS on what at that stage, in the light of the information we had, would have been a quite futile exercise.

Whether a programme and performance approach will be useful in the future is a matter to be determined: it certainly was not appropriate at the time. I again refer to the fact that the corporate review undertaken by the CFS, the Coroners' reports and their findings, the establishment of various committees (such as the Davies Committee), the provision of extra financial assistance and expertise in the CFS, had all been set in train prior to receiving the PAC Report because we are well aware of the need to have the CFS in top class shape for the coming fire season. It is a funny definition of inaction and, as the Deputy Premier has pointed out in relation to the PAC recommendations, they are being dealt with as a matter of urgency.

#### RACEWAY ACCIDENT

**Mr MAYES:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport report to the House on what steps he is prepared to initiate to investigate an accident during a race at the Adelaide International Raceway in which a motorbike rider fell and yet the race was continued, a situation which could have endangered his life, the lives of other riders, race officials and ambulance officers? A fortnight ago on *ABC News* the winner of the senior race which was held that day at the Adelaide International Raceway questioned the race stewards for allowing to continue a race in which a rider had fallen. He went on to say that in his opinion the race should have been stopped to reduce the danger to riders and officials.

Later that evening I had the opportunity to view the replay on ABC television and in that replay it was quite clear that officials and ambulance officers were placed in some danger because the rider had fallen in the middle of the race in a very precarious part of the track. Later during that race officials were forced to cross the track during the race as it continued. It would appear from the comments of the winner—it is an unusual situation where a winner makes a comment at the end of a race—that there was some danger to riders and officials.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The member for Unley mentioned this matter to me privately yesterday so, in the meantime, I have tabled a report from the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia under whose auspices the event was conducted. The President of that union informs me, regarding the incident, as follows.

The rider did fall and the race did continue while the fallen rider was being attended to. I am also informed that the stewards raised the yellow caution flag, which means that all riders are supposed to slow down and hold their positions in a race. It was considered by the stewards that the race could safely continue as there was ample room for the riders to pass the fallen rider. The rider was not seriously injured and was a considerable distance from the edge of the track. I was also advised that at no time did the St John ambulance attendants feel that they were in any danger.

Further, I was advised that if at any time there had appeared to be an immediate danger the stewards would have stopped the race. As a matter of fact, I point out that three riders fell in a previous event after which that race was stopped.

It was also suggested to me by the Auto Cycle Union that the stewards' report on the incident is available. If the honourable member wants a copy of that written report, I think that that could be made available by the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia. Every safety precaution should be taken in these types of events. Accidents have occurred in the past, as we all know, which have proved to be serious to riders. Indeed, I believe that every precaution needs to be taken to ensure that the safety measures are maintained. If the member for Unley wants a copy of the stewards' written report, I will undertake to obtain that from the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia.

#### MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Premier refer for determination by the Supreme Court the matter of the constitutional position of members of this Parliament who have accepted Government money in return for the sale of shares to the TAB? Yesterday the Premier undertook to obtain an opinion on this matter. Thus far he has not provided that opinion; nor has he indicated from which source he will seek it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Opposition believes that the matter should be referred to the Supreme Court to ensure that any opinion given is seen to be independent of the Executive Government. The fact that three members of this Parliament may no longer be entitled to take their seats raises other important constitutional questions, including the status of votes in which those members participate if their seats are subsequently declared void. This is another reason why a constitutional interpretation should be sought from the Supreme Court with a request that it be given as a matter of urgency.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, I have indicated where I would get this information. I gave that information to the honourable member yesterday in answer to a question that he asked me. So, his memory is exceedingly short. I told the honourable member that I would consult with the Attorney-General who, in turn, would obtain a full and appropriate legal opinion from the Crown Law Office. I made that clear. I spoke to the Attorney-General earlier today after receiving a message from him.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I wouldn't be surprised if he refused to give it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to come to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That legal opinion is not yet available, but it will be presented to the House as soon as the Attorney-General has obtained it.

#### FLAGSTAFF ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Minister of Transport dispel the misrepresentation of facts related to the Flagstaff Road reconstruction adjacent to the bridge area and the construction of the inbound and outbound access to South Road? Over the past few weeks constituents in the area that I represent have been given quite misleading accounts about what is occurring in relation to this priority project. The

misrepresentation has been initiated by people making statements to the media and by statements made in local papers. My constituents have expressed their concern that, having been informed in December last year that the Government had placed urgent priority on the bridge reconstruction, they are now seeing deliberate misrepresentation of this matter and are concerned that this could jeopardise the already instigated construction commencement.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the honourable member for her question. I do not know who is responsible for the misleading accounts referred to by the honourable member or what they hope to achieve from them. However, traffic management improvements at Darlington which involve widening the Flagstaff Road approach to the South Road, Marion Road intersection will commence no later than January/February next year, and work is hoped to be completed within three to six months.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Three years late.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The Highways Department has issued property owners with notices of intention to acquire land which is necessary for this work, because I consider this to be a high priority.

I have instructed the Department to expedite matters and to ensure that construction commences in January/February next year. The only issue that could hold up work is if there is any dispute relating to land acquisition and any delay in court proceedings, but once the Department obtains the right of entry to the land construction will commence. The intersection will be specifically improved by widening the stormwater drainage culvert, together with an additional inbound and outbound lane, so that the Flagstaff Road approach will comprise three inbound lanes and two outbound lanes. Opposition members say that it is three years too late, but they had an opportunity to do something about this problem and did absolutely nothing about it. We have made a decision to do something about it and hope that work will be started in January/February next year and completed within three to six months.

### PRISONS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Will the Premier say what is the Government's explanation for such a dramatic increase in the average annual net cost per prisoner of running the prison system in South Australia, and what action will the Government take to rectify the situation? The 1984 Auditor-General's Report states that for the past 12 months the average annual net cost per prisoner increased by \$8 900, or 36 per cent, to \$34 000. The 1983 report stated that the average annual cost in that year was \$22 500, so there has been an increase from \$22 500 to \$34 000. In relation to the Yatala Labour Prison, there is an increase from \$20 000 per prisoner in 1982 to \$50 000 this year, and that does not take into account expenditure on capital works.

**An honourable member:** It's cheaper at the Hilton.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Indeed, it is much cheaper at the Hilton. This year's Auditor-General's Report also states that there are now 727 staff overseeing 700 prisoners—more than one prison officer looking after each prisoner.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I might be a bit confused, but I thought it was the honourable member who only a few weeks ago (and certainly periodically over the past two years) was demanding that more prison warders be employed in the prisons, higher security, and that more be spent on our correctional services system. Now, however, he comes up with this ludicrous statement. I think the question, rather than being directed to me, ought to be directed to the ineptitude of the shadow Minister in charge of prisons (and thank goodness he is not actually in charge of them, because

he does not understand what is going on in our prison system).

On the one hand, whenever an escape occurs or there is a danger of a prison riot, he is down there saying that more warders are needed and that the Government has to get tougher and put more money into the system. In fact, the Government has spent a lot on correctional services and, most importantly, on basic capital works in our security system which are well under way. The simple explanation—the main explanation—as to why the cost per prisoner has increased is that the prison population has substantially reduced.

### TOURIST BOOKLET

**Mr HAMILTON:** Has the Minister of Transport considered providing a tourist guide booklet for use and distribution by taxi drivers in metropolitan Adelaide? Victorian taxi drivers distribute a booklet that contains many details of interest to taxi users and tourists. These include a list of emergency services, such as hospitals, veterinary services, and normal general services such as Government, post offices and other Government agencies. It also includes an accommodation, leisure and entertainment guide for tourists. There is, in addition, a public transport map and details of taxi charges. Members will recall that on 8 August 1984, at page 118 of *Hansard*, I said, in part:

I believe it is very important [that this book be issued] because nothing is more galling than being ripped off by an unscrupulous taxi driver and, of course, that is bad publicity for the industry as a whole.

Will the issue of such a booklet be considered for Adelaide?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Yes, I have discussed this matter with the Taxi Cab Board of South Australia. *The Taxi Drivers Guide of Melbourne* is a private enterprise booklet produced by Richard Stention and Associates, of Balaclava, Victoria. The cost of that booklet's production is paid for by advertisers. The guide is of value to taxi cab drivers and the general public and is distributed through drivers, hotels, motels, business houses, and so on. A similar booklet was produced in Adelaide in early 1984, but because of unsatisfactory advertisements was not proceeded with. The Taxi Cab Operators Association, realising the potential of the publication, is currently negotiating with a publisher to produce a guide similar to the Victorian publication. This should be ready for distribution in early 1985.

The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board is quite prepared to assist the publisher with details of fares and other relative information. It is pointed out that the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board has published a folder for the information of the general public on how to hire a taxi cab. These folders are distributed throughout the metropolitan area in appropriate places. All taxi cabs are fitted with stickers on the windscreen setting out the proper fares chargeable by drivers. Adelaide differs from other States in that the total fare payable by passengers is set out on the taxi cab meter. There are no hidden charges or extras. This makes it more difficult for any unscrupulous driver to rip off any passenger. The Taxi Cab Board has agreed to co-operate with the Taxi Cab Operators Association. I understand that the guide will be published every three months, thus providing the opportunity to include the dates of any activity or sporting fixture that may be of interest to the public. The guide will also be distributed to hotels, motels, and so on. It is hoped that distribution will commence early in January next year.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Alexandra.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do not have a question ready, or anything like that, but I appreciate the opportunity. I direct my question to the Premier, subsequent to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, about budget programming within the CFS. I seek leave to explain why I am on my feet at this stage and why I ask the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to proceed and ask his question, so that we may be enlightened of it.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Sir. As I say, subsequent to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, I ask whether the Premier was aware that the Minister of Agriculture (the Hon. Mr Chatterton at the time) on 22 February 1983 wrote to the Director of the CFS saying that in his view programme performance budgeting was unnecessary within that organisation?

The point was canvassed briefly, as I indicated earlier, by the Leader, and we are all aware of the concern publicly prevailing about the lack of accountability in that Department. The system of programme performance budgeting was introduced in order to achieve accountability in Government departments. It is my understanding that the request to perform accordingly at CFS level was made of the Minister of Agriculture of the day in order to assist in improving accountability within that division, and in this instance it was refused. I think that it is important to know whether the Premier, and indeed the Government of the day, were aware of this sort of thing going on; hence my question to the Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member finally got to the question. I do not know what the honourable member's colleagues think about such a question, but I guess that they are struggling with their own so it does not matter very much. I do not specifically recall the letter referred to by the honourable member, but I think that I covered my attitude towards that question in response to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, actually, who asked the question, not the Leader of the Opposition. A programme performance budgeting exercise being carried out could possibly have been counter-productive and distracting of the necessary financial rearrangements that have to be made in strict and straight accounting terms within the CFS.

Unfortunately, I think that the previous Government was responsible for promoting this idea. Programme performance budgeting does not solve all problems of priorities or strict accounting procedure. In some instances it can be of assistance, but one of the things that I noted within the Public Service was the enormous amount of time, energy and effort being devoted by members of the Public Service to pursuing dual programming systems which in fact were completely wasted. Year by year we have seen that example coming through the Estimates Committees in this House with the so-called white book of estimates and the accompanying yellow books. As the honourable member well knows, members on both sides of the House have been less than satisfied with the outcome of that operation in which so much was promised by the previous Government.

Members on both sides of the House, with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, have expressed to me the problems they are having in grappling with those two concepts and really making some sense of them. I concede that extra information has been supplied, but in many cases supplied in such a manner as to lead to difficulty. I would say that, against that background, for an organisation which plainly had to get its accounts and accounting procedures

in order to have added on to it the further burden of instituting an entirely different system under some form of programming performance, when its programme is quite clearly a programme aimed at CFS activities in a narrow area, would have been onerous; so, I do not think that anything needs to be done about that.

It is interesting that the honourable member who asked the question was formerly in charge of the CFS, and the Chairman of the CFS Board had a number of things to say about completely contradictory financial instructions that were given by the previous Minister in Government to the Board, making its job in administration very difficult. It was told on the one hand to stay within its allocated budget and that there could be no expansion of that: 'You stick to your budget and do not make any difference.'

On the other hand, it was told that it is essential to maintain a 50 per cent subsidy because of the tremendous impact any change in that policy would have had in local council areas. The Chairman pointed out quite correctly that those two instructions simply did not correlate. It was impossible on the one hand to maintain the budget which had been given by the Government and, on the other, to maintain the 50 per cent subsidy concept. Yet, the member who asked that question, as Minister, gave those conflicting instructions. Little wonder that there were considerable problems in the CFS at the time that we came to Government. We are doing something about redressing them.

### FIRE BRIGADE STATION

**Mr PETERSON:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether it is the Government's intention to build a new fire brigade station on LeFevre Peninsula and, if so, where and when? The Minister and the House will be well aware of the resistance by people who lived in my electorate a few years ago when it was suggested in the Cox Report that the existing ageing station in Hall Street, Semaphore, would be closed and the services absorbed into the Port Adelaide facility. At that time an undertaking was given that the fire services would not be removed from the Peninsula and that, in fact, a new building would be erected at Strathfield Terrace to house these services. I have now been informed that this site will not now be used but that another site on Victoria Road may now be developed. Will the Minister clarify the situation?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** That is a reasonable question for the member for Semaphore to ask.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** With interjections going across the Chamber, members opposite must not want me to reply to the honourable member. I said that it was a reasonable question because the Cox Report, in the first instance, recommended that the fire station on the Peninsula be abandoned. That was the problem in the first place. I know that the honourable member took an early interest in the matter and pursued it at quite some length to see whether he could change the situation. The Cox Report took into consideration many other fire stations. I see the member for Victoria nodding in assent, because the report from Cox brought about the recommendations which, in the main, are very good but which in some areas were going to have an effect.

It is true that the proposed site in Victoria Road, Taperoo, to which the honourable member referred, had some sort of gas main problem under it. So, obviously, that had to be obviated. It having been decided that a further fire station was to be developed, a new site had to be found. The new site is on the corner of Willochra Street and Victoria Road. The honourable member will no doubt be familiar with that. The capital works programme for 1986-87 contains

funds for relocation of the existing fire station at an approximate cost of \$450 000. I understand that initially it will be a double bay parking fire station. It will have only one appliance in the first instance, but, if it is proved that a second appliance is required, it will be placed at the station. I also understand that the station has 16 staff currently and that when the new station is built staff numbers will be increased to 20 in accordance with the Cox manning recommendations.

### ST JOHN'S BOYS HOME

**Mr BECKER:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare say why it is necessary to close the St John's Boys Home at Brooklyn Park, along with several other homes, later this year? I am advised that there is great concern amongst juvenile residents at the St John's Boys Home at Brooklyn Park, who for the first time are in a stable and caring environment, that they may be once again farmed out to an unknown welfare agency when the home closes. I also understand that for most of these youths a number of alternatives have already been tried, and these admittedly difficult youths are presently being successfully cared for within the ambit of the Catholic Welfare Bureau.

As the Minister has additional funds in the 1984-85 Budget for grants to non-government children's and youth homes (that amount has increased from \$1.3 million to \$1.5 million), because there have been very few referrals by the Department to the St John's Boys Home, causing some problem, and, more importantly, because of the need for continuing stability of the welfare of those boys, will the Minister use his good offices to ensure that the St John's Boys Home and other Salvation Army homes are retained?

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the Minister I would quickly say this: questions directed to the Minister concerning private establishments not within his direct jurisdiction are of course out of order. However, those parts of the question which deal with the Minister's or the Government's financial backing of the institution or organisation are in order. I would not like honourable members to take the question that the member for Hanson asked and explained as being a precedent.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance on this matter, because your ruling is pertinent in this instance. The decision as to the future of the St John's Boys Home rests not with the Government of this State but with the Catholic Church, the Order involved, and particularly with the Catholic Welfare Bureau. In its Budget, the State Government has provided an additional amount of money to the Catholic Welfare Bureau for the purposes of the continued functioning of that boys home. That money is there, it is available and the first payment may have already been made for that purpose.

However, the decision that has been taken within the church to change the function of that home and to provide care for those young people in a different manner is in line with what is happening in many other non-government organisations providing similar care and, indeed, is already the policy of the Department for Community Welfare. This is now showing to have very real value for the young people who are cared for in this way.

So, I can assure the honourable member that this is not a decision of the Government. Funding is available if it is seen fit that the home should continue in its present form. I should, however, point out that obviously a great deal of consideration has been given to this matter within the forums of the Catholic Church itself.

### MURRAY RIVER FLEET

**Ms LENEHAN:** Can the Minister of Tourism provide the House with any information about the projected new paddle vessel to be added to the river fleet catering for tourists on the Murray River? One of the State's most popular tourist attractions with local, interstate and overseas visitors is the Murray River, with its opportunities for leisurely cruising or perhaps more active aquatic sports. It is with this in mind that I ask the Minister whether he can confirm indications which I have received that the Murray River is about to get a substantial addition to its touring fleet.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yes, I can advise the House that this morning Captain Keith Veenstra contacted me (and I thank him for the courtesy of so doing) to let me know that the company of which he is General Manager—that is, Murray River Developments—has announced today that it will add a new luxury passenger vessel to its fleet on the Murray River. The vessel will take 100 passengers in 50 luxury cabins on three tiers. An unusual welcome feature about the new vessel is that it will cater for severely and marginally handicapped people, and that will certainly provide holidays for people on the Murray River who currently are unable to take advantage of that beautiful holiday area.

It indicates a confidence in the tourism industry in South Australia, particularly in the Murray River sector, and, together with the decision that was announced today by Limani Motel at Port Lincoln where 12 new luxury motel units are being added to the complex there, it really shows that tourism is going very well in South Australia. I would therefore like to congratulate Murray River Developments. Certainly their passenger vessels provide a very unique holiday opportunity in Australia. South Australia is the only State in which that sort of holiday opportunity is available.

While on my feet, I would like to comment very briefly on an event that occurred today on one of our other beautiful rivers, the Torrens River. This event could develop into a tourist attraction and become an annual event. I refer to a tug of war between Government and Opposition members. I want to comment briefly on this matter, because my knowledge of this has been gained mainly from hearsay, as I was number two in our team, directly behind the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and I saw very little of the event. My understanding is that, once the anchor person (the member for Light) had the rope tied around him, it meant that immediately three-quarters of the rope was on his side of the line, leaving a quarter of it on our side. He then very promptly fell over backwards, which meant that all of those on our side of the team found themselves over on his side of the line with him. However, we did not complain about this—not because we are good sports and not because we are not used to losing but because we were desperately concerned that the event might be run again.

### STATE POLITICS

**Mr ASHENDEN:** In view of the resounding defeat inflicted by the Liberal Opposition's tug of war team, which comprised the members for Light, Hanson, Bragg and Todd over the Government's team, which comprised the Ministers of Recreation and Sport and Local Government and the members for Albert Park and Unley, will the Premier acknowledge that there is a decided move to the right of politics in South Australia, and that his Government is comprised of political lightweights?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Premier has just volunteered to take part in the next contest, and I think that that will help us show a distinct swing to the left—but

perhaps we ought to try to find other variations on that theme in order to introduce some fairness into it as well.

pleased that he raised the design matters that he did raise when he referred to the egg beater type machine.

### WIND POWER

**Mr KLUNDER:** My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I should like to continue the Quixotic tilting that has been going on. Will the Minister outline to the House the progress that has been made on the wind energy monitoring project that he announced early in June? I am prompted to ask this question following the publishing of an article recently in the *Financial Review* which pointed to developments in egg beater type windmill design (and that is no reflection on any of the members opposite in regard to the tug of war competition) in the United States which suggests that that might prove to be the most efficient energy converter yet developed.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I can provide the House with some information on the progress being made in the joint Government/ETSA wind monitoring programme. Most members would recall that this programme was announced at the time of release of the alternative energy volume of the Stewart Committee Report. I guess that, as I am one of the members who has been here since 1970, I have had quite a deal of experience in the wind area, so it is quite reasonable for me to be asked to give some information on this topic. My Department has informed me that work is well advanced on selecting the first five sites where the monitoring will take place. They are sites south of Adelaide. A further 23 sites are to be selected, and they will be located throughout the remainder of the State. That selection will take place later this year.

As part of this second stage, reviews of the existing wind generator designs and performance as well as the necessary economic and costing studies will be undertaken. The honourable member referred to the egg beater or Darrieus type of wind generator. I think that that is a very interesting report. I have seen some information which tended to indicate that in the 1970s there was a great swerve off in the United States into designs of that type. Subsequent engineering and other difficulties tended to put that particular design into disrepute. I understand that another look has been taken at that design, and some of the newer designs that have been built and put into service seem to show a lot of promise for the future.

It is very interesting to read, in reports about the wind driven generator, the number of problems and tribulations encountered by designers when trying out their particular models. I recall one generator installed somewhere in Australia that did not have slip ring arrangements so that the tower supporting the propeller could turn. As a safety factor, about two and a half wrap-arounds were allowed on the connecting cable and it was thought that that would never be exceeded and that that was adequate cable movement to provide. In fact, in the first three months of operation the machine was out of order more than once, simply because the cable had wrapped itself five times around the tower of the wind generator. That is an example of the simple problems that have been encountered and illustrates that, whilst it is nice to say that wind generated electric power will solve all our problems, there are still some design, and, what is more important, operating improvements necessary.

Earlier this year I had a discussion with a Belgian designer of a conventional horizontal axis wind driven generator which I think holds much promise. It was a 200 kilowatt machine, a number of which have been installed, and their availability (being online delivery) has been remarkable. I thank the honourable member for his question and I am

### ROXBY BLOCKADE

**Mr MEIER:** Has the Premier, or a representative of his Government, in the interests of South Australia's unemployed, conferred with the responsible Federal Government Minister to ensure that no person engaged in the Roxby Downs blockade is receiving unemployment benefits? Recently a constituent of mine, who had been unemployed for the past seven months—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Do you want to hear the explanation? If you do, I think you might learn something about the unemployed in this State and what they have to go through. Recently a constituent of mine, who had been unemployed for the past seven months and who had only recently obtained a job, contacted me expressing concern at a report that some people engaged in the Roxby Downs blockade were receiving unemployment benefits. Several months ago my constituent, who was frustrated at not obtaining a job, decided to undertake a six-week receptionist course in Adelaide. The cost of the course was \$400.

**Mr Hamilton:** Most unemployed persons would not have \$400.

**Mr MEIER:** She did not have it, I can tell you that.

**Mr Hamilton:** Where did she get it from?

**Mr MEIER:** From her parents. To ensure that she was complying with the law my constituent notified the local branch of the Department of Social Security of her proposed actions. Although the course concluded at 2.30 p.m. each day for the first two weeks, the Department of Social Security told her that because she was doing the course she could not be out looking for a job and therefore she would not be paid unemployment benefits during the course. Although this caused considerable hardship to my constituent, the course was undertaken, unemployment benefits were stopped and the \$400 was paid. As a result of the course, my constituent is now employed but she is very concerned, after what she has been through in trying to improve her job prospects, that participants in the Roxby Downs blockade are possibly receiving unemployment benefits even though they could not be in a position where they could be out looking for a job unless they wish to seek a job at the mine.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The administration of unemployment benefits, the enforcement of the rules that are applied and entitlements to them are the responsibility of the Federal Government. I would assume, if there were persons existing on unemployment benefits who happened to be at Roxby Downs, that they would be in compliance with those rules or that the Department is aware of it. If that is not the case, it is up to the Federal Government to be involved: it is not a matter for consideration by the State Government.

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

### DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### ROAD FUNDS

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** I move:

That this House is concerned at the inadequate funds available for road construction and maintenance, calls on the Federal Government to increase road grants allocated to State Governments and to give South Australia a fair and equitable portion of those funds and calls on the South Australian Government to reverse its decision to direct fuel tax revenue away from the Highways Fund.

In moving this motion, particularly as this matter was raised during Question Time today, I only hope that the member for Mawson (who I see has departed the House already) and the member for Brighton (who also has a concern in this matter) come back into this House and hear the truth about the bridge on Flagstaff Road and a few other things about road funding in this State. It is interesting to see the member for Mawson, having asked a Dorothy Dixier, flee from the House, not wanting to find out the facts about funds for road construction.

It is also interesting to note that the total taxes imposed on motorists by the Federal Government reached a staggering total of \$6 920 million in 1983-84, based on research done for me by the Library of this Parliament. It took a great deal of effort in contacting public servants in Canberra to get that information. The taxes were: excise duty on crude oil, \$3 376 million; offshore petroleum royalties, \$83 million; petroleum products excise duty, \$1 944 million; the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme, \$410 million; sales tax on motor vehicles, \$700 million; and import duty on motor vehicles, \$407 million. That makes a staggering total of \$6 920 million in taxes taken from the motorists in Australia in the financial year 1983-84.

Of that sum only \$1 195 million, or 17 per cent, went back through the State Governments for road construction and maintenance. A drop in the bucket of the total money taken in taxes from Australian motorists goes back to benefit them in the way of improved roads and even in trying to maintain the existing road structure. I think that that is appalling. I understand and I would be the first to acknowledge that to a lesser extent that same trend has been going on for several years under successive Federal Governments. It is time that the motorist stood up and objected to being bled off like that by successive Federal Governments, particularly as there is such an urgent need, as we heard earlier this afternoon, for additional road funds here in South Australia.

I am disappointed that the Minister of Transport is not going to stay here to support this motion seeking a greater share of Federal road funds for South Australia and for a greater allocation of those road funds by the Federal Government. My concern is that such a small proportion of what is taxed from the Australian motorist in fact comes back to him in the way of road construction and maintenance or developing an infrastructure.

My second concern is that, of the amount that does come back, the mere 17 per cent that is shared among the States, South Australia does not get a fair proportion. I will give some facts to the House about this: if one takes the number of motor vehicles in South Australia, we have 9.4 per cent of the total number of motor vehicles in Australia, travelling 9.2 per cent of the national total of kilometres travelled by motor vehicles throughout Australia every year. We consume 9.35 per cent of the total fuel in Australia. Our road length compared to the national road length is 12.2 per cent. Our population is 9 per cent, and our total area of the State as a percentage of Australia is 13 per cent. But do honourable members know what percentage we get back in road funds—a mere 7.7 per cent of the national cake when it gets divided up!

The disturbing fact is that, when we get down to the latest allocation of funds, the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme—which involves the extra 2 cents

a litre imposed on motorists throughout Australia and which is dedicated straight back for road construction (except for the increased portion, of course, imposed by the Hawke Government in Canberra which it is now pocketing in general revenue; another new measure he has introduced to get extra money out of the motorist every six months without going back to the motorist)—of that ABRD programme a mere 7.1 per cent came to South Australia in 1983-84.

We are getting a raw deal from Canberra, and it is time that the Bannon Government in this State stood up to the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) and started to fight for South Australia. After all, he was elected on the basis that he wanted South Australia to win, but the fact is that South Australia is not winning. We are missing out sadly in the allocation of road funds that we get here. So, the second part of the motion specifically stresses that it is about time more money was allocated to roads and that a greater percentage of that was allocated to South Australia, so that we do get a fair and equitable portion of the total funds allocated for roads.

I stress that it does not matter what formula is used or which way one looks at it—whether it is road length, number of vehicles, population, number of unsealed roads or the area of the State: we should get a substantially greater proportion than we are currently getting from Canberra. Yet, I have not heard one word come out of the South Australian Government or from our Federal Labor politicians who are supposed to be out there fighting for South Australia asking for a greater share from Canberra for this State. It appears that they accept what they are given, and they meekly lie down and lick the Prime Minister—at least in political terms—and say, 'Bob, you're doing a good job.'

I think it is about time that this State stood up and fought for its fair share. I am also concerned at the extent to which the Bannon Government in South Australia has imposed additional fuel tax on the South Australian motorist but no longer gives the money raised from that additional tax back for road construction. It has been a long-standing tradition in South Australia that all moneys collected from motor vehicle registration, drivers licences, specialised number plates and all fuel taxes are put into a dedicated fund called the Highways Fund which is then spent exclusively, after administration costs are taken out, on road construction and maintenance. But that all changed last year.

In the 1983 Budget the Premier introduced an additional 1 cent a litre fuel tax but for the first time he gave that money to general revenue rather than dedicating it to road construction. Yet we have had a case cited just this afternoon involving years of consistent traffic congestion on Flagstaff Road near Darlington where traffic has built up, I understand, at the morning peak hour causing delays of at least 28 to 30 minutes at the bridge on that road. We have a case where the Minister says, 'Unfortunately, it cannot be done until next year owing to lack of funds.' Yet it was his own Premier who redirected that money away from road construction into general revenue.

I have taken these figures from the Auditor-General's Report: in 1982-83, \$25.8 million was raised from Federal taxes, and in 1983-84 it increased to a staggering \$38.5 million. However, the money actually transferred for road construction and maintenance in both those years was exactly the same—\$25.7 million. In other words, although the Government raised an additional \$12.5 million from fuel tax, not one cent of that additional money went into road construction.

It is not only by fuel tax that the motorist has been bled in this State. Last week in another private member's motion I revealed to this House facts about sales of land owned by the Highways Department, land having now been sold, particularly in the north/south transport corridor, and the



money not having been returned to the Highways Fund as one would expect and as is required by the Federal road grants legislation. What has happened: \$2.7 million of that money has in fact been put aside for a special slush fund to be under the control of the Minister for Environment and Planning down in the western suburbs to be spent, I presume, for political purposes but not, I stress, for road purposes.

So, last year alone, we found that \$12.8 million plus a further \$2.7 million, making a total of \$15.5 million, was bled out of road funds to finance other activities of this Labor Government. Yet the Minister of Transport has got the hide to stand up and constantly talk about the lack of adequate funds to carry out essential road construction programmes. The bridge on Flagstaff Road is just one minor project, albeit an important one, which would not cost a great deal of money.

What about the more important projects such as the widening of South Road which will not be completed until at least 1987-88, all because this Government has not got \$3.5 million to spend on that important project? As a result, thousands and thousands of people in the south have to suffer long and tiring trips to and from their work each day because of the traffic congestion that they face, and all because this Government has bled off the legitimate Highways Fund for other purposes.

How bad is the road problem in South Australia at present, or even nationally? Let us look at it on a national basis, because just recently a very authoritative report has been prepared by what is known as NAASRA, which is a committee of road construction authorities representing each State in Australia—if one likes, the *el supremo* on road construction at a Government level, which was involved in the preparation of that report. The list includes the Department of Main Roads (New South Wales), the Road Construction Authority (Victoria), the Main Roads Department (Queensland), the Highways Department (South Australia), the Main Roads Department (Western Australia), the Department of Transport and Works (Northern Territory), the Department of Main Roads (Tasmania), and the Commonwealth Department of Housing and Construction. As I said, NAASRA is the supreme Government body in terms of road construction.

So, one could agree that any report produced by impartial public servants with that sort of authority would be an accurate and factual report. That body has come to the conclusion that there are very serious problems at present with our road system in South Australia. Presently, 86 per cent of our national highways—the big important roads that take people from one State to another—are below acceptable standards as laid down by NAASRA in its report.

In the country, 22 per cent of the traffic travels on roads described as poor, yet we have a Premier who stands up and talks about the need for improved road safety and the fact that he will impose measures, such as reducing the speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h because road safety is such a key issue. I put to the Premier that the only justification for reducing the speed limit from what I can see is that he has bled road funds to such an extent in South Australia that our roads are no longer as safe to drive on at 110 km/h as they were a few years ago. That could be the only justifiable reason. I do not agree with the proposal that he is putting forward to reduce the speed limit, because the evidence is that it will not be effective in reducing the road toll. If it were effective, I would be the first to support it.

Finally, this report comes to the conclusion that more than 80 per cent of our country local roads are unsealed. I know that there are no Labor Party members of Parliament representing genuinely rural areas. I know that they have

locked themselves into being only an urban oriented political Party with no regard for the country people at all. That was obvious in the Budget, when they removed virtually all the vehicle registration concessions for primary producers, without any consultation whatsoever. They have decided through that measure to impose an additional \$1.5 million tax on farmers in this State; so, one can understand that perhaps they put very little priority on rural local roads or in fact any country roads whatsoever.

That was more than ever brought through last year when the Government actually reduced grants to local councils for rural arterial roads by 37 per cent in one year alone. I will deal in more detail with the effect that that decision of the Bannon Government had on certain roads in our country areas: the consequences are quite frightening. The NAASRA road study then outlined what benefits could flow to Australia if road funding was increased by 25 per cent for a seven year period—and that is not out of the question. We are considering an increase of funds of 25 per cent each year for the next seven years, when we know that the Federal Government was returning only 17 per cent of what it currently collects from motorists and we know that the Bannon Government alone is (I suppose one would say) stealing or stripping something like \$15 million a year off the funds that legitimately should be spent on road construction.

The NAASRA road study report released this year stated that a 25 per cent increase in funding for a mere seven years would, first, prevent 85 deaths and 1 150 major injuries on Australia's roads each year, and that would be a permanent benefit that would carry on beyond the seven year period. Secondly, it would save an estimated 235 million litres of fuel each year in a world, and particularly a country, that is very conscious of the extent to which it has to import its crude oil and the cost of that to its foreign exchange.

Thirdly, it would create an extra 50 000 jobs each year for the next seven years by allocating those additional funds, those jobs being created in road construction, which is again a very top priority task in a country that is concerned about its level of unemployment. Finally, it would slow down the increase in severe urban traffic congestion. The last point should be taken up because it relates very closely to what is occurring already in Adelaide. The study shows that over the next seven years we can expect approximately a 20 per cent increase in the traffic flowing per lane in urban areas of Australia. In other words, calculations have been made about where there might be widening of a road, an additional lane put in or something like that.

Therefore, we can imagine that over the next seven years, unless severe action is taken to increase the level of funding in South Australia we can expect at least a 20 per cent increase in the type of congestion that we are already experiencing during peak hour traffic. In fact, I would argue that a 20 per cent increase in traffic flow on some of our roads, particularly South Road and through the Darlington intersection, would take those roads to the point of complete chaos—and I am not exaggerating there. Anyone who doubts me should look at the considerable delay and the traffic congestion already occurring at the Darlington intersection. Read the local newspapers down south—the *Southern Times* and others.

The member for Mawson asked a question this afternoon in this House because she is becoming very edgy about the extent to which transport and traffic congestion in her electorate is becoming a crucial political issue, and it is becoming an issue because people are being hurt by it on a daily basis, every morning and every night, and this Government has done nothing. Its record is appalling in the area of solving the traffic congestion problems in the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide.

I have mentioned through this report what is occurring on a national basis, but what is happening in South Australia? It is almost unbelievable that a developed region such as Eyre Peninsula has so many unsealed arterial roads, but Eyre Peninsula is certainly not isolated as an example. The national highway at Kingston and Highway No. 1—the road that we should be so proud of—has such an uneven and broken surface that the local St John Ambulance staff have written to the Government claiming that the road is now unsafe. In wet weather the water collects on the road, making it almost impossible to pass large trucks as water sprays out from beneath them.

I think that it is appropriate that I give some further details on this road. The Highways Department allocated \$110 000 in 1983-84 to help improve this 20 km section of road between Kingston and Robe and in the District Council of Lacepede area, and it is acknowledged that there is an immediate need to reconstruct and upgrade 19 km or 20 km of this road. At \$110 000 a year, it will take many years—perhaps as many as eight to 10 years—before this road is adequately reconstructed to a safe level. I stress the point that it is groups such as the St John Ambulance, not political groups but people who are concerned about the safety of our motorists, who are now taking up the plea that we need more funds and we need them urgently because our roads are becoming unsafe.

Take another example in South Australia: the Morgan to Burra road is the route taken by major interstate transport trucks travelling between Sydney and Perth, Brisbane and Perth or through that general vicinity, as they come down the South Australian Riverland and cut across from Morgan to Burra. It is a dirt road that is unsealed and dangerous. Even the local tow-truck operator—the last person one would expect to complain—has written to me in very strong terms complaining about the nature and dangerous condition of that road. I stress that he was not the only one who wrote to me.

The local council has written to me, the Minister of Transport and the Federal Minister for Transport. I have been there and seen portion of that road, and I would be the first to acknowledge that there is a serious problem and a very dangerous situation arising. The Minister of Tourism particularly talks at great length about trying to attract tourists to the Flinders Ranges and Kangaroo Island, which are our most scenic beauty spots. We would all support him, but what is the point of pouring more money into tourism promotion when, if one goes to the Flinders Ranges or Kangaroo Island, one finds hardly a single sealed road? The roads are all unsealed, full of potholes, ruts and very dusty.

I do not believe that we will attract Japanese honeymooners to a place like that whilst we have roads in such appalling conditions. As soon as 4 inches of rain fell on Kangaroo Island the roads turned into lakes, with hundreds of thousands or perhaps millions of dollars worth of damage being done to the roads over the years. I am delighted to see that the member for Alexandra has taken up this issue very strongly.

They are just some of the examples where the roads in South Australia are in such a poor and rundown state. Councils throughout the State know only too well that funds for rural arterial roads—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I realise that the member for Florey thinks that the shocking state of our roads is a joke, and does not want to see additional funds allocated.

**Mr Mayes:** No, we think you are.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I know that the member for Unley has completely ignored the plea from the Unley Chamber of Commerce for him to get off his tail and do

something about the increased traffic congestion on Unley Road. The Unley council has been to the Premier, who turned down its request. The member for Unley's own area is now in open revolt with what his Government is doing. I am glad to see that the member for Mawson, the woman who is so vocal in the local paper in trying to defend the inactivity of the Government, has now entered the Chamber. You, madam, have completely ignored the transport needs of your constituents in the Mawson electorate. You have failed to meet the promises that your Government and your Minister of Transport made almost two years ago. Where is the new upgrading of the bridge on Flagstaff Road? Nothing has been done. Where is the promise that road construction would start on the realignment of Reservoir Drive? Nothing whatsoever has been done. What has happened to the promise that funds would be allocated for the widening of South Road? Nothing has been done whatsoever.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is private members' afternoon. I ask that the interjections cease and that the member for Davenport refrain from answering when they are made.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Sir. I uphold your ruling. I stress that I have not been answering them but have been throwing out challenges across the House, through you, Sir. What has happened to the promises made by the Labor Government? 'Nothing' is the answer! No action has been taken to allocate the funds to overcome the traffic congestion that is so desperate now in the southern metropolitan area.

Coming back to the allocation of funds for local arterial roads in rural areas, I mentioned earlier that there has been a drop of something like 37 per cent in the allocation of those funds last year. Between Lock and Elliston, 75 kilometres of a significant arterial road is totally unsealed. I have been over there and seen the shocking state of that road. The council is getting funds from the State Government to seal the road at the rate of one kilometre a year while 75 km needs sealing. In other words, it will be the year 2059 before the Lock-Elliston road is finally sealed. Road construction authority people point out to me that, by the year 2059, the part of the road already sealed will have deteriorated to the point that we may as well be back to a dirt road, because it does not last that long.

It is a problem not only in country areas but one that confronts people in urban areas. Although the Labor Party of this State continually shuns any support for rural people, it is about time it sat up and took note of what is happening in the metropolitan area. Simple and relatively cheap jobs like the widening of the bridge on Flagstaff Road seem to have been deferred indefinitely. Today we found in Question Time that it will be done next year. It has been deferred for at least two years. We can look at the Old Belair Road—a significant road taking more than 5 000 vehicles a day. That would have to be the worst major road with that traffic burden anywhere within the metropolitan area. It is a public disgrace.

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am sure that the member for Florey, having driven up that road on many occasions in his lifetime, would agree with me that it is a public disgrace. It needed upgrading 30 years ago. Fortunately, the Liberals put it on the works programme when in Government, but funds have still not been allocated to ensure that it is done this year. Having prepared for this debate several days ago, I found yesterday that that was the situation when I picked up the latest edition of the Auditor-General's Report, released at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. I had listened with some sympathy to the argument being put by the State Government that it did not have sufficient funds for certain urgent road works, although I had pointed out that it should stop divert-

ing other funds—the \$17 million to which I have already referred. However, on picking up the Auditor-General's Report yesterday, I found that this Government, which is constantly pleading for additional funds and saying that it cannot carry out urgent roadworks because of a lack of funds, had underspent, by \$8.9 million, last year's allocation for roadworks. I challenge the member for Mawson to go down to her area and to point out to her people, who have asked for urgent roadworks, like the widening of the Flagstaff bridge—

**Ms Lenehan:** It's not in my electorate.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No, but your people, madam, travel across that bridge and complain because of delays at that bridge. They have complained bitterly to me on numerous occasions. I challenge you, madam, to go down there and point out that your Government underspent its budget on roadworks last year by \$8.9 million. I know, madam—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Davenport to refer to another member by his or her district. The honourable member for Davenport.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I thought that I referred to her as the member for Mawson.

**Ms Lenehan:** You referred to me as 'madam'.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I thought that 'madam' was quite a legitimate phrase to use in this House. If you are not a madam, what are you?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Not only has the Government underspent its allocation for roads last year by \$8.9 million, but it has sitting in the road funds of the Highways Department \$15.4 million unspent.

**Mr Groom:** Is this your leadership speech?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It is interesting to note that the member for Hartley—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Davenport to come back to the motion.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have stuck to the motion. I was speaking about road funding, and was about to refer to what is occurring in the Hartley area, the electorate of the great pretender of the Labor Party—the great pretender for the Ministry. In his area and to the north-east, people are complaining about the lack of money spent on roads by this Government, along with the need for urgent roadworks to be carried out and money to be spent on the O-Bahn system. Of course, that is a subject with which I cannot deal, as it does not relate to the motion before the House. However, the same trick and ploy is being applied where this Labor Government has underspent for two years in a row the funds allocated for O-Bahn. Yet, it turns around and says that the project has had to be deferred until 1988.

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The member for Florey can second the motion if he wishes to speak to it and he can speak immediately after I sit down, if he is so keen to support it. In fact, I hope that he does, because I want to see the Bannon Labor Government in South Australia take a stronger and tougher stand against the Hawke Federal Government to make sure that we get more funds for roads and that this State gets a fair allocation of those funds. I hope that the honourable member takes up with his own Premier (I hope that he seconds the motion) the fact that that Premier is bleeding off something like \$17 million a year which should have been allocated to road funds. However, these funds are not being allocated to road funds but are being used for other purposes. As a result of that action, we face continuing traffic congestion in the metropolitan

area, and that congestion is getting worse. In the country, about four kilometres of every five kilometres of our roads are unsealed, and even our existing national highways are deteriorating at a rate which is becoming deplorable and certainly a hazard for road users.

So, it is with that plea that I ask all members of this House to stand up and support this motion and to do so with vigour. Can I throw out a challenge to the other members of the House? I believe that anyone who opposes this motion is being anti South Australian and anti the need for a solution to the traffic problems we face, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area. I will take great delight in highlighting to those members' constituents the fact that they oppose this motion, if they have the hide to do so. I hope that it will be more than just a voting support for the motion: it is time that we had some action from the South Australian Government to make sure that more funds are allocated for road maintenance and construction throughout this State—particularly from the Federal Government and also from State resources.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT RATES

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I move:

That this House—

- (a) strongly opposes the space rate increase and operational cost recovery policy applicable to MV *Troubridge* and its proposed replacement as announced by the Minister of Transport on 18 April 1984;
- (b) recognises that the 25 per cent increase in rates for 1984-85 and the CPI plus 10 per cent increase to apply each year thereafter until full cost recovery is achieved will cause considerable hardship and place an unfair and unprecedented burden on the residents of Kangaroo Island; and
- (c) calls on the Government to rescind that charging policy and to replace it with a schedule of space rates which are comparable with those applying to other forms of mainland public transport over similar distances.

In support of the motion, I would like to place on record a summary of the operation that exists at present. The vessel, *Troubridge*, since 1972, has operated the cargo, passenger and vehicular ferry service between Kangaroo Island, Port Lincoln and Port Adelaide. During 1982-83, the *Troubridge* was involved in 187 trips from Adelaide to Kingscote and 49 trips from Adelaide to Port Lincoln. The trip between Adelaide and Port Lincoln is more than twice the sea distance of that between Adelaide and Kingscote. It is therefore reasonable, when rationalising the operational costs associated with the *Troubridge*, to take into account the extra distance involved between the latter two ports, and it is certainly fair to do that for the purposes of sharing the net deficit that has occurred since the commencement of the operation of that vessel under the ownership of the Highways Department.

If one does that brief calculation and doubles the 49 trips between Port Adelaide and Port Lincoln—to make it better to cater for the double distance involved—one is looking at 98 trips as against 187 so that, quite clearly, one third of the total operating cost associated with the *Troubridge* service may be attributed to the Port Lincoln or Eyre Peninsula region of the State.

Having regard to that factor, I place on record a brief table which cites the operating payments made by the Highways Department in each of the years between 1980 and 1984 inclusive. The table incorporates the operating receipts from cargo, passenger, and vehicle movement, etc. It also includes the total operating receipts involved in that service

and the respective operating deficits, less the contribution from Consolidated Account toward operating costs and, finally, the net operating deficit met by the Highways Fund in each of those years. I seek leave to have the table inserted

in *Hansard* without my reading it. I assure you, Mr Speaker, that it is of a strictly statistical nature and it is recorded at page 116 of the current Auditor-General's Report.

Leave granted.

	1980 \$'000	1981 \$'000	1982 \$'000	1983 \$'000	1984 \$'000
Operating Payments .....	2 828	3 184	3 929	4 729	5 688
Operating Receipts—					
Cargo, passengers, vehicles, etc. ....	1 448	1 670	1 798	1 996	2 156
Recoup from Consolidated Account for transport concessions to pensioners .....	12	12	12	12	12
Total Operating Receipts .....	1 460	1 682	1 810	2 008	2 168
Operating Deficit .....	1 368	1 502	2 119	2 721	3 520
Less—Contribution from Consolidated Account towards operating costs .....	505	333	—	—	—
Net Operating Deficit met by Highways Fund .....	863 (\$'000)	1 169 (\$'000)	2 119 (\$'000)	2 721 (\$'000)	3 520 (\$'000)

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I now turn to the situation to which the motion is intended to draw attention, namely, the current formula of charging used by the present Minister of Transport for the purpose of receiving the whole operational costs of that service from the users or, in this case, the recipients. I speak on this occasion on behalf of the community of Kangaroo Island which has no other alternative form of cargo transport available to it.

On 28 March this year the Minister of Transport announced in this Parliament that the Government had accepted, and intended to implement, the recommendations contained in a report entitled 'The operations of the *Troubridge* and future sea services to Kangaroo Island'. No-one on Kangaroo Island had any knowledge of the nature of the recommendations contained in that report. The people on the island first learnt of the recommendations through the media. Following the release of the report, the District Councils of Kingscote and Dudley were at pains to avoid knee-jerk hysteria and advocated patience to allow a proper and rational analysis of that report.

At the time I was very vividly aware of the deep concern that was being expressed by my constituents in that area about what they had heard and read in the media after the statements by the Minister had been made. However, the councils appointed a joint committee to study and respond to the announcement and the report. At the outset, the committee was severely handicapped and its work delayed by the unavailability of copies of the report. Only one copy had been made available to each council, and it was several weeks before more were obtained. Indeed, I recall the embarrassment that was experienced by the people on the island because here in this House on the day of the announcement the Minister was unable to provide me, as representative of the area, with a copy of the report which he had tabled. The Minister knows only too well, as do the officers of his Department, of the difficulty that I subsequently had in obtaining copies of that report for the community groups, which, as a result of hearing about the matter by way of the media, were experiencing deep concern in regard to the details contained in the report.

In due course this resulted in a lack of community awareness of the report and its contents and consequently a lack of feedback to the committee, which was trying very hard to approach the subject rationally and to obtain facts about the reasons for the Minister's outrageous announcement. In due course the committee reported back to the councils, resulting in three resolutions being sent to the Minister. The first was to reject the cost of recovery recommendation; the second was to reject the introduction of the 12.5 per cent initial rise scheduled for 1 July 1984; and the third was to

urge further investigation into the replacement vessel design as a means of reducing costs.

Although there was no response to this communication, the island based committee continued to meet. The evidence produced, together with a more detailed analysis of the report, reinforced the earlier findings. A letter was sent to the Minister requesting an urgent meeting. That request was followed by telephone calls and a telex urging that there be a delay in the implementation of the new formula for charging, scheduled to commence from 1 July. Further, I made a number of requests to the Minister directly and through this House that he enter into communication with the island community and at least give those involved the courtesy of meeting with them, following the tabling of his report, and before 1 July, at which time it was recommended that the first round of increased charges would apply.

In the meantime, a further meeting of the committee on the island was held, this time with representatives of the agriculture and tourist industries. The validity of the earlier resolutions as forwarded to the Minister was confirmed by that joint community group. The cost recovery concept as it applied to Government owned sea transport servicing Kangaroo Island was totally rejected. Indeed, in a submission to the Minister they identified the reasons for their rejection of it. As an objective in itself, cost recovery in all Government undertakings is commended, but as an objective in relation to Kangaroo Island shipping it is discriminatory, potentially destructive of the social and economic fabric of the island and, indeed, quite impractical.

Governments from 1972—that is, throughout the period of Government ownership of the Kangaroo Island shipping link—have acknowledged in several documented references that the shipping link to Kangaroo Island is part of the South Australian road link system and that, as such, freight rates should be maintained roughly in parity with those of other public transport systems. In *Hansard* of 14 August this year, from pages 237 to 244, and in particular on page 238, reference is made to undertakings that have been given by both political Parties to the Kangaroo Island community in relation to trying to head at least towards parity between charges for the *Troubridge* and public transport charges on the mainland. As such, it is maintained that freight rates should be applied fairly. It is not that the Kangaroo Island community wants to pay less than anyone else does, but people there certainly do not want to pay a great deal more than anyone else: the Kangaroo Island community wants public transport freight rates for the vessel to be consistent with those that apply to other public transport services over comparable distances on the mainland.

On page 238 of *Hansard* of 14 August this year, reference is made to commitments made by the previous Minister

(Hon. G.T. Virgo) during the mid 1970s; to commitments made by the shadow Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson) during 1979, when the Liberal Party was in Opposition; to commitments made by the Premier of the day in 1980; and to those made in more recent times by the present shadow Minister of Transport (Hon. Dean Brown). Of course, the present situation was well outlined in a Ministerial statement, in which, in respect of the undertakings given earlier (which were consistent, irrespective of Party politics), the Minister abdicated those long standing arrangements and, indeed, adopted an operational cost recovery policy whereby the user pays for services provided by the *Troubridge*.

That policy does not apply to any other form of transport in South Australia. Indeed, it has never done so in the history of this State. An extensive amount of research that has been undertaken indicates that such a cost recovery policy does not apply to any other form of public transport anywhere else in Australia, on land or on the sea. The only instance that has been identified of a Government in Australia considering the introduction of such a policy of operational cost recovery for a service that was being provided related to when a Liberal Country Party coalition Government federally in 1958 sought to adopt a cost recovery policy as it applied to the services provided by TAA. In fact, I am advised that that policy was never implemented because a two airline agreement in Australia effectively cancelled the policy intention and the Ansett and TAA operations agreed accordingly to charge the same rates not only for passenger service tickets but also for freight rates and, further, that that would apply between capital cities of Australia which they serviced, and they arrived at similar, if not identical, schedule timetables.

Kangaroo Island residents should not be asked to accept a system which gives no incentive for cost containment or cost savings but which we believe gives a blank cheque for the financing by cost recovery of future cost blowout. A whole host of examples have been cited to demonstrate the anomalous, quite unfair and unprincipled situation which now exists in relation to freight rates applying to that community and which will only snowball as a result of the introduction of the Minister's policy.

Thus, if the cost recovery as a principle had merit, justice and equity it could not apply until a new and totally efficient system was introduced. With regard to the efficiency of the current *Troubridge* the Minister's own report tabled on 18 April 1984 stated that the committee identified that the present service is inefficient. Kangaroo Island people are already paying freight rates that are high by any objective assessment, and they are already making a fair and reasonable contribution to the operation of the sea link. Cost recovery, as it is currently to apply, would hit the island's two major industries, agriculture and tourism, with such a devastating impact that they might never recover, even though the system was abandoned later. Low income families and those on fixed incomes would be seriously hurt.

Already freight on some items exceeds the cost of the product. It is a universally held belief that cost recovery, if implemented, would seriously injure business competitiveness, destroy many jobs and lead to a mass movement of people away from the island. The first 12.5 per cent increase in the first year, which is part of a planned 25 per cent increase and part of the overall cost recovery package, is rejected by that community. It is true that in the absence of a long-standing bipartisan commitment to bring the island's sea link charges into parity with mainland public transport rates, a 12.5 per cent increase might have been justified but as it is part of a scheme to go on with—for example, on 1 July 1985—another 12.5 per cent increase and then each year thereafter until total cost recovery is

achieved, 10 per cent plus CPI is quite unacceptable to the community.

I cannot urge the House too strongly to urge the Government to withdraw from that approach and apply a fair and appropriate system which treats those people not as different, not as people who should be further isolated from access to other State facilities, but indeed as South Australians.

The committee is concerned that many of the design inefficiencies of the *Troubridge* will be perpetuated in the new vessel. A need is seen for more research into a cargo-only vessel, the local island committee says. There is a fair bit of conjecture about that, and I do not intend today to canvass factors associated with the replacement vessel as proposed in the report but I do believe that the community ought to be consulted and supported in its call for more opportunity to discuss the matter before any contract is let for the rebuilding of a replacement ship.

The announcement of the proposed huge freight impost has, according to the local committee, had an immediate and serious effect on inquiries about land purchase. From my own inquiries about the subject, it is clear that broad acre land sales on Kangaroo Island have depreciated since the Minister made his announcement and I believe that that is coincidental not with any seasonal or associated factors but with the fact that buyers and potential buyers of land, including those already holding land on the island, have been deeply shattered by and are very concerned indeed about the impact of the formula as announced by the Minister if it goes ahead. Worse, however, is the fact that many of the island's best known farming families are seeking land in Queensland and Western Australia. I know that my immediate neighbour on Kangaroo Island has sent members of his family to Western Australia to inspect land with a view to shifting there. They say they have lost confidence in the island.

It has to be remembered that farmers are most severely hit by freight increases because they are both importers and exporters. In this case, collectively we are talking about the movement between the mainland and Kangaroo Island and back again of about 60 000 tonnes of cargo a year. Most of that cargo movement is for the purpose of moving in materials for primary production and moving out the primary produce itself. Either way, the primary producer has no opportunity whatsoever to pass on freight costs, unlike the retail industry where the freight costs (whether they be sea, rail, road or air) can be added to the cost of the item before it is offered to the consumer. Primary producers are the victims of a marketing system in Australia where, irrespective of their costs of production, the market-place determines the price that is paid for the product.

Any transport subsidy to Kangaroo Island should not therefore be regarded in the negative sense as a subsidy to the island residents but, in the broader sense, as an investment in South Australia. Kangaroo Island has so much to give the State that any Government transport investment within reason will return handsome dividends, given the right conditions and encouragement. The Government has a transport monopoly with the *Troubridge*. No other organisation competes with the Government, and in this instance no other section of the community on Kangaroo Island is in a position to transport its goods in or out by any means other than the Government owned *Troubridge*. There is absolutely no alternative for that isolated community to survive without that sea link between Kingscote and Port Adelaide.

In those circumstances it is considered that the Government is exploiting the opportunity in applying a cost recovery policy in this isolated instance which has never before been applied as a matter of policy for public transport services in this State or anywhere else in Australia. It is noted in

this instance that wherever there is a competitor, for example, road transport to Eyre Peninsula and hire cars, rates are set at a competitive level. In this instance, while the Government holds the monopoly over the road service link between the mainland and the island, there is obviously no room for anyone else to come in. At this stage, there is no call by the island community, anyway, for anyone else to come in. All they seek is fair and reasonable access to the rest of Australia, as indeed is enjoyed by all mainland South Australians.

It is true that, apart from the cost recovery proposal, the Kangaroo Island committee (as originally formed and as it is now) accepts the broad concept of most of the recommendations in that report. My only qualification which I stress to the House on behalf of the community is that it be given more information about the alternative vessel design. I realise that, in an effort to overcome that specific problem, the Minister has invited (through my office) a recommendation for an islander to serve on a departmental transport committee.

I appreciated the opportunity to participate in that exercise and recommended several names to the Minister that I considered were in fair priority order. From those names he selected a nominee and has appointed Mr Dudley Kelly of Kingscote to act in the capacity outlined. The priority order for the ultimate selection was discussed with both councils on the island, Kingscote and the Dudley district, and their approval was obtained prior to submission to the Minister.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** What is Mr Kelly's qualification?

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Mr Dudley Kelly is a retired primary producer from Kangaroo Island. He has been in that community for about 30 years, perhaps a little longer, and has been involved in many other activities in the community. He has served both as a councillor and as Chairman of the District Council of Kingscote for a considerable period.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Particularly suited.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I believe that the submission of his name to the Minister was appropriate. He is a fair and reasonable gentleman who has demonstrated his capacity to act responsibly in his own business and in local affairs over a number of years. I have had the pleasure of serving with Dudley Kelly in a number of community activities, including the time when I was district councillor, and I have found him to be fair; otherwise I would not have been prepared to submit his name.

I only hope that Mr Kelly's contribution to that committee on behalf of the community will be appreciated. We ask that the Government consult regularly with the local committee of islanders. We feel that the committee should have direct access to the Department, which was one of the calls made by the islanders initially. I have outlined progress made in that direction.

In conclusion, I submit that the island people are end users of the product and should, accordingly, have an input into the decision making. We are stuck with the *Troubridge* for the time being, and although I indicated earlier I did not intend to discuss the replacement vessel at any great length I stress that, if the Government insists on its operational cost recovery policy and accordingly replaces the *Troubridge* with a vessel of similar design, it will become a Rolls Royce service that the local community will not be able to afford to use.

There is no question in my mind that the \$11.5 million that the Government intends to spend on the replacement vessel will be absolutely wasted public money unless it comes to terms with not what may be wanted by some

people but what is in fact needed by that community and is available to it for use at rates that suit the pockets of the users. Unless there is some rational, fair and reasonable approach to this matter, then, as I say, the replacement vessel as designed will become an embarrassment for the Government and a facility that the island community will not be able to afford to use.

Finally, I am pleased to place also on the record my appreciation of the efforts of the Hon. Mr Milne in another place who on 11 September 1984, sought leave to make a statement about transport to Kangaroo Island and the *Troubridge* charging system in particular. He said in that statement to his colleagues in another place the sort of things that I have outlined to this House. He acknowledged other references that had been made to the subject in this House in recent months by saying:

... In support of Mr Chapman I put it to the Government that the matter requires a quick response along the lines suggested by him and by the Kangaroo Island Branch of the Australian Democrats. In essence, they amount to the same reasoning.

It is a comfort indeed when other political Parties in the Parliament—in this case the Australian Democrats, God bless them, who apparently appears do not support us on too many other things but have been fair enough to do so in this instance—have seen the reality of the problem and recognise that the island community has been victimised, recognising also that Ministers like the Minister of Transport are clearly out of touch with the subject and could not have known the real position, set out to inflict a policy of the kind that has been formulated. We have seen Ministers like the Minister of Tourism ignore the subject and indeed run away from his responsibilities in this matter, which is so important to South Australia and Kangaroo Island especially.

I think, without getting into a Party political wrangle, that it is fair to acknowledge the support we have received at least from that minority Party. Collectively, on behalf of the island community and we in Opposition in this House, I call again on the Government through this motion to apply just a little fairness and withdraw the policy about which so much concern has been expressed. I have an incredible number of examples that demonstrate the sort of unfairness surrounding that shipping service if any member is interested. It is far too extensive to seek to have inserted in *Hansard* in support of a motion, the kind to which I have alluded, but I do urge Parliament to show its support for a section of South Australia—the first settled area and an extremely valuable and producing part of South Australia—in its call for no more or less, just a fair sharing of the facilities that other South Australians enjoy.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## URANIUM ENRICHMENT

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That this House condemns the Government for its policy on uranium enrichment which has lost to the State a billion dollar project which would enhance the economy of South Australia very significantly.

Madam Chairperson (Madam Acting Speaker, or whatever the modern appropriate title is for a lady in the Chair), this motion encompasses a matter of major significance and importance to every citizen—man, woman and child—in

South Australia. The history of moves to secure uranium enrichment facilities in South Australia goes back to 1973 during the life of the former Dunstan Administration when then Premier Dunstan set up what is known and has been known since as the Uranium Enrichment Committee. That was before the Labor Party really got itself into the bind that it has continued to be in since about 1975 or 1976 (or maybe even a little later than that) on this uranium issue.

However, the Uranium Enrichment Committee, comprising some very capable people, was set up in South Australia to secure for this State this processing industry. Most commentators agree that we enhance very greatly the value of our minerals if we can not only dig them up but also process, refine and enrich them in this country and, of course, uranium is no exception. I well remember succeeding Prime Ministers suggesting that we would do better if we could not only dig up the enormous iron ore resources in the Pilbara but also have a steel works to process that iron ore and turn it into steel. Part of the original agreement, as I understand from inquiries I made when I visited the Pilbara about three years ago, was that a steel works was part of that project.

However, that proved to be uneconomic in that the nation could not support a steel works there, and we had no option in the event but to export massive quantities of iron ore in the main to the Japanese. Those contracts proved most valuable to this nation in terms of earning export income to supplement the very large contribution made by our major primary industries, and that did a great deal indeed for the economy of Western Australia and for the nation as a whole. I think that it reached its zenith at about the time that Prime Minister Gorton was presiding in Canberra. He acknowledged the enormous contribution that was being made by our mineral industry to our balance of payments and to the health of our economy.

Considering it on a regional basis. I believe that what happened in Western Australia could indeed be repeated in South Australia. In fact, during the period of the Liberal Government between 1979 and 1982, when I was at a Ministerial conference in Western Australia I took a weekend and the following Monday off to fly to the Pilbara to look at the onshore gas facilities which were being constructed to handle the offshore gas. Then I flew south to Kambalda to look at Western Mining's operations in the Kalgoorlie region. Having viewed all this development that has occurred probably in the past 15 or so years, I came back firmly convinced that South Australia could and should go down the same track and that the sort of benefits that had accrued to the Western Australian economy because of its enormous development under the leadership in the main of Sir Charles Court, previously as Minister responsible for development and then more latterly as Premier of that State, could occur here. An enormous fillip had been given to the economy of Western Australia and indeed to the nation, and we had the capacity in South Australia if we grasped every opportunity as it arose to go down the same track. In fact, we were about 15 years behind Western Australia.

One of the projects initiated and completed in the space of 12 months during that Administration of which I was proud to be a part was the Cooper Basin development, one section of which was opened last week. All that came from the Labor benches when I put that legislation to Parliament was whining and whingeing that we were going too fast. However, the Premier quite cheerfully opened those facilities last week as a result of those developments and welcomed with some degree of pleasure the enormous fillip that it has given to the State Treasury in terms of about \$30 million this year in royalties—and to an increasing extent in the future—and the fact that it employed about 3 000 people.

Likewise, after intense opposition to the Roxby Downs development in South Australia, with the Labor Party doing everything that it could to throw the spanner in the works in relation to that development, the Labor Party had a change of heart under the weight of electoral pressure after we had managed to convince one of its members in the Upper House that he should support that legislation. The Labor Party was faced with a State election, whereby it thought that it would be defeated if it continued in its opposition to the project, so it swapped horses and now has accepted the inevitability of the Roxby Downs development.

However, along the way, of course, there have been some casualties. By the way, my criticism of the present Administration in this area is the leisurely way in which it solves any problems that are encountered, and a number of problems are encountered from time to time in relation to these projects. As I said at the start of my remarks, we must grasp these opportunities when they present themselves as quickly as possible or we will be beaten to the draw. One major criticism of the present Administration is that when problems arise it sits around and has a committee or sends it off to an expert. If it does not like what the expert says, the Government sends it off somewhere else, and that is a great time wasting exercise for the people who are trying to get on with the job and get these projects up and running.

That charge could not be levelled at the Liberal Administration. However, I make the point that there have been some casualties. One of the results of the failure of the Labor Party to come to grips with a rational, realistic and comprehensible uranium policy is that we have lost to South Australia a billion dollar refining industry—an industry that is probably the safest part of the uranium cycle. A uranium enrichment facility is the type of operation that one would compare with, say, a copper refinery, copper smelter or steel works that turns the raw material into a usable commodity.

There are two stages in relation to refining uranium. First, it is mined, and I would suggest that the most hazardous part of the uranium cycle is the uranium mining. It is not a radiological hazard, which can be well controlled in this day and age. The fact is that if one is engaged in an underground mining operation a risk is associated with that. We well know that if we look at the fatalities that occur in coal mining throughout the world almost weekly. So, the hazards associated with the project are the traditional hazards that are associated with underground mining. The hazards associated with uranium enrichment are minimal. The first stage in the process is uranium conversion, where the uranium oxide, which comes out of the initial separation plant at the mine site (uranium oxide or yellow cake as it is called), is converted into another chemical. That procedure takes place in a conversion plant. That is simply a chemical works.

The radiological hazards there are minimal. The main hazards in a conversion plant are that strong acid, hydrofluoric acid, must be used to convert uranium oxide into uranium hexafluoride. So, it is a chemical process. The Liberal Government was well advanced, in co-operation with the District Council of Port Pirie and a number of major leaders in industry, in a study which was to establish a uranium conversion plant based on the ailing economy of Port Pirie. Despite the fact that a number of people were unashamedly members of the Labor Party in that town, they quite enthusiastically supported our plans for a uranium conversion plant in Port Pirie because of what it would have done for the 30 per cent unemployed, which was a major problem amongst the young in Port Pirie. They were happy to have this conversion plant, which would have been the first stage in refining uranium into a usable product for a nuclear reactor for electricity generation.

However, that has ground to a halt as one of the casualties, along with uranium enrichment, for further development which we were on the point of securing for South Australia after a lot of work. They are a couple of casualties of this incomprehensible policy of the Labor Party which will accommodate some uranium mines but not others.

In the next motion that I will move a little later, I will refer to the Honeymoon and Beverley Mines, which are casualties of this incomprehensible policy of the Labor Party where some mines are safe, others are not safe and any other aspects of the industry simply are wiped out, regardless of whether or not they are safe. An enormous amount of effort was pioneered initially by former Premier Dunstan, who set up the Uranium Enrichment Committee. He enthusiastically supported their efforts until, in his declining year or two, the Labor Party was in such turmoil in relation to its uranium policy. He and his Minister of Mines, Mr Hudson, spent a lot of time trying to secure this industry for South Australia. They fell on hard times because of the fluctuating and see-sawing attitude of the Labor Party on the uranium question. Suddenly the Party became hard against it. I recall reports of Premier Dunstan being in London talking about these very matters during his decline, which these events helped to precipitate. The telephone calls were coming to and from Adelaide because there was insurrection in the camp, led by the member for Elizabeth—now aspiring to bigger and better things in Canberra.

Premier Dunstan had to communicate to and fro with the Parliamentary Party in Adelaide to ascertain whether he still had the numbers. He was heard to say, in effect, that if they were going to undercut him he would give the game away, as he subsequently did. He was being subverted, led by the member for Elizabeth, Mr Duncan, who in turn was being led by the anti-nuclear group. Mr Dunstan could not conclude anything in London in relation to uranium enrichment because he could not control the numbers in his own Caucus.

When the Liberal Government came to office in 1979, we upgraded and accelerated the efforts of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, because I believe that we had a more enlightened attitude and certainly were better informed than were a number of elements of the Labor Party in relation to the world scene, uranium developments and the essential part that it is playing in providing a significant part of the energy needs around the world, both in communist and non-communist countries. Anyone who thinks that they can turn back the clock is sadly disillusioned.

We took up with some vigour the question of securing this industry for South Australia, because we believed that it was a very significant industry. When one talks about a billion dollars invested in the State, one is talking of something of very great significance indeed. We read with some interest that a \$20 million manufacturing industry may be projected for metropolitan Adelaide, and that will secure a headline or two. It may employ 80 or 100 people. That seems to be newsworthy material. However, when we get a billion dollar—a thousand million dollar—project (there would be only one in Australia, and we were on the point of securing it for South Australia), the Labor Party shrugs that off as not being necessary. The present Minister of Mines and Energy and his Premier said just that to the Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia.

I have been talking, about the enrichment committee in South Australia, but the Fraser Government set up an industry group called the Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia, which did a lot of work in latter years in relation to economic studies on uranium enrichment. When they were on the eve of making a decision in favour of South Australia, I believe, they called on the new Premier of South Australia, Premier Bannon, and the door was then shut in their face. So, that

group has gone into limbo. It is interesting to note (although the Budget papers do not show it) that the uranium enrichment group is still active in South Australia. The Labor Party has managed to hide that somewhere, but in the Committee stages we will no doubt discover where it is being funded.

I understand that the Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia is still operative, albeit in secret, and is waiting for the time when the realists in the Labor Party believe that they can bring the rest up to speed in relation to this question and get them to accept the only sensible and realistic policy in this day and age, at which time we will be able to gain for this State that enormous development.

Whilst I was overseas two months ago I went to see Dr Brian Kehoe at Urenco-Centec. He was well known in South Australia, along with several others who have been associated with this State in trying to negotiate a suitable project. Urenco-Centec, I remind members, is the consortium of three nations—the British, the Dutch and the Germans—that controls uranium enrichment in those three nations. The organisation controlling those uranium enrichment facilities is Urenco-Centec.

I went down to Marlow, out of London, where I had been previously, to see Dr Brian Kehoe, one of the principals in that consortium, to see how we were faring in South Australia and, indeed, how Australia was faring in relation to securing uranium enrichment facilities for the nation and, in particular, for South Australia, in view of the rather uncertain state of the Labor Party's thinking both federally and in this State regarding where it is going with uranium development. The news was rather sad, unfortunately. It was a case of a lost opportunity and one which has cost us years.

As I said initially, if we are to do anything for the lot of every man, woman and child in this State in this great area, where we have opportunity, we must grasp opportunities as they arise, do it with alacrity and see that we get on with these developments as rapidly as possible; otherwise, they may be lost. Unfortunately, uranium enrichment is lost for some years at least as a result of the procrastination, the lack of decision and the U-turns (pardon the expression) for which the Labor Party is responsible in this whole matter.

Brian Kehoe had a telex which had come from Australia, as did everyone with whom I spoke about uranium overseas, and which was issued after the latest ALP Federal Conference which hammered out what it believed was a neutral policy to satisfy all the warring elements within the Party on this question. They all had certain parts marked with a high-lighting pen. There is intense interest overseas in Australia's attitude to its uranium resources. Unfortunately, these people are saying that Australia is being seen as eccentric, and it is unfortunate that we are being perceived as such on the world scene because of the changing nuances and stances of the Labor Party on this vital question.

There are leaders in the Labor Party, around this nation, some State some Federal (unfortunately the Premier in this State is not one), who are seeking to bring the Labor Party into the twentieth century—into 1984 and the real world—in relation to what should be happening on this question. Again, unfortunately, those people cannot muster the numbers in the councils and conferences of the Labor Party so that at least a sensible, real policy can be enunciated.

If the member for Elizabeth should leave this place and be successful in gaining preselection for what is believed to be the safe Federal Labor seat of Makin, I should be sorry to see him go. This applies at a personal level because I find him quite personable.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Amiable, in fact.



**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, quite personable. His hatred of the present Premier is well known and perhaps that helps my own attitude towards him. His distaste for the qualities which are lacking in the present Premier, his distaste for the lack of real leadership, is well known. We know his famous quote about the Premier being as strong as orange-flower water, but do not let me digress. At the personal level, I shall be sorry to see him quit the place, but he will be an inhibiting force in the councils of the Labor Party in Canberra in relation to this uranium question, because he is completely blinkered (as the leader of the left in this State) to what is reality and what is happening in the real world, the requirements of the real world and where we should be going.

**Mr Hamilton:** Are you supporting Peter Duncan?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I know he will get a lot of support from members in this place who want him to go.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** His colleagues.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, his colleagues on his side of the House. He has ramming for him not only the left wing but also a whole heap of the rightwingers who want to wave him goodbye. As I understand it, without betraying confidences, and I would not want to do that—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby):** Order! Will the honourable member return to his motion.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We are dealing with uranium and the contribution that unfortunately the member for Elizabeth is likely to make in the uranium debate in Canberra. It will be extremely counter-productive in relation to securing this important industry, the subject of this motion, for South Australia and this nation. It needs a sensible approach to these matters. All I was doing was indicating that the honourable member's chances of succeeding in moving to Canberra appeared to be enhanced by the fact that he has not only the left wing supporting him but also the right wing who want to wave him goodbye, because his hatred of the Premier is so well known. I was about to mention his famous quote about the Premier being as weak as orange-flower water.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member revert to the subject of his motion.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I certainly am doing that, with due respect. The Premier would go down a sensible uranium track but he is not strong enough. He is so busy counting heads in the councils of the Labor Party that he cannot lead. The people who are suffering are every man, woman and child in this State, because this opportunity has been lost. Brian Kehoe at Marlow told me that there was a possibility, a probability, almost a certainty, that the opportunity to make a decision for a uranium enrichment facility in South Australia, even if it were to be made now, has gone. The opportunity has now gone in terms of the enrichment requirements of the world and places where people will gain their supplies.

It is bad news for the Uranium Enrichment Committee, which the Labor Party is secretly keeping going under wraps. I cannot find the Budget line but I know that it is there: I know that it is being funded. So, that committee which is operating secretly, is hoping beyond hope, I suppose, that the Labor Party may be able to push its policy a bit further (some of the sacrificial lambs have had their throats cut as a result of this policy just to let one or two others go ahead) and that it may be revived. That is a tragedy for this State. The possibility of securing that uranium enrichment facility, according to my discussion with Urenco-Centec a couple of months ago, is now some years away. So, there is an opportunity which has been lost; a major opportunity has been lost which has put us back years.

I said in relation to resource development in South Australia (and I did not say it with any sense of spite but with a sense of reality) that it was not put back three years by the advent of a Labor Government being elected for three years: it was put back at least five years, because once things are wound down they cannot be cranked up in five minutes, even with a change of Government. I even push that out further, as a result of my most recent discussions with the people who are making decisions on the world scene. I do not think I will say any more about this motion concerning uranium enrichment except to repeat that it is a tragedy for the State, and the Government deserves the strongest condemnation for its lack of action and leadership, particularly on the national scene.

The Premier—and I say this without any sense of malice or spite—unfortunately is weak. He is a weak Labor Premier—a nice fellow, personable, likeable at a personal level—but weak. He has shown no leadership at all on this question, nor will he. I am speaking from the point of view of what we need in this State: we want someone out in front who will fight for the Northern Territory railway, who will fight to knock off a wine tax, who will fight for billion dollar developments like uranium enrichment and who will take a few chances within his Party, as Prime Minister Hawke does. The Prime Minister takes a few chances, and I admire him for it, in trying to bring reality into the councils of the Labor Party on some of these questions. However, unfortunately we are not blessed with that sort of approach in South Australia.

So, I deplore the fact that we have lost this industry in the short term. I trust that we will be able to revive these negotiations that the Uranium Enrichment Committee, which as I say is meeting secretly at present under the auspices of this present Government, will be able to come out in the open and present its annual reports to Parliament as it has done previously. I hope that it will again be able to undertake meaningful negotiations with the people to whom I spoke in England, the Dutch, the Germans and Urenco-Centec, and that we may be able to revive this project to the enormous benefit of the people of this State. It is with a degree of sadness that I move this motion.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## URANIUM POLICY

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That this House urges the Government to reopen the Beverley and Honeymoon mines in South Australia thus providing employment and investment in the State, and condemns the Government for its hypocritical and contradictory uranium policy which allows some uranium mines to proceed and not others.

**Mr EVANS:** Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Opposition deplores the fact that the Labor Government in South Australia has closed down two of the important mines in this State. As I have said in an earlier debate, the mines, together with some other projects, were sacrificially dumped in an attempt to try to mollify those elements within the Labor Party that will not come to terms with reality. Unfortunately, the Labor Party has thrown all morality to the wind, and that has upset a number of its supporters. I can understand their point of view. For example, Young Labor insists on defying the Premier, despite his soothing words in trying to placate them and to stop them from protesting about Roxby

Downs. The Young Labor Movement is an official organ of the Labor Party but its members are in open defiance of the Premier in relation to the Roxby Downs project. One must be either for or against uranium mining—one cannot be in support of some mines and against others, unless there is a good reason for it. However, the Labor Party has no good reason, except that it must try to thrash around and placate those elements within the Party, such as the Young Labor Movement and the left wing, as I said, led by the would-be member for Makin.

To try to placate them, other members of the Labor Party must try to reach a compromise. But how on earth can one have a compromise of that nature? Roxby Downs will probably become the largest uranium mine in the world, no thanks to the Labor Party. However the Government has now taken the project to its bosom and decided that it must let it go ahead, and it was even acknowledged in the Premier's Budget speech that the State will receive royalties that will flow from that project before the end of the century, at which time certain taxes might be removed. However, it maintains that other projects of lesser magnitude which could have come onstream immediately will be chopped out, and Honeymoon and Beverley are a case in point. A pilot plant at Beverley which cost \$10 million is now rusting, because in 1983 the Minister of Mines and Energy declared that it could not go ahead.

The developer had complied with all the environmental strictures of both Federal and State laws. The pilot plant had been built, but when the Labor Party was elected to office in South Australia the developers were told that they could not proceed, that the Government would give them a holding lease but not a production lease. They were unable to put their \$10 million pilot plant into operation. That was a tragedy not only for the State but also for the people who were thrown out of work as a result of that decision. I received telephone calls from some of them. The girl on the switchboard of the company office in Adelaide, for instance, asked me what she was going to do when she lost her job. These people were sacrificed on the altar through the stupid, hypocritical, immoral Labor Party uranium policy.

To its credit the Young Labor Movement pays testimony to the immorality of the situation and at least shows its colours. I do not agree with it for a moment, but at least those in the movement take a moral stance. They believe that if some mining is not to go ahead no mining should go ahead. Accordingly, they make protests—and they are a damn nuisance—but, nevertheless, they are not being hypocritical in accepting a policy which dictated that two mines, which could have been brought into production and which could have had secure markets, would be closed down and that people would be thrown out of work while the giant mine at Roxby Downs would go ahead. I believe that this is a tragedy not only for the people who were thrown out of work but for the future development of South Australia.

The Minister outlined the rationale for the decision to close down the Honeymoon and Beverley mines in South Australia in a Ministerial statement to the House which was one of the most deceitful documents ever presented here. It was a pathetic attempt to rationalise and justify the decision. Three excuses were given for closing down those mines. The first was that there was division of opinion in the community, and that the Australian Democrats did not agree with the operation of those mines. That was a quite nonsensical argument to advance. If such a division of opinion in the community existed about the operation of those mines, surely that would apply also to Roxby Downs. Similarly, of course, the Democrats are dead set against the operation of Roxby Downs also. What an absurd and stupid reason to advance for the closing down of the Honeymoon and Beverley mines!

The second reason advanced was that those two mines were only small fish in the pond, anyway, and that we should not worry about them. What an immoral, nonsensical and entirely stupid argument to be advanced by a Party that made such a big song and dance about supporting small business in the community. The other point advanced in that part of the Minister's statement was that it was difficult to secure markets. However, all the people engaged in the industry who were taking the risk by spending their own money (not Government funds, that is, taxpayers' money) maintained that they believed that they could secure markets and that they could provide employment, that they would get the pilot plant going and produce some yellowcake, similar to that which is being produced right now at Roxby Downs. Nevertheless, the Government maintained that that was not the case, that they could not find markets and that therefore the mines would be closed down.

That was an absurd reason to put to this Parliament for closing down the mines. If that argument were to be applied, we should have closed down all the car plants in the nation because at that time they were having difficulty in selling cars: perhaps we should have said to Mitsubishi and Holden's that they should close down because they were having difficulty finding markets. At that time the mining companies involved said that they could secure markets. I have material with me that was put out by the companies indicating that they believed that they could find markets. However, the Big Brother Government here did not believe that they could find markets and decided that it would close down the mines. There would have been no risk to the Government, no risk to the public and employment would have been created. But, no, it could not go ahead. What a dishonest argument to advance to this House to try to justify an immoral decision.

The third reason given by the Minister when trying to rationalise the irrational was that the *in situ* leaching process at Honeymoon and Beverley was new to the country, so we should not use it. We would still be back in the Stone Age in Australia if we followed that argument, because everything that has come to this State since 1836 has come from outside. To hell with the fact, he says, that *in situ* leaching of ore had been tried, tested and proved in America for years. To hell with the fact that it has been through all the environmental strictures, both State and Federal, to say that the process is safe. To hell with the studies which put to rest the fears of the environmentalists who said that the underground aquifers would be contaminated as a result of the mining. Some people like to peddle untruths knowing that they are untruths. To hell with the fact that scientifically they have all been dispatched.

Yet, this Government is saying it will be closed down because it will use a mining method that has not been used in Australia before, a mining method that is as benign as any one could imagine. There are no miners underground, with lights and helmets and all the hazards of that. You pump into the lode bearing ore an acidic solution about as strong as lemon juice and dissolve out the ore. It is not touched by human hand: it is processed in chemical works on the surface and turned out as yellowcake in a process much simpler than anything that is happening at Roxby Downs. They suggest that because this process is new to Australia it will not be allowed to proceed.

I feel sorry for the Minister, who had to stand in this place and try to enunciate these reasons for the Government decision to close down these mines which were on the threshold of operating, but that is what he put to the House. It was a pathetic performance, not to put too fine a point on it. He said that the Government was closing the mines down because there was a division of opinion within the community, the Democrats did not want it, and it was

small, so it did not matter anyway, it could not find markets, despite the fact that the private entrepreneurs and the mining companies were prepared to risk their own money and their own capital to provide work to prove that they could find markets. Thirdly, it was a process which was untried in Australia. I ask you! It was tried and tested for many years in America and I cannot think of any more benign mining operation, where no-one will have to go underground and none of the associated hazards would have to be faced.

It was a tragedy for this State, no less, that people were thrown out of work because the Government would not give the company a lease. I have probed the Government unsuccessfully about what arrangements were made to find jobs for these people. There are more people unemployed in South Australia and fewer people in paid employment than when this Government was elected to office. This Government contributed to this situation in no small way by closing these mines. I have asked what it has done to rehabilitate these people and to re-employ them, but I believe it has done precious little because it does not know what the answers are.

Let me give an example of the sacrificial lambs the Labor Party has used to try to accommodate what is an immoral and completely illogical uranium policy. At Honeymoon the pilot stage had been completed at a cost of about \$10 million but because of a change in Government it is now rusting out. The number of people employed at the site was 35, which would lead to employment of 70 people full time. The service industries supporting these people at the mine employed 250 South Australians. Where do we get an industry starting up overnight in South Australia to replace those 300 jobs that were just wiped out? Where can Labor members point to a development where 300 people are taken off the dole queue in one hit? They cannot do it, but we can point to a project where they pushed 300 people out of employment at one stroke of the pen with their decision.

At Beverley, the other mine which was not so far down the track, there would have been over the life of the mine an investment of \$500 million. That would have employed probably the most benign mining method that could be devised for extracting ore. What other projects of that magnitude bob up in a State like South Australia? As I said earlier, if an investment of \$20 million was made in metropolitan Adelaide we would think that was a cause of great rejoicing, but the Labor Party banged the door shut on the second mine with a \$500 million investment in the State. Initially, 100 people were employed there and the service industries supporting them would have employed another 400 people. The Government has banged the door shut on that.

I mentioned in the earlier debate the \$1 billion project for the uranium enrichment plant. These are the casualty figures of the Government's immoral policy relating to uranium. During the construction stage of the uranium enrichment plant there would have been 600 jobs, and during operations there would have been 300 to 500 jobs with about 900 to 1 500 jobs in the service industries. We were looking at a couple of thousand jobs. What other industry can the Labor Party point to with the potential of providing 2 000 jobs in South Australia? None, let alone the infusion of funds in terms of royalties, the extra value added to the product in terms of export income which doubles the export income. It makes a contribution as significant as the royalties that are flowing from the oil development which we initiated: from nothing to \$30 million this year. It is a tragedy for the State that these projects have had to be sacrificed.

One of the other appointments I had overseas two months ago was with the Central Generating Authority, in London, the people responsible for planning and providing electricity

throughout Great Britain. I discussed with these people where they intended to get their uranium supplies in the future. They had had a telex from Australia and they had put a texta-colour mark through the qualifications of the Labor Party's most recent uranium policy, the puzzling bits. They asked what they meant and I said that I would be the last to know. They said that this immoral, illogical policy of the Australian Government was being talked about as being eccentric in that forum. I asked their position about uranium and whether they had seen people from South Australia. They said that they had seen representatives from some of the companies but no-one from the Government. They had written two contracts, but unfortunately not with South Australia, because our mines had been closed down.

They had written two contracts, I think with Jabiluka and Koongara in the Northern Territory. Australia's competitors are, in the main, Canada and Namibia for the European market. They had contracts with Namibia which they did not intend to renew because they are looking for stable, long-term high grade supplies which Australia can provide. Australia could be the foremost provider of this fuel in the world. So, they had those contracts written. South Australia was the first to close the mines down, by the way; the others waited for the Federal decision but the South Australian Government did not mess around too long: it closed them down. But, Koongara and Jabiluka, which are high grade mines, are also casualties of this uranium policy recently enunciated at the Federal level, where unfortunately Prime Minister Hawke could not carry the troops with him.

So, this compromise policy, which is completely nonsensical, said that Jabiluka and Koongara were to close down. So, I said to the people at the Central Generating Board in London, 'Where will you get your uranium?' They said, 'From Canada.' That is nothing short of a tragedy for this nation. Those mines would have dwarfed the two I am talking about in South Australia, but they would have been important to South Australia: mark my words! However, these two mines in the Northern Territory would have been important to us and the whole nation.

But the Labor Party, in its frantic search for a compromise, said, 'We will let Ranger go ahead'—that is in the Roxby Downs scale in the Northern Territory—and we will let Nabarlek continue to sell their uranium. They have mined it out and stockpiled it anyway but they can go ahead and sell it. Koongara and Jabiluka have been cut off at the head—decapitated—closed down. Contracts had been written which would have meant millions, tens and eventually hundreds of millions of dollars to this nation. That is happening right here in South Australia. It is a tragedy, nothing short of it.

If we in South Australia do not grasp these opportunities as they arise, and grab them with a degree of alacrity, they will go. The unions are not trying to close down nuclear reactors in Britain. They know that they will freeze and starve if they do. If we do not grasp the opportunities, they will go to Canada. We are the losers; they are the winners. If we in South Australia do not grasp these opportunities when they are there every man, woman and child is the loser. We are the losers in terms of what this Government has decided to sacrifice in South Australia in this resource area. So, where we could become national leaders and make a very significant contribution to the economy of this State, we cannot do so.

We would be able to lower the taxes we have to levy on people of this State; we would be able to provide services and employment, but that is sacrificed on this altar of ideology by which the Labor Party seems incapable of coming to reality with the world scene. It is again with sadness that I move this motion. But, I must draw to the attention of the House—and unfortunately I do not think this has

impressed itself on the consciousness of the public at large—the extent to which we have been penalised as a State and a nation in an area and at a time when we are in serious economic trouble. The Labor Party's uranium policy and the economic damage it has caused has not penetrated the consciousness of the public.

As I have said, I move this motion with a deal of sadness but with a real sense of the reality and urgency of the situation as it confronts us and, particularly, the rising generation in this State. We read yesterday, that of the youngsters leaving school at 18, 27 per cent of those between 18 and 20 years are unemployed. What future do they have in this nation if we do not grasp these opportunities as they present themselves? What future do they have if we get bound up in this ideological gobbledegook in which some members of the Labor Party have unfortunately become enmeshed?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D.C. Brown:

That this House expresses its grave concern that the Government is selling large areas of land essential for the construction of the north-south transport corridor and at the dishonest manner of paying inadequate compensation to the Highways Fund for the land sold and calls on the Government to stop further sales of land and to pay all moneys received for land already sold into the Highways Fund.

(Continued from 29 August. Page 629.)

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport):** I want to take the opportunity to put the facts on this matter. The member for Davenport has continuously brought a series of red herrings, mistakes and misquotations to this House. I would like to correct two errors which seem to suit him and which he has presented on a number of occasions. First, it was his Government that abandoned the freeway south of Darlington. I would like to quote from a statement on 24 February 1982, of the then Minister of Transport who announced in this House:

The Government has decided that the 40 km tract of land formally designated for freeway from Dry Creek to Noarlunga will be cut by half in width and truncated south of Darlington.

He went on to say that the right of way south of Darlington would be retained to provide a bypass to Morphett Vale East and a future northward extension of that bypass.

It is exactly this piece of right of way that the present Government has decided to use to construct a third arterial route through the Darlington area. Since the former Minister's announcement, further studies carried out by the Highways Department indicate that it is not a high priority to build a bypass for Morphett Vale. The problems now are recognised as being in the Darlington area and the highest priority for the use of the right of way south of Darlington is to provide a bypass to that bottleneck.

Secondly, land disposal is being carried out by the Minister of Lands in accordance with Government policy. I quote the member for Davenport:

The Government has no faith, trust or confidence in the Minister of Transport in selling this land. The disposal of the land was transferred to the Minister for Environment and Planning.

For the information of the House, and in view of this misinformation supplied by the honourable member, I draw attention to the fact that land disposal is being undertaken by the Minister of Lands on the advice of the Minister for

Environment and Planning according to sound planning principles appropriate to such a redevelopment project. The decision to abandon the corridor has been made. The disposal of this land is not, under any circumstances, a matter for the Minister of Transport.

On the matter of disposal of funds, it is well known that land in the corridors has been purchased over a number of years varying in prices at varying times. This has been done to avoid hardship for people who otherwise might have not been able to sell their property because it was to be reserved for the future use of motorists. However, now that the Government has made a decision to abandon this corridor we are left with a stock of land for which present day value far exceeds the original purchase price. It would normally be expected that those funds would go back into roadworks, and as a general rule that would be the case. However, the impact of this corridor and its reservation of land on the communities it serves has resulted in huge financial and social loss to those communities. The Government is very conscious of the need to redress speedily this balance. It has therefore decided to allocate some of the funds to the replanning and redevelopment of parts of the inner western suburbs.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Do you deny 70 per cent?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The honourable member would have us continue to acquire properties on the corridor probably at the rate of something like \$1 million worth per annum and put more than 1 000 properties under threat for no real benefit. As a matter of fact, there are 1 285 properties in this corridor. That is a hell of a lot of properties that would affect a very large number of families and businesses.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** How many of those are in your electorate?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I have not counted the number. There was a very large number in my electorate, and I must say that it really devastated that area of the corridor that was in my district.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Most of them were in the Premier's and the Deputy Premier's electorates and in your electorate.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Whether or not most of them were in the Premier's, the Deputy Premier's or my electorate is beside the point. That was not taken into consideration at all. Instead, this Government favours the current use of that money for road improvements, which will improve the lot of the motorist today, release the funds currently tied up along the corridor and remove the threat to properties.

I refer now to the honourable member's reference to the Royal Automobile Association. The honourable member said:

... we must not forget that the Royal Automobile Association represents more than 400 000 motorists in South Australia ...

Over the years the Royal Automobile Association has established itself as an excellent servant and supporter of the motorist. However, the honourable member's claim that it represents the views of 400 000 motorists is imaginative, to say the least. Even the Royal Automobile Association would accept that the vast majority of its members join to obtain the security of emergency road service, and travel help and advice. The membership gives the honourable member no franchise grounds for the sort of emotional and misapplied campaign that he is conducting. It would be just as unreal to suggest that every telephone subscriber endorses the policies of Telecom Australia.

The honourable member also cites the people of the south as supporting his emotional campaign. Their proposal—and his for some of the time at least—is that the corridor should be retained to give access to the city from the southern region. Let me quote the former Minister of Transport when

he spoke to this House on 24 February 1982. He said that the modified corridor was to be retained, 'providing a bypass for cross-city traffic'. However, it was not to provide access to the city. Therefore, the proposal of the member for Davenport is to retain the corridor to perform a function that it was never intended to perform. In relation to the Darlington bottleneck, the honourable member has gone further and claimed that the Government's proposals will merely shift the congestion that is occurring at Darlington 1 km farther north.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Most people tend to agree with that.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Again, it is an example of the trivial thinking that the honourable member is giving to this issue. The capacity of the road network north of Darlington is so much greater than is the capacity of South Road, Darlington, that it is nonsense to suggest that the establishment of a third arterial road will merely move the congestion to the north. It is obvious that most of the roads in the southern area focus at Darlington. One kilometre farther north there is three or four times the capacity in the network than there is at the one location. One can also take into consideration the effect of the widening of South Road, which will help a great deal.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** You went for the least effective option.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The Darlington bottleneck is the problem area because of the intersection of Flagstaff Hill Road, Marion Road and Seacombe Road, and there is greater capacity when one by-passes it. Statements like those show the honourable member's complete inability to comprehend transport issues or a complete contempt for the facts and issues involved. As a further example, the honourable member quotes statistics in traffic growth. He cites the first four months of 1984 as a basis for rejecting the trends that have existed for years previously. It is nonsense to take a change based on four months to project future needs.

We must take a much sounder and long-term view. It is true that the decision to delete the corridor was supported by, but not based on, the seven to 10 previous years experience of a 1 per cent growth in traffic. Projections on which the need for the freeway were based would have a growth rate in excess of 4 per cent over that period—enough cause to seriously doubt the validity of those projections. The honourable member goes on to quote Highways Department figures. Perhaps he would like to show the Parliament the figures from which he is quoting. I may have confirmed that those figures were contained in the Highways Department document, but many of the figures quoted at that time were wrong and have since been repudiated.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Come on! They were 1982 figures, which you released in 1983, and you yourself admitted—

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The honourable member grasps at stray figures like a drowning man.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** You released the figures—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Still on the matter of statistics, which the honourable member abuses with flair, he quotes the growth rate of the southern area on a percentage basis. The honourable member said:

... the population of Adelaide's southern suburbs will increase by 46 per cent in contrast to the total population, which is expected to increase by only 8.9 per cent—

That is during the period from 1981 to 1991. The honourable member conveniently ignores the fact that the actual increase in population in the northern region of Adelaide is and will continue to be greater than the increase in the southern region. It is quite shameful that the Opposition has chosen to treat transport matters with such disregard. I presume

that the Opposition supports the statements being made by its spokesman in these matters and I have pointed out so far the number of ridiculous factual errors that the honourable member has made. We are all familiar with his grandstanding style, and he will say anything for a cheap headline. I refer to his use of phrases like 'traffic chaos'. I think that the member for Davenport interprets 'traffic chaos' as applying when two motor cars are parked in his driveway. His deliberate misrepresentation of the facts to the electorate in general and to the people in the south in particular should be taken with a grain of salt with two cups of sugar for the sour grapes.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** You released those figures in March last year.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will please resume his seat. The Chair has been very patient with the member for Davenport, and I advise him that that patience has now run out. If he continues to interject in future, the Chair will act accordingly. I hope that the member for Davenport takes the Chair's remarks as a fair warning.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I think the member's only excuse can be ignorance, but even that excuse is hollow. It is an ignorance of his own making. He has not once accepted the invitations given by me and by the Director-General of Transport to attend a briefing so that he could get first hand information from the professionals who advise the Government on these transport issues. That invitation is still open to the member, and I challenge and welcome him to accept that invitation and go along and hear the briefing, similar to the advice that the Opposition offered the Government in this matter. That offer is still open, if the honourable member has the courage. However, his house of cards may fall down around him, and I think that that is what he is frightened of.

I quote from the advice of the former Minister of Transport to this House in February 1982. The then Minister stated:

The final decision on whether a freeway should be constructed is something that the State Government will have to make well into the future, taking into account planning work that is now to be done and, in particular, taking into account whether it is able to fund the project which has an estimated cost of over \$200 million in 1982 prices.

The sum of \$200 million would be a lot higher in today's prices. It was \$200 million in 1982 prices. The former Minister went on to say:

If a freeway was to be constructed eventually, that section from Darlington to Anzac Highway would be the last to be built.

The previous Minister knew what he was talking about. He will be pleased that the planning work has now been done and will accept, I am sure, that further studies have shown that there is no priority at this stage for constructing a bypass to Morphett Vale. The emphasis must be on relieving pressures that will build up at Darlington in years to come and, more importantly, the planning work has shown that the decision that the State Government will have to make well into the future is so far away that there is no justification for continuing to reserve the land. To do so would not only be costly, both economically and socially, but would also probably produce a corridor location and type inappropriate to the real needs which might be generated in the future.

Can the honourable member say that he will commit a Liberal Government to reinstating the corridor? I challenge him to answer that question. Will his Government find the millions of dollars necessary for land acquisition and the \$200 million plus to build the freeway and, if so, how will he justify it when all the evidence says that the corridor should not be retained and that the freeway should not be built?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. The Minister is inviting me to comment across the Chamber and you, Sir, have asked me not to interject. I am not sure to which evil I should bend. I believe that I should respect the Chair. Mr Deputy Speaker, will you please ask the Minister to stop inviting me to interject across the Chamber?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. I point out to the member for Davenport that he will have the right at some time in the future to reply to all of the so-called criticism which he says the Minister is levelling at him. He can reply at the conclusion of the debate.

**Mr BECKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## WINE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House, recognising the depressed state of the wine industry, the plight of wine-grape growers and their inability to meet mounting costs, condemns the Federal Government for imposing a 10 per cent sales tax on wine and calls on the Federal Government to withdraw the tax forthwith.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 478.)

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education):** I previously spoke on this matter on the day on which the motion was moved by the member for Chaffey and when the House debated the matter of urgency on the imposition of the wine tax by the Federal Government. I indicated my grave concern about that imposition. Indeed, in closing my remarks on that day, I referred to the effect of imported wines on the Australian industry. I feel that that issue has not been seriously entertained or taken into account by the Federal Government in its consideration of the wine tax question.

Members will know that the Federal Government is determined not to increase the level of tariff on imported wine and is doing so because of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the GATT agreement. It is a commendable decision to adhere to GATT agreements. However, by adhering to that set of agreements and then imposing a 10 per cent impost on the wine industry, it puts the local wine industry at a disadvantage in relation to imported wines. I express two causes of concern in relation to that, both of which came from the fact that there is a substantial wine lake in the European Common Market that is seeking markets at the moment. This is having a devastating effect on the American wine production as this European wine is coming in at cheap rates, and I believe that the same will happen here.

The two effects relate, first, to special imported bottled wine and, secondly, to the mixing of grape juice from overseas with grape juice from Australian sources, so that we will have hybrid wines. Already there is one hybrid wine from the Penfold stable, Italian wine being mixed with Australian wine. I believe we will see more of that happening. I say that because we have noticed in recent years a tendency towards an increasing share of the local wine market going to overseas wine products. I understand that the figure prior to 1984 was something of the order of 3 per cent of the market being taken by imported wine bottles. I understand that the figure is now of the order of 6 per cent. That was before the imposition of the wine tax. This clearly indicates that the market is upward for overseas wines. It is upward because of promotion factors and also because of cost factors. I do not know whether many members had the chance to visit the Royal Show. I took a brief opportunity to pop my head in, and noticed that one of the stalls was promoting

German wine. We have had in recent years an active promotion of German wines in South Australia, and I believe that that will be joined by wines from other parts of Europe as well.

Indeed, one could speculate that champagne will be another. There have been significant reductions in the price of European champagnes relative to Australian champagnes, and they will bite more seriously into our market. That intrusion will not be assisted by the fact that Australian wines will have to either put up their prices by 10 per cent to meet the extra impost or will have to absorb the 10 per cent in their cost structure to which I will return in a moment.

In regard to the mixing of grape juice, the main people who will suffer the effect will be the grapegrowers, because the wine producer will be able to draw on relatively cheap grape juice from overseas to mix with local grape juice, thus minimising the cost element. He can then still sell his bottles for the same price as before and make the same profit margin, but the person who will suffer will be the Australian grapegrower. I suspect that not one person in this House does not appreciate the serious problems that grapegrowers have been facing in the Riverland. I want to raise another matter. I feel that the ramifications of this impost have also not been taken into account sufficiently and that they run much further than simply the impact on the wine industry itself.

In the past few weeks I had the opportunity of attending a meeting of Ministers of industry and technology held in Canberra. That meeting discussed heavy engineering and the problems facing the heavy engineering industry in Australia, and they are serious problems. One might ask what is the connection between heavy engineering and the production of wine. But there is a connection that means something to us in South Australia. In the Riverland we have the largest—if not the largest, certainly the most expert—manufacturer of stainless steel vats that are produced for the entire Australian market. That producer is located in that area clearly because of the wine production of that area and has developed employment opportunities and expertise that has found that company an Australian market. If, however, the local wine economy and grape industry is to suffer serious effects there will be natural impacts upon such enterprises because the wine producers will put off the installation of new wine vats, they will defer orders and consequently the deferral of orders will affect the operations of that particular company.

So, that is one example of the kind of ramification that can be seen from the impost of this wine tax. The excise or the impost has been imposed by the Federal Government because there has been a considerable lobby and a debate about the equity of wine not being taxed compared to beer and other drinks, such as spirits. I understand that the Federal Auditor-General's Report identified as an anomaly the fact that wines were not taxed, compared to the very heavy rates of revenue raising and taxes on beer, spirits and the like.

The point is quite correct: one can say there is an anomaly, but then one has to compare certain other things, and I come back to the tariff on imported wines, because it is important. In this country there is not a significant inroad or intrusion of foreign beers: there is some intrusion, but it is by no means significant, because in terms of the value per volume or the value of the weight of beer, the large scale importation of beers, ales and the like into this country is not economic.

So, the Australian beer industry will not be at a disadvantage because of the high levels of excise that apply in that industry. Much of the spirit industry is overseas based in any event—exceptions are the brandy industry, which

suffered very badly when an excise was imposed. So, fair enough, the Auditor-General's Report is correct: there is an anomaly, but one must look at the wider implications of such an anomaly and not just take first glance impressions as being the ones that really should apply.

One will remember that the Federal Government imposed an excise on fortified wines in the 1983-84 Budget that caused considerable agitation at the time. It was the South Australian Government that led, I believe, the national outcry against it, resulting in that particular excise being repealed. Not only was the excise repealed but also the amounts of money raised by that excise were returned to the source, so that the money paid in was no longer withheld from the community; it was sent back to those who had originally paid the excise.

What is needed is a similar kind of agitation in the wine tax situation, to explain the inequity of taxing wine and to explain that the anomalies identified in the Auditor-General's Report are really not appropriate understandings of the situation. What has happened is that the Federal Government, at the same time as imposing this latest tax, established an inquiry into the wine industry. I made the point on the last occasion that I fully supported the decision for an inquiry into the wine industry. It is a very important event. I also lamented the fact that the Federal Government chose to impose the tax before it had the results of the wine industry inquiry. It would have been more appropriate if the taxing position had been deferred at the very least until the wine inquiry determined what it would do. Nevertheless, I support an inquiry into the wine industry.

I wish to refer to that inquiry that was announced by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (John Kerin). He stated that the purpose of the inquiry is as follows:

- A. Review the structure of the grape and grape product industries;
- B. Identify the major policy issues of concern to those industries; and
- C. Make recommendations on ways in which the efficiency and competitive abilities of those industries can be improved.

The membership was announced by John Kerin and I do not propose to go through it now. Mr Kerin detailed a number of aspects that would need to be considered by that inquiry. Some of those aspects that would amplify the terms of reference were:

1. Recognising the short, medium and long-term implications for the viticultural and wine and brandy and dried vine fruits industries of developments in international trade and in the domestic rural policies of our traditional and potential trading partners; developments in the macro economic and structural characteristics of the Australian economy; domestic policies including assistance in all forms to other sectors of the community; changes in technology in production and processing and the stimulating effect of these changes on adjustment; and developments in the domestic market including changing tastes, the demand for quality and the structure of the market.

To review the structure of, and identify the major policy issues relating to, the Australian grape-growing, wine and brandy industries, taking into account in particular:

- (a) The regional characteristics and technical and economic efficiency of grape production, varietal requirements to meet markets and present supply capability, and factors inhibiting regional adjustment.
- (b) Connections between the grape-growing, wine, brandy, dried vine fruits, table grapes, grape juice, grape concentrate and spirits industries, other major inter-industry relationships.
- (c) Processing and distribution arrangements in Australia for grapes, wine, brandy and other specified grape products.
- (d) Government measures affecting grape, wine and brandy production, producers' incomes, and rural adjustment, taxation issues, grape pricing arrangements, and other Government charges and regulations.
- (e) Recent changes in the market for wine, other grape products and grapes and short, medium and long-term prospects.

The inquiry is to make recommendations on the matters aforementioned. It was necessary to read out and amplify those terms of reference because it is important that, if honourable members are to debate this question, they should, at the very least, turn their attention to the inquiry established by the Federal Government and argue whether or not that inquiry is able to address fundamental problems facing the wine industry in this country. I believe that the terms of reference are very good and go to the root cause of many of the problems facing the industry. They will give the opportunity for viewpoints to be canvassed, ideas to be considered and solutions to be put forward for consideration by the Federal Government, State Governments and communities within Australia.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Wouldn't you consider it would have been fairer to have the inquiry first and then impose a tax?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I know I ought not to answer interjections and I appreciate it is out of order, but I ask for the indulgence of members by making a brief—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister should not arrange for interjections, either.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In fact as I said previously (and as it is an important point, at the risk of breaching Standing Orders I will repeat myself) I entirely agree that the inquiry should have pre-dated any decision by the Federal Government to impose a wine tax. If there has to be a wine tax (and I am not saying that that point is accepted), surely at the very least the Federal Government could have deferred such an imposition until after the findings of the wine inquiry. I mentioned that previously but the honourable member was probably not in the Chamber at the time. In fact, I entirely agree with the point that he has made.

It must also be mentioned that that inquiry will hopefully work on issues that are similar to those which other inquiries are presently considering. The State Government has been working in a tripartite sense with Victoria and New South Wales to establish a three State inquiry into minimum prices for grapes. This tripartite group will first meet in October 1984, and it has been asked to report within six months, hopefully with enough time for consultation with industry before changes apply for the 1986 vintage.

That is an important question affecting the wine industry. It is not simply a matter of whether or not an excise is imposed, but it is a matter of considering the other costs of production and the other sources of revenue that are available to those in the various levels in the industry. Problems facing the grapegrowers are uncertainty and the low levels of income that they receive. In South Australia we have done some work with minimum grape prices, but, in isolation, that might have caused problems, given the situation that applies in other States. So, the decision of the State Minister to work with Ministers in other States in an attempt to reach some tri-State agreement, so that interstate rivalries and competition in the marketplace do not disadvantage South Australian grapegrowers, I think is most commendable. If that works out satisfactorily, I think one could then look forward to a situation where minimum prices would give grapegrowers some income security so that they could plan in advance their income levels.

One of the other issues that the State Government is very concerned about clearly is the Riverland. Last time this motion was debated it was mentioned that one of the serious impacts of the wine tax will be its effect particularly on the Riverland grapegrowers and wine industry. A number of problems have been experienced in that region over recent times. The State Government is very concerned about those problems and is endeavouring to do what it can to meet them in a structured way in order to best serve the interests of people in those areas and in other parts of South Australia.

Consequently, the proposal has been put forward for the Riverland Council for Redevelopment, which the State Government has considered and approved. It is hoped that that council will be operational in the near future. I understand that an applicant for the position of Chief Executive of the council is presently being interviewed. When a person is appointed to that position, the council can then become operational and co-ordinate redevelopment within the region. The council will be a State funded body and that is an indication of the Government's commitment to the Riverland region.

The redevelopment council will look into the long-term prospects for the Riverland and will determine the industries (either primary or secondary) on which the area should focus attention. It may well determine that there should be some readjustment in the industries, including those in the primary area. The council may determine that alternative crops or primary products should be produced. Many of the products grown in the Riverland are not quickly turned over. It is not like an area where cereal crops are grown, where crops can be changed within 12 months. In the Riverland it takes a longer time to do that. Therefore, again we have raised with the Federal Government that any decision to impose taxes ought to take account of the longer time that it takes such a region to adjust to changed market circumstances.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** The grapegrowing section of the industry in the Riverland is one of the best in the world. It would be crazy to produce other crops in place of grapes purely because the industry had been destroyed by the wine tax.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** We all recognise that the 10 per cent impost will indeed have an impact on the industry. We need to ensure that South Australia responds to it. I have referred to the Riverland Development Council as being one way that that will happen. But also we must look at other issues. I have mentioned that we support the Federal inquiry and that we are looking at the tri-State arrangements for a minimum prices inquiry. There are also other issues that the State Government is considering. The State Minister of Agriculture will be advising the Parliament on those issues in due course.

In the few minutes that I have available to me before I finish, I want to reiterate the Government's concern about the impost. I ask those who hold the view that an impost should be put on the wine industry because of the anomaly that exists in regard to beer, spirits and the like to consider the very special nature of the wine industry and the fact that such an impost cannot serve the industry well: they must recognise that if the industry is not well served then the State of South Australia will not be particularly well served. In his motion the member for Chaffey has called for the withdrawal of the 10 per cent sales tax forthwith. I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and we believe that it would be appropriate to amend the motion, and accordingly I move the following amendment:

Delete all words after 'recognising' and replace with:

the important issues facing the wine industry, commends the Federal Government for its decision to remove the excise on fortified wine and repay the excise collected, and supports the decision of the Federal Government to establish a committee of inquiry into the wine industry in the 1984-85 Budget, following its announcement of a 10 per cent general sales tax on wine.

I believe that by linking this with last year's proposed excise, which was later withdrawn, we will indicate that we hope that the Federal Government will do the same thing again. Certainly, the point that we make is that, while the Government commends the decision to hold the inquiry, it regrets very much and attacks the decision to impose the 10 per cent tax. I repeat the point that surely it would have

been better had the 10 per cent tax not been imposed but deferred until after an inquiry had taken place. Without any hesitation the State Government opposed the wine tax. It has said so to the Federal Government.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Despite the recommendations that may come from the inquiry.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding the recommendations that may come from the inquiry, I believe that, if our understanding of the wine industry is accurate, the inquiry will recognise the many serious problems that the industry faces. I have pointed out previously that the ramifications are wider: the grapegrowers, the wine industry and other sectors of the industry are affected. From information provided by the State Development Council, the Department of Agriculture and from other areas, we believe that when all of these matters are taken into account it is obvious that the issue is not a simple one. If there must be an impost on wine, surely at the very least the Federal Government should have breached the GATT agreement and increased the tariff on overseas wine. That is one other solution that is available. But in the absence of any understanding of those problems, of any protection against overseas wine, and of any serious attempt to face redevelopment issues prior to an inquiry, we most strongly condemn the 10 per cent impost and believe that—

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** I was just trying to get you to say that, whatever the inquiry brings down, you will still be opposed to the tax.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** That point has been raised on other occasions in other contexts: I think that it is most inappropriate to ask one to totally pre-empt the findings in a report. One is often asked questions about whether one was going to do what one intended to do anyway regardless of what a report says, but surely a wise and rational person would consider what a report says. A report may identify things totally differently. In fact one should not support the holding of an inquiry unless one is prepared to consider the recommendations that come from it. Until the inquiry gives its findings, we maintain that there is no justification for the wine tax and, accordingly, the Government is totally opposed to it. We believe that the issues at hand have not been investigated and because of that the whole wine industry could seriously suffer, which means that we in South Australia could seriously suffer, because South Australia is the basis of the wine industry and, in particular, the Riverland could suffer grave consequences.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** 'When Bannon fights, South Australia loses.' Certainly, the Minister of Education has done nothing to alter that attitude of the Opposition. The offering made by the Minister is a total disaster for the industry in South Australia. I will develop my comments at a later stage. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Since the Second World War, the wheat industry in Australia has operated under a series of five-year marketing (or stabilisation) schemes. Details of a new wheat marketing scheme, which is to operate from 1 October 1984, are



currently being finalised and legislation to implement the scheme will be passed by the Commonwealth and all States in due course. That legislation will cover all aspects of the Australian wheat industry.

In the interim, this short Bill seeks to amend the Wheat Marketing Act, 1980, to permit the new domestic pricing arrangements for human consumption wheat to operate from 1 October 1984, thereby allowing continuity of wheat sales to millers under those pricing arrangements which form an important part of the new wheat marketing scheme. Currently, the domestic price of human consumption wheat is determined annually by a formula which is designed to maintain the home price, on average, at a level 20 per cent above export parity. The formula has failed to achieve this aim. At the present time, the domestic human consumption price is around 40 per cent above export parity.

Under the Bill, a domestic human consumption price will be determined each quarter. The price will be an average of forward Australian Wheat Board prices for (a) the quarter in which the price will apply and (b) the quarter preceding the quarter in which the price will apply. To this average price the Commonwealth will add an amount made up of two components:

1. An amount to cover the extra costs incurred by the Australian Wheat Board in servicing the domestic human consumption market, compared with those costs incurred by the Board in servicing the export human consumption market; and

2. A levy to finance the shipment of wheat to Tasmania.

There will be no change in the role of the Australian Wheat Board in administering the domestic human consumption wheat market. The amended method of price determination will result in an improvement in the economic efficiency of wheat marketing by linking the domestic human consumption price directly to export returns. The quarterly price will be determined prior to the commencement of each quarter and, because the price will be an average over two successive quarters, the effect of any major export price changes between quarters will be dampened. Consultation with wheat growers and their representatives, and with the milling industry, has been exhaustive and the proposal is considered an acceptable compromise between all groups. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Bill comes into operation on 1 October 1984. Clause 3 makes an amendment to section 14 of the principal Act that is consequential upon the amendments contained in clause 4. Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act. Subsections (1) and (2) are struck out and new subsections substituted. New section (1) provides that the price at which, during the relevant season, the Board shall sell wheat for consumption in Australia is the price derived under this section.

New subsection (2) provides that, during a quarter (the 'relevant quarter'), the price per tonne of Australian standard white wheat in bulk sold free on rail at a port of export for human consumption in Australia is the amount determined by the Commonwealth Minister in the following manner: by taking the average export price quoted by the Board during the 20 business days immediately preceding the 16th day of the month immediately preceding the relevant quarter and the quarter preceding the relevant quarter (i.e., the average price over those 40 days) for Australian standard white wheat to be disposed of during the relevant quarter or the preceding quarter, by the Board by way of export

sale, and by adding to that average price such amount (if any) estimated by the Commonwealth Minister under subsection (2a). Under new subsection (2a) the Commonwealth Minister may, after consulting the Board, estimate an amount per tonne by which the costs of marketing wheat for human consumption in Australia exceed the costs of marketing wheat for human consumption for export.

Paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) make minor amendments that are consequential. Paragraph (i) provides that subsection (12) is struck out and the following subsections substituted: new subsection (12) provides that where a person exports wheat products that contain any wheat sold by the Board under this section, the Board shall, on the application of the person, refund to him the amounts referred to in subsections (2a) and (3) that applied in relation to that wheat when it was sold by the Board. Under new subsection (13), applications under subsection (12) must be in a form approved by the Board. New subsection (14) provides definitions for use in the section: 'associated farm' has the same meaning as in section 13; 'business day' means a day other than Saturday, Sunday or a public holiday in the place where the head office of the Board is situated; 'quarter' means a period of three months commencing on any 1 January, 1 April, 1 July or 1 October; and 'relevant season' means the year beginning 1 July 1984. Clause 5 provides for the repeal of the schedule to the principal Act, which, by virtue of the amendments to section 21, is no longer required.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 11 September. Page 760.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): In addressing myself to the State Budget for 1984-85, I would like to pay a tribute to the retiring Under Treasurer, Mr Ron Barnes, and echo the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken earlier by acknowledging his excellence as Under Treasurer in South Australia over a number of years. I recall the great courtesy and assistance which Mr Barnes provided to me as a Minister in the previous Government. I also recall the assistance that he provided to me as a very new backbencher when I was examining the Budget of 1977-78 following my election.

At that time I found it to be a very strange and confusing document. I am not sure, if we were all honest, that we would not acknowledge that as the years go by the document seems to become even more complex and potentially confusing. At any rate, I recall that Mr Barnes was extremely courteous and helpful in answering my queries. I think that every member of this Parliament has always felt that he was readily accessible to them and would provide them with any information that was properly sought. In examining the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer when presenting the Budget, one is confronted with some apparently contradictory statements, to a Liberal at least. I refer particularly to the statements made by the Premier when addressing the tourism area of the Budget. I refer to page 6 of the Financial Statement, where the Premier states:

For the second successive Budget the Government will increase the resources directed to developing and promoting tourism. The total budget for tourism is approximately 30 per cent higher in 1984-85 than was the case in 1983-84.

If one looks at the aggregate figures, that percentage is correct. However, if one examines the Budget closely, con-

cerning both this year and last year, one finds that amounts are included which the previous Government attributed to other Departments and which, in my opinion, falsely inflate the net amount of the tourism budget.

Last year a sum of \$240 000—which is not insignificant in a total budget of \$5.6 million—was simply transferred from the Public Buildings Department, where it was previously listed as an amount of rent paid by the Tourism Department, to the Public Buildings Department. If one looks at simple aggregates over the years, one receives the impression of an enormous boost for tourism under the Bannon Government. However, if one looks between the lines one will see that the speed of the Government's hand deceives the eye. In fact, the aggregate sums in terms of the allocation directly to tourism are not what they appear to be.

This year there is another significant sum included in the tourism budget which is not really going to do anything to boost tourism as such. It is simply funds for the Minister's office which have been transferred from where they were previously itemised, namely under the Minister of Local Government, and which now appear within the aggregate budget of the Minister of Tourism.

**Mr Becker:** Sleight of hand!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I think that is a fair description of what the Government has done. In this case the office of the Minister is allocated a sum of \$175 000. If the tourism industry was simply looking at the grand total of the tourism allocation—namely, \$7.4 million—it should first subtract \$250 000 for rent previously listed under another Department, and also \$175 000 for the office of the Minister which was also previously listed under another Department. They are comparatively small points perhaps; nevertheless, they are points that should be noted.

**Mr Becker:** They are matters of principle.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Indeed, they are matters of principle, particularly when the Premier chose to release details of the tourism allocation two days before the Budget was brought down. The Premier provided figures through the media which gave an appearance that cannot be substantiated when one looks at the actual Budget papers. For example, in his press release the Premier stated that marketing and promotional expenditure had increased by 90 per cent, or words to that effect. However, when one realises that last year the Department was allocated \$2.4 million for marketing and spent \$2.6 million, and when one also realises that media costs have risen by about 20 per cent, one can see that the increase of \$3.1 million does not give the Department a great deal more spending discretion.

It simply enables it to maintain existing levels of spending and keep pace with inflation, which, incidentally, in the area of the media runs considerably higher—triple or quadruple the rate of inflation as we apply it to the consumer price index. Incidentally, that increase in marketing funds to \$3.1 million includes \$100 000 which has been allocated for marketing of the Adelaide Convention Centre. This is an entirely new initiative: one that I applaud; one which is overdue and which should have been provided in the last Budget. However, there are two accounts for criticism here.

First, that marketing figure appears to be inflated; that \$100 000 must be subtracted from it because it is an entirely new initiative that will not enlarge the marketing and promotion funds for the general South Australian tourism product. In addition, it is regarded in the industry as entirely inadequate for the marketing of that centre. Other similar centres in Australia are receiving substantially more for their marketing funds. We are competing against those other States. We are competing with one hand tied behind our backs if we are not providing adequate amounts. I note that the Budget allocates that \$100 000 not to the Adelaide Con-

vention and Visitors Bureau Ltd, which is the authority that accepts responsibility for selling Adelaide and South Australia as a convention centre, but to the Department of Tourism.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Well, I think that the Department of Tourism budget is the appropriate place for that sum to be found, but I query whether it is appropriate for the Department to be promoting the centre rather than the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau Ltd. It is the Bureau that has the expertise, years of experience, a superb record to its credit, and contacts all over the world. It seems to me that the work of the Bureau is so intertwined with the marketing of the Convention Centre that to provide a different body with that role is simply to reduce the cost efficiency of expenditure in that area and to duplicate in a rather costly way the work that needs to be done by giving it to two separate bodies.

I will pursue that matter in the Estimates Committee debate with the Minister and in other forums, but that is my assessment on looking at the manner in which this Budget has been put together; that that critical area of marketing the Convention Centre, which, as I say, should have been commenced 12 months ago, will be severely hampered by inadequate funds and by the administration of those funds by a body other than the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau Ltd.

If we look at the broad totals and take an historical perspective on this tourism budget, it is interesting to refer to the Auditor-General's Report in regard to the Department of Tourism from the year 1979 onwards, that is, five calendar years ago. Five calendar years ago the State Government was spending \$2.336 million on tourism, which was a smaller sum than virtually all of its competitors other than the Australian Capital Territory were spending at that time, but that was the situation which the Liberal Government inherited when it came to office in September 1979. I stress that that 1979-80 Budget was virtually in place when the Liberal Party came to office.

There was very little time and very little room in which to manoeuvre in terms of tourism. In fact, my clear recollection is that we took one—and one only—major policy decision that altered the direction of the tourism budget. The Labor Party, as a campaign ploy, in one of its many desperate efforts to win the seat of Mount Gambier, had offered to the South-East \$100 000 for a regional tourist association. In making that offer, the Labor Party had completely ignored the years of patient and painstaking work by regional tourist associations in other areas and had virtually insulted those associations by ignoring the work that they had done. The Liberal Government decided to use that \$100 000 by allocating for the first time ever grants to the tourism regions of South Australia. That was the beginning of the professionalisation of the tourism regions and the recognition of them as potentially extremely valuable bodies. That established the foundation that has subsequently been built on.

In 1980, as I say, the budget was increased by a mere 3 per cent to \$2.4 million. In 1981 it was increased to \$3.278 million, an increase of \$886 000 or 36 per cent. In 1982, an extraordinarily difficult year for State Governments, a year in which loan funds had been savagely slashed by the Federal Government, the budget was increased by 16.5 per cent to \$3.8 million. In 1983 under the present Government the increase took it to \$4.9 million. In 1984 it went to \$6.2 million, which, as I say, included the best part of \$250 000 that was nothing more than rent transferred from another department. This year the amount is \$7.4 million.

Those increases in each year are commendable, but any member of this Parliament who recognises the potential of

the tourism industry as a creator of jobs, and any member of the industry who has worked to see the industry recognised, in ways that are often frustrating, would acknowledge that the Government that wants to see tourism fulfil its potential as a creator of jobs and prosperity will not look at topping up last year's budget. It will go back to basics and look at what tourism needs if one is recognising it in the context of the mid 1980s and beyond as an economic generator for a State and national economy.

On those criteria the tourism budget would look very different from what it now appears in the light of history. In other words, South Australian Governments have still not taken the initiative in terms of recognising tourism as probably the single most effective means of generating employment and creating a better life and a better lifestyle for South Australians. If the Government were to do that and to look critically at how it could best do that, this budget would be of a very different order indeed.

The Premier made much of the increase in funds for marketing and promotion. I remind members of the House that in 1981 the Liberal Government increased marketing and promotion funds by 69 per cent; that was an increase of \$402 000, bringing the marketing budget to \$982 000.

I readily acknowledge that it is easier to create a more impressive percentage increase when one is working on a comparatively small base. The base annually is getting bigger; therefore, to create an impressive percentage increase becomes more and more difficult each year. I do say that the 1981 Budget, when almost \$1 million was injected into marketing for the first time, was a watershed in the marketing of South Australia as a tourism destination.

One of the other very significant areas in the tourism budget is the grants for regional tourism associations. This is where I believe the Government stands to be severely criticised. When we came to office in late 1979, not a single dollar was allocated to regional tourist associations. In the year ended 30 June 1982, the Liberal Government had allocated \$128 000 to regional tourist associations, and in our Budget of 1982-83 we allocated \$241 000. In the current year, if one looks at the grants to regional tourist associations listed under programme 4 'Advice and Assistance to Tourism Regions', one sees that the sum was \$234 000. I assume (and this will be clarified in the Estimates Committees) that the other two items for regional tourist associations, one under 'Strategic planning and policy formulation' with a sum of \$10 000 and another under 'Marketing the State as a tourist destination' with a sum of \$60 000, should be added to that total to get a proper comparison between last year's spending and that of this year. In other words, last year's allocation was \$288 000.

I trust that this year's allocation is not \$234 000 (namely, a substantial reduction) but \$304 000. That, in itself, is an increase of almost \$14 000, which amounts to little more than \$1 000 for each of the 11 tourism regions. That does not even cover the cost of inflation, yet we expect the volunteers in those regions, which are manned almost solely (and, in some instances, solely, because there is not one regional manager for each region) by volunteers, to manage on sums that are manifestly inadequate for the job that they have to do. The regions really are the backbone of the tourism product of South Australia. It is the job of the regional tourist associations to develop that product and to market and promote it. How those people, who give up their precious time from their own small businesses—most of which are running on very fine margins—are expected to perform the miracle of the loaves and the fishes with these sums is hard to imagine.

The severest criticism needs to be levelled at the amount which is being allocated to the Adelaide tourism region. In looking at that region, one needs to look at the history of

its development. In our last year in office, it was suggested to the Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau (which was an existing structure promoting Adelaide as a city) that it share the responsibility for promoting Adelaide as a tourism region and for administering the Adelaide region in a way similar to that used in other regions in the State. The funds allocated to the Adelaide region in that last year of the Liberal Government amounted to \$10 000. It should, I hope, give every member in this House reason for deep concern to realise that the funds allocated to the Adelaide region for this current year are not \$1 more. Two years have passed and inflation is occurring on an annual basis of what, over the past few years?

**Mr Becker:** I don't know. It's dropping.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** It is dropping, certainly.

**Mr Becker:** From 10 per cent to about 6 per cent.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** From about 10 per cent to 6 per cent and, if one averages that out, it is about 8 per cent. The very minimum that should have been given was a 16 per cent increase not to keep pace with anything but virtually to stand still on the spot. The sum of \$10 000 is allocated for the Adelaide region—the whole City of Adelaide, the Adelaide Hills and the Adelaide Plains, the areas which members opposite consider so vital and which I agree are so vital to South Australia. There is also the coastal region, that precious and potentially marketable coastal region which goes from LeFevre Peninsula to the beginning of the Fleurieu Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills region, and the city itself. The sum of \$10 000 is absolutely static on the 1982-83 allocation.

The actual allocation to the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau is \$120 000, also the same as that for the year that we left office. I well remember that the Bureau was extremely critical of the Liberal Government for what it considered to be grossly inadequate funds in that year for the job that it had to do. I wonder whether the House realises that the number of visitors brought to Adelaide last year by the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau for conventions was 75 000. Spending by those visitors in actual terms was approximately \$26 million, but I am advised that if one looked at convention spending overall (because not every convention is organised by the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau) it would be more likely to be in the region of \$40 million. That is \$40 million injected into the South Australian economy by visitors brought here by an organisation that is working around the clock on a shoe-string budget!

Yet this Government, which is claiming praise for planning to build a convention centre in this city, has not increased by \$1 the grant to the Bureau that is charged with the responsibility of selling this city to interstate and international visitors. It is quite farcical and unreasonable to expect people to continue to work under those conditions. The credibility of the Bureau is on the line, and no-one can criticise the way in which it has worked to gain membership, nor the professionalism of its officers. However, it is just not right and it is not fair to expect people to work under those conditions, and the Minister and the Government deserve severe criticism for that.

Another important area, which this year is identified by a new name, is that of facilities development. It appears under Programme 3, 'Advice and Support to Tourism Development'. It was formerly identified as grants for the development of tourism resorts. I acknowledge that the new description is a more accurate and appropriate one, but unfortunately the sum allocated is, as has been the case for many years, inadequate to meet the needs of facilities development around South Australia.

If one thinks of what is involved with these grants one realises that we are talking about the quality of the tourism product. We are talking about signs that tell people where to go and which, incidentally, for a small business that is off the main track can often mean the difference between staying in business, making a profit or going broke.

It can also mean the difference between a visitor seeing something special and unique and missing it entirely because there is no proper signposting. It can mean caravan parks, tourist information bays, coastal redevelopment and a thousand different things. However, all of them are basic, practical efforts to improve the general environment of a tourist destination. I hasten to add that in every case the first beneficiaries of these improvements are local residents. They are the permanent, long-term beneficiaries of this expenditure. It is well known that there is in excess of \$7 million worth of applications for these grants and barely half a million dollars allocated to this area this year.

In addition, for some extraordinary reason that I can hardly fathom, the full sum allocated to this area last year was not spent. I recognise that there are difficulties in terms of payments and in terms of ensuring that projects come through at the desired time and that everything meets a date line. However, to have been allocated \$342 000 and to have spent only \$331 000 when there is a backlog of \$7 million in applications seems to me to not be very good management. The Budget papers are voluminous and include not only the financial statements and Estimates of Payments but also an interesting paper 'Employment Aspects of the 1984-85 Budget'. I suspect that the Premier might have moments of regret that he tabled such a paper because it does not show his Government in a very good light.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, the whole tone of the paper implies that if one could get the Government to employ everybody there would be full employment. The preface to the paper identifies public sector action affecting the economy in relation to the provision and pricing of services and infrastructure to business and the community. It is not wrong there. The tourism industry has really been hit for six by taxes imposed by this Government. It identifies land planning and business regulations; again, the very restrictive policies of this Government have inhibited development, mainly through bureaucratic delays, which are costly. Therefore, that has had an adverse effect on tourism as it has on other industries.

Environmental controls are identified as a factor, and no-one would dispute that they are necessary. However, one would question whether all of the controls imposed by this Government are necessary or desirable if one is looking for economic development. Industry assistance and promotion are listed as factors. Certainly the Government has been promoting the State, but there has been precious little industry assistance and virtually none by way of incentive or by way of the promised low interest rate loans that the Premier continues to ignore.

It lists labour legislation: we have had plenty of that of a very socialist flavour, which the tourism industry does not appreciate. The document mentions the level and composition of Government revenue raising and financing. Again, the fiscal policies of this Government have adversely affected the tourism industry. If one continues to look through the employment aspects of the 1984-85 Budget one will find opportunities missed so far as tourism is concerned.

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

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** In South Australia the Minister of Agriculture is responsible for a number of primary producer emergency assistance Acts, and the Treasurer and the Minister of Lands are also responsible for assistance Acts. The Acts administered by the Treasurer are as follows: the Advances to Settlers Act, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act, the Loans to Producers Act and the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. Those administered by the Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation are: the Agricultural Graduates Land Settlement Act, the Crown Lands Development Act, the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, the Land Settlement (Development Leases) Act, the Livestock (War Service Land Settlement) Act, the Marginal Lands Act, and the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act. The Acts administered by the Minister of Agriculture are: the Beef Industry Assistance Act, the Cattle Compensation Act, the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act, the Marginal Dairy Farms (Agreement) Act, the Primary Producers Debts Act, the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, the Rural Industry Assistance Act, the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, and the Swine Compensation Act.

Further, the Minister of Agriculture has a care, control and agency role in regard to the Commonwealth Acts that apply to rural assistance nationally and in each of the States. I have identified that range of rural assistance Acts to draw to the attention of the Government a recommendation made by officers of the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture that there should be a review undertaken of those Acts not only for the purposes of clarifying the assistance that is available throughout the community generally but also that available in those areas where primary producers are practising agriculture and, as well, that available from the ordinary commercial lending organisations.

I have been concerned about this matter for some time. I know that recently a very deliberate attempt has been made within the Department to have the matter taken up, and I urge the Government to do so. I have raised this matter on this occasion in particular because I see that even in the most recent Auditor-General's Report some problems have occurred with accountability in the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department. Mention was made (albeit briefly) of this in the 1983 Auditor-General's Report, but this time it is more than a mention; indeed, it is a criticism of the procedures that have been adopted. I have some sympathy for the officers in this respect. I place the responsibility on the Government and the Minister to tidy up the matter at base.

I hope that the Government will heed the concerns that have been expressed about this area, recognising that it is a very important part of the agricultural portfolio. If the Rural Assistance Branch is given a fair go and the Government legislatively cleans up that multiple and deranged area of Acts and consolidates the Acts in the way that has been discussed and recommended, everyone concerned with that Branch will be better off. The other matter that I want to raise during this brief opportunity to address the House is a matter that arose out of the tabling of the Public Accounts Committee Report in this House yesterday.

Understandably, the Chairman of the CFS Board, Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger, was quick to appear before the media and defend his position and that of his board members and, of course, the position of his little mate Lloyd Johns, the Director of the CFS. Those men have had plenty of practice at defending themselves over the past couple of years. I gained the impression, after hearing one of the interviews, that they are defending themselves with a degree of cynicism in this particular round.

**Mr Becker:** Do you think they're on their last legs?

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Well, if they take the message that is very clear in the PAC Report, I would expect that the Chairman, at least, of the Board would resign and recognise that, after numerous efforts at all sorts of levels to get its house in order, under his leadership the Board has failed. Whether or not the other Board members resign is a matter for very careful consideration, bearing in mind that some of the Board members have been appointed to their respective positions quite recently. In my view it would be unfair to blanket cover all the outfit with the unsavoury climate that has surrounded that operation for a very long time—indeed, too long.

Last night I was a little annoyed by remarks made in an interview between *Nationwide* interviewer Maxine McKew and Peter Schwerdtfeger during which he attempted to defend himself by entering into a round of criticism of the Liberal Government generally, when in office between 1979 and 1982, and of my predecessor as Minister in particular. My attention was drawn specifically to a remark made by Professor Schwerdtfeger concerning my direction to the Board to give greater attention to the needs of firefighting organisations in the field, even if it were at the expense of reducing the administrative costs in the central outfit. I am sure that members will recall the period when the Liberal Party was in Government when I was initially critical of the priorities set by that Board and its Director.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have allowed extraordinary tolerance to the honourable member but this is not a grievance debate. I hope that he will link his remarks to the Bill before us.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** It is my clear intention to do that. The subject I am discussing at the moment is directly associated with the funding of the State and the Budget debate before us. I cite a few examples to demonstrate that it was not in 1982 that directions were given to the Board causing it difficulties in administering its fund: in fact, the rot had set in long before that. During 1981-82 the Board substantially overspent its budget to the tune of \$202 000, representing approximately 8.5 per cent of its allocation. On learning of this drift and absence of control in the area I called in the senior members of the Board and the Director and, on behalf of the Government of the day, I made very clear that more efficiency was expected at the administrative level. I indicated that that deficit was to be met out of the budget allocation for 1982-83.

I said that they should not find great difficulty in doing so, because the 1982-83 Budget had been increased substantially and should cater for it, but only if they applied strict control over finances, continued to meet their responsibilities to local government and, indeed, recognised the need to cut down on the candy-coloured glamour that was surrounding headquarters generally, and the items that were publicly described as glitter, in particular.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member, having defended his honour as a former Minister, can now come back to the Bill.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to refer to the figures that have led to the situation represented in the line in the Budget and, in order to do that, I refer to details of previous Budget periods to demonstrate the allocations from the Budget to that division in each of the respective years and identify at the same time the deterioration in management that has occurred. In an address to the Association Delegates Conference on Monday 23 August 1982, I stated:

At the opening of the State championships yesterday, I signalled the intention to be present this morning and that I believe this was the more appropriate forum to expand the matter of finance. As representatives of regional firefighting associations I know well your level of dedication and that you are vitally interested in maintaining the efficiency of our State volunteer service. I make no apology for laying emphasis on the voluntary component. The

volunteers are the backbone of the CFS, consisting of the men and women in the front ranks. They are the real body of the CFS. All other activities and expenditure should, and must be, focused on maximising the effort in the field. That we, the Government, local government, the board and headquarters administrative staff, in that order, are there to guide, co-ordinate and serve the volunteers, not dictate to them. If this is not so, then those areas which are not directed to this end are surplus, and must be terminated.

Clearly, in respect of financial management of that Budget line, the message was given to the CFS Board as early as 23 August 1982. I went on to state:

I have prepared a letter to go to all local government corporations and councils administering CFS brigades this week, in which is set down in detail the Government's attitude to the present circumstances, and I will provide you with the same information so that you as leader representatives are informed of the situation. There is reference in the Board's minutes of 'Government cuts' to the amount of money available to the CFS, and unfortunately I have received reports that this has been spread from within the system. This allegation of quote 'Government cuts' has been publicly canvassed by the Leader of the Opposition, and this has given rise to the need for the Government to put its position forward in the Parliament, in the media, to local government and to yourselves, as representatives of the 11 500 volunteers who make up the CFS throughout South Australia. The Government's main concern is related to that expenditure component of the total Budget broadly associated with headquarters, and its impact on reducing the amount of money available to local governments to subsidise the purchase and maintenance of fire-fighting equipment. While I don't like quoting a lot of figures in an address, I feel that it is necessary on this occasion to clarify the picture.

First, for your information, the CFS budget for 1982-83 will be \$2 396 000, which is an 8.9 per cent increase over the last financial year. This is made up of equal contributions from the Government and the insurance industry of South Australia. Since coming into office in 1979, the Government has been aware of the need to support the operations of the CFS, particularly as it applies to the voluntary brigades which, as referred to earlier, are the backbone of the service. The details of the Government and insurers' allocations since then are:

•1979-80 .....	\$1 220 000
•1980-81 .....	\$1 910 000
•1981-82 .....	\$2 200 000

and this year, as I said, \$2 396 000. However, to gain a full picture, one should analyse the CFS Board's annual reports, which reveal that in the two years to 1981-82, the Board enjoyed a 33.5 per cent increase in total expenditure. Before that, its expenditure for 1979-80, including a carry-over credit from the previous year, amounted to \$1 676 297.

The Board's headquarters funding for that year was \$1 021 000, representing some 61 per cent of funds available. Last financial year this headquarter's slice had grown to 69 per cent of total funds. While this escalation is partly, or it could even be mainly, due to factors beyond the Board's control, I point out with some emphasis that the Board's expenditure on headquarters plant, vehicles and equipment, about which great promotion is displayed, has risen by more than 100 per cent from \$140 440 to \$289 168 for the given period. In the light of this, I have called on the Board to insist on tighter financial management and to ensure a fairer and more appropriate apportionment of funds to local government to assist in the primary role of fire protection and suppression.

As a result of that and subsequent directions given to the Board at that time, the drift has continued. The promotion of the CFS in the form of non-productive equipment in the field has also continued, and at an alarming rate, to the point where yet again in the period which has just ended and for which we have evidence in the Auditor-General's Report there have been even greater deficits and a greater drift from budgetary control within that division.

I believe that whilst this may not be a subject that is directly related to the much canvassed taxation and charges items in the Budget papers delivered by the Premier recently, the division is an arm of government which is accountable. Therefore, I welcome the report that the Public Accounts Committee brought before us and indeed I agree that, whilst it might read harshly, it is justified in this instance and I commend the Public Accounts Committee for the comprehensive job that it has done.

I believe that, when the Committee said that the Board has failed to recognise or accept the extent of its responsibility for efficient management of the whole CFS budget, it said it all. In fact, it reaffirms alleged occurrences as far back as 1982 and indeed what was vigorously denied by the then Chairman of the Board and the Director of the Service. I will not enter into a personal criticism of those people. They have had a fair lashing from the components of the fire service organisation throughout South Australia, some of which might well have been justified and some might not. But, as far as I am concerned, they have a job to do like every other department and arm of Government—that is, to work within the ceiling levels of their respective budgets. This crowd has shown that it is unable to do that.

There has never been a Government in this State that has denied a department an overrun in the case of disaster. But if we take, for example, the year in which they really fell in the trough, 1981-82, no-one in his right mind could describe that as a fire disaster year for South Australia. They were almost totally clear of major fires or major crises, yet even in a situation like that and given the structure, manpower and funds available to them, they just could not manage their own till. Quite clearly, there is a limit to the extent of excuses that one can make in protecting management of that kind. So, as far as I am concerned, if the restructuring of the Board means that there needs to be replacement of personnel, that is how it should be.

It is no good people who are not doing their job looking for sympathy on this side of the House. I repeat that I am disappointed that at this late hour, some two years or so after the matter first surfaced, we still have officers and Board members defending their situation, if not at the same level then even more vigorously in some places than they were last year, the year before, and so on. The Chairman is reported in the press today as being sick of the attacks being made upon him. My answer is that, if one does not like the heat, one gets out of the kitchen. He talks about working for petrol money.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is certainly exhausting the patience of the Chair. I ask the honourable gentleman to come back to the Budget.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** There is a line in the Budget which provides for the salaries and funding for this outfit. Those salary levels do not amount to mere petrol money, as they were described by the Chairman of the Board. In fact, the allocation in the Budget this year for the Chairman's salary is \$3 000. I understand from research that the Board meets approximately monthly. Fees for Board members amount to more than \$200 per meeting: each member in regard to whom allocations have been made in the Budget this year is entitled to receive \$85 per half day meeting, \$45 per half day committee meeting, and so on. Of course, they also receive expenses. No-one is criticising Board members' entitlement to a fair and reasonable amount for their services. I am not critical of that and, in fact, it may well be that the fees are perfectly appropriate. However, for mine, it is an insult to Parliament, which is the body that appropriates these funds, and it is an insult to the Government of the day and everyone concerned with the outfit for the Chairman of the Board to come out publicly and say that he is only getting petrol money.

On top of all that, last year—and the line is in the Budget for everyone to see again this year—there was an allocation for other promotional expenses for the outfit to which I direct most of my attention in this debate. In 1982-83 promotions associated with the CFS cost that division just over \$20 000. In 1983-84, according to the Auditor-General's Report issued yesterday, the allocation for promotion and public relations for the CFS was increased from just over \$20 000 to more than \$66 000. In these economic times no

outfit in this country can sustain that sort of overrun or expenditure. As I said quite clearly on behalf of the then Government two years ago, I think it is time the shutters were brought down. These people cannot continue in this direction forever.

If it means putting an inspector, an accountant or someone else alongside them, I suppose that will have to be done in the meantime. There are many organisations in this country which run with a staff similar in number to that of the CFS and which manage to keep their house in order, to work within their respective budgets, and to sort out any problems as they arise. They do not let problems go on and get worse, as is the case with the CFS. Mr Speaker, I am disappointed if it is your view that I have not stuck reasonably to the Budget papers before us. There are a whole host of areas one could discuss at length in a debate of this kind.

I believe that the Budget lines that are earmarked yet again for this all important Country Fire Services Division are important enough for me to concentrate my remarks on that area on this occasion, and to take advantage of the opportunity to express my disappointment that the matter that has been ventilated too often has not been repaired and seems to be no further down the track of being repaired than it was when we left office some two years ago. The answer given by the Deputy Premier in the House today was a self-promotion answer. All he was doing was patting himself on the back for what he personally had done since incorporating the Country Fire Services in the emergency services area of his portfolio.

However, as for taking the messages delivered to us quite clearly by the Public Accounts Committee and acting on the accompanying recommendations, it does not appear that any action is forthcoming. In the meantime, public reports have made it clear that there was no reason at all why in the lead-up to the actual tabling of this document the Government could not have been good and ready to act spontaneously in this regard. There is one other matter in the same report about which I would like to make a few comments. Members will recall that this afternoon, whilst I was very busy in discussion with my colleague the member for Mount Gambier, I was called to my feet to ask a question.

**Mr Ferguson:** You remember it?

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I remember it all right. I think that everyone else does too. However, we managed to muster up a question for the Premier and, as members may recall, it was about programme performance budgeting. So that it is clearly on the record, I quote from the Public Accounts Committee Report the basis for my question and explanation as given to the Premier. At the bottom of page 63 of the report is a record from the CFS Board minutes of 22 February 1983, as follows:

**Director:** Reported that on 16 December he had written to the Secretary, Minister of Agriculture, regarding the introduction by the Board of programme performance budgeting, and asking for assistance from the Public Service Board to review the system of operating the subsidies scheme.

Of course, at that time the CFS was having some difficulty in meeting the subsidy call from councils. The report further states:

He had also sought the assistance from the Departmental Services Division, Public Service Board, in relation to the operations of the Administration Section. No reply had been received until 2 February which said that the Agriculture Minister's Office considered programme performance budgeting as unnecessary.

I think that it ought to be acknowledged now that, despite the haste with which I mustered up that question today, the quote relating to the CFS minutes is now clearly on the record.

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker; I object to the remark made by the member for Florey while the bells were ringing. I will not repeat the remark, but I object to it and ask that it be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** The problem I have is that I did not hear any remarks made. The honourable member has not told me what remarks he alleges were made, and the alleged offender was not in his seat when he made it; so I find it very difficult to do very much about it except to ask the member for Florey to apologise if he feels that he has transgressed the spirit of the Standing Orders.

**Mr GREGORY:** Mr Speaker, I did not hear what you said for the past few minutes. I have some hearing deficiency, but if I have transgressed in the House I withdraw what I said.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate and I thank the member for Hanson for giving me an audience. I hope that what I have to say will be worth listening to. One of the things that concerns me about this Government is its ability to keep on saying that the increases in taxation and charges are of no consequence to the consumer. Any Government that chooses to increase its taxation, having set the base in the previous year, by some 15 per cent needs to be questioned, not only because it had said that it had received advice that it did not need to do so but also because it had quite categorically said that it would not. Credibility and this Government do not run hand in hand.

In this State we need people who are prepared to make promises and produce the goods. This Government has not done that, and in the near future it will be condemned for that. As was pointed out earlier, this Government is heading towards being the first billion dollar collector of tax in this State. It seems to do it quite unashamedly. It argues clearly that it needed to put the economic house in order when it came to power, but in both Budgets it has been not only a high taxing but also a massive spending Government.

It is about time that the South Australian public woke up to the fact that this Government has very little comprehension of management. The Minister of Recreation and Sport is having a bit of a laugh, but I will get to him when I talk about the Auditor-General's Report. What interests me is that the Government keeps on hiking the taxes. If it hiked the taxes in order to pay off some of the debts there would be some justification for what it was doing.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I thank the member for Hanson for bringing to my attention the fact that a single line in the expenditure of the State, 'State debt interest', is budgeted to be \$5 million more this year. It has now reached the magnificent sum of \$225 million in interest—not in money we owe, but in interest we pay on that debt.

**Mr Becker:** How much is that per person per week in South Australia?

**Mr INGERSON:** I believe it is something like \$3.20 per person per week. The important thing is that since the early 1970s, when we had a reasonable State interest debt of approximately \$70 million, we now have a State interest debt of \$225 million. In just on 10 to 12 years we have had a State interest debt increase from \$70 million to some \$225 million. That is the sort of indictment that ought to be brought home to the public of South Australia when recognising the sort of budgeting control that a Labor Government has in this State. There is no question that, when—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! I ask that honourable members stop cross interjecting and show some respect for the speaker.

**Mr INGERSON:** I respect your help, Mr Acting Speaker, but, as I have a lot of difficulty hearing the member for Hartley, it does not matter.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I was not referring only to the member for Hartley.

**Mr INGERSON:** The thing that seem to be important in this area is that, if you borrow money, some day you have to repay it. However, in this business one does not have to repay it: the line is increased and people are taxed at the end of the year to pay for it. It seems quite wrong, and this Government has been in power for by far the majority of the period. The only time that the Liberal Government was in power in the period quoted was for 2½ to three years. The biggest percentage of the debt was created in the early 1970s and under this Government. It was not created during the period of the Liberal Government in this State.

**Mr Becker:** What is the size of the public debt now?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Hanson to stop interjecting and let the speaker run his own race.

**Mr INGERSON:** I do not mind, Mr Acting Speaker; he is doing a good job of prompting me.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to cease interjecting.

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Acting Speaker, I again draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr INGERSON:** The other interesting note is that a little statement in the Budget papers says that the staff increases have been of the order of some .5 per cent. That does not sound very much until we quantify it, look at the whole area, and find an increase of some 1 000 people. Looking at the increase of 1 000 people, one can see that that is where the tax dollar has gone: that is part of the spending of this Government. I am concerned about a comment that the Premier made earlier when he said that in boom times it is important that Government has the pleasure of being part of those times.

I do not object to that. Governments ought to prosper but one thing the Premier has to learn is that prosperous times are the only times when there is an opportunity to pay any part of the debt. In bad times there is not that opportunity: during bad times one has to haul in the budget and manage it well. It is disappointing to see that, with the massive increases in taxation that this Government has said it is justified in imposing, it has not attempted in any way whatsoever to pay off its debt which has increased to about \$225 million in interest alone. An interest debt is wasted money. A capital or recurrent debt is not a problem, but money paid out in interest for no reason at all, simply because the dollars cannot be managed, is a total waste, and that concerns me very much.

I now turn to the area of small business. There was a massive amount of grandstanding by this Government when it came into office about what it would do for small business. It is interesting to see what it has done. It set up a Small Business Development Corporation. When did it do that? The Government said in October 1982 that it would set up this Corporation, but it took 18 months for this big important promise to come to fruition. In December 1983, suddenly there was this very important piece of legislation and the need to do something for small business. If that was not enough, we had to wait until 31 August 1984 (some eight months later) for the Government to decide that it needed to appoint eight people to a board—a major decision!

In February it appointed a Chairman of that committee but it took another six months to find seven more people to go on the board. Here is a Government saying that it has an interest in small business—it is the greatest lot of

bunkum I have ever heard! If it was so interested in small business it would have done something about it. It has taken until 31 August this year—some 18 months after its initial promise—to do something about it. Hopefully, we will not have to wait another 18 months to get a decision from the board. Hopefully its first decision will be to tell this Government that small business employs 60 per cent of the private sector and that it is the small business area that is being belted around the ears by the taxation of this Government.

It is all very well to make lovely promises but when these are put down on a piece of paper they make interesting reading, especially in relation to how well and efficiently the goods are produced. It did not take 18 months for the tax hike to get going but it took 18 months to begin on what the Government said was one of the most important single factors in its programme.

What are the things that are hurting small business? It is easy for me to stand up and say that small business is being belted around the ear. However, if one looks at the receipts in the Budget, at the land tax area, the increases to State revenue will be about 13.1 per cent, a massive increase of \$4.3 million. When that is divided amongst all the small businesses it does not sound very much but that increase is a direct cost to business. No longer do landlords readily accept this as a cost factor of owning property: it is a large single item as far as the investor is concerned.

Who pays that cost?—the mug in little business, the person whom this Government says is the most important single factor so far as it is concerned in this whole economic area. Where does one go from there? The next thing to look at is motor vehicle registration fees. Motor vehicles and motor vehicle costs, of which the next item (the cost of business franchise on petroleum) is a part, are the two items representing one of the biggest escalating costs for small business. If members opposite had ever run a business they would have found that they could not run around and deliver, drive to work or do anything without paying for petrol, which is another cost. What has this Government done to petroleum costs? It has hiked them up another 15 per cent. It has said, 'You are the great employers. We are interested in employment, but here is another little belt around the ears. We will give you a 14.9 per cent increase in petroleum franchise charges.'

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** And instead of putting the money back into roads they put \$30 million straight back into general revenue.

**Mr INGERSON:** That is a very important point. If one is continually paying tax and cost increase one cannot and will not employ people. The whole area of small business costs is escalating under this Government. Pay-roll tax has been the greatest grandstand play of all. This Government said that it was going to help small business by increasing the bottom level for pay-roll tax exemption to \$200 000, thereby helping small business. However, to incur that amount a small business must employ the equivalent of eight employees. More than 90 per cent of all small businesses employ fewer than four people. What a big deal it was for the Government to say that it would increase that base level. All it is doing is increasing the base level, which is a very important increase to those who are employing more than eight people, but—

**Mr Mayes:** So you would not do that?

**Mr INGERSON:** I would do it, and believe that it should be done, but do not come here and tell me that the Government is doing a great deal for small business by doing this because very few small businesses will be caught in that trap. If members opposite are going to be fair dinkum, they should be fair dinkum. However, if they want to be dishonest, then they should continue telling the story that they are

telling at the moment. If members opposite are fair dinkum people will believe them and support them, but if they are dishonest, they will go the way that I believe they will go in a very short time.

I turn now to the financial institutions duty. This duty is not a big item to a small business and costs most small business between \$500 and \$600 a year. That is not a big deal, but it is another add-on tax to these ever burgeoning taxes in the business area.

What about the tax shown at the bottom of this page, this thing called the 'Electricity Trust of South Australia'? There is a simple little increase of 10.6 per cent which will produce a \$2.6 million increase in revenue. This is a cost that every single business in this State, large or small, has to wear. In particular, small delicatessens and people involved with refrigeration such as independent supermarkets that use massive amounts of electricity for refrigeration, which is a vital part of their business, will cop it again. This is another small group of independent people that will be adversely affected.

I have made a few crosses on the page before me alongside taxes and of the 10 shown seven hit businesses. Here again we have an example of hitting the private sector, transferring it to the public sector and then redistributing it. One of the things that members opposite keep on forgetting is that the biggest single group that will increase employment in our economy during the next 15 years is the small business group. It will not be the Government or the public sectors, but small business that does this.

The Government is continually belting small business around the ear, while wondering why employment in business is declining. It is going down because in business a very deliberate decision is made that, if costs rise in an uncontrollable manner, staff will be reduced. I am most concerned about this negative attitude of the Government.

I turn now to matters concerning recreation and sport. I take this opportunity to congratulate the best young rover in this State and the best Magarey medallist that we have had for a long time in young John Platten. I congratulate him on the magnificent job that he has done. It is a pity that today I was not able to ask the Minister of Emergency Services a question, because he might have been able to help us overthrow a decision that was made last night. However, that is just one of those things that cannot be done.

**Mr Meier:** What about the Liberals' tug of war team?

**Mr INGERSON:** I think that it is important, too, John. While on this topic we should mention the new rising stars, namely, those in the tug of war team. Perhaps I ought to get in a little self praise and say how good they were.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I accept that the anchor man was by far the best there. In regard to the activities of the Institute of Sport, I think it is fairly important that we consider what sort of priority the Government has placed on sport after the congratulations that we had extended to our super athletes. It is noteworthy that the Government has provided for an extra amount of \$165 000 for the Institute of Sport, increasing the previous allocation of \$345 000 to \$500 000—an increase of some 45 per cent. However, we must put that into perspective and perhaps really identify where the Government places the importance of sport in its overall Budget. I refer to a technique that the Premier used successfully several days ago during Question Time when he referred to percentages. I think it is important that we use the same technique for continuity purposes and so that the 45 per cent increase is put into the correct perspective.

The amount of \$165 000 (which to the Institute is an important sum) as a percentage of the total Budget, which is an indication of what the Government really thinks about



this allocation, represents something like .0008 per cent of that total. The money allocated by the Government represents 8c in every \$100 000 raised by it. That is the amount that it is prepared to spend on the elite athletes who will be working through the Sports Institute. When saying that a 45 per cent increase is good and that it is important to grant that sort of money to the Sports Institute, we ought not to get carried away with its being a big deal because, as I said, the amount allocated represents 8c in every \$100 000 collected by the Government being given to the elite athletes in this State. After all the bouquets and congratulations which were extended to these worthy athletes (to which I was happy to see the Premier contribute), we must come back to earth and remember that the Government, after all its riding on the back of the super athletes, really is not prepared to put its money where its mouth is in relation to recreation and sport.

In this elite athlete area it is important that cycling has been added to the number of sports that are now within our Australian Sports Institute. It is important to note the very important project mentioned in the *Sunday Mail* on 26 August—a \$6.5 million cycle project for Tea Tree Gully. The Federal Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism has argued that cycling should be decentralised. Perhaps it should come to South Australia. But, where will the Government get the basis for the dollar-for-dollar subsidy? Will it put its money where its mouth is and support cycling?

This Government should take up this challenge. Here is an opportunity to have an international cycling facility. It will not cost very much money but will require the Government to do something. I do not think that it will do anything, but it will be interesting to see whether or not the Government takes up the challenge and gets into this international sport of cycling.

The Auditor-General on page 178 of his report, when dealing with the State Aquatic Centre, clearly shows up the management process of this Government when he states:

The Commonwealth Government has agreed to provide \$3.7 million. In addition, the State Government will meet any increased operating deficit, in real terms, over the existing level for a period of 10 years.

Then, and this is very important, he states:

There has been no attempt to quantify this cost.

How can a Government honestly stand up and say that it will take on and carry the cost of an aquatic centre, with the Auditor-General saying that he does not have a clue what the cost will be? It could be a 'cuckoo land' cost. That is really a first-class indictment on this Government. The Auditor-General said that the Government will take up the cost. I hope that it will, but it should put its estimated cost down for the public of South Australia and say whether or not it will really take up that cost or pass it on to the city council or the swimming association. I believe that those bodies have the right to know who will pay for that ongoing cost.

Concerning general capital grants for recreation and sport, it is important to note that there has been an increase of \$3.5 million—a welcome increase. This grant will principally go to the aquatic centre. There is no question that South Australia needs a first-class swimming centre. When one looks further one sees that grants for local recreation and sport purposes have been reduced by \$695 000. It is nice to have all these major centres, but what about the other participants in recreation and sport that require capital grants?

**Mr Hamilton:** How would you do it?

**Mr INGERSON:** What I would do is reallocate the Budget so that the right perspective is placed on recreation and sport in comparison to the health budget. If we are fair dinkum about looking after the health of the community in

this State we would be looking at the health cost and at ways and means of talking money and putting it out of the health budget into recreation and sport so that people in this State can become healthier.

That is what we need to do: we need to get reallocation of dollars in the health area, in promoting health in this country and placing it in the area of recreation and sport. There is no question that in the next 10 years to 15 years in Australia we will spend more of our time in leisure and that we need to put more dollars into recreation and sport so that we are able to utilise properly our time and end up at the end of the 15-year period with a healthier and better nation.

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** In support of the Budget I would like to address the subject of the Government's commitment to housing. Nowhere is this commitment more apparent than in the Government's actions in so far as its decisions on Loan Council funds. Last year the State Government took the unprecedented step of nominating its entire Loan Council borrowings for housing—a total of \$127 million. The Government was prepared to put its money where its mouth was, so to speak. It had come to office with a pledge to stimulate the housing sector in order to revitalise the State's economy. A massive commitment of funds was necessary to get the public housing sector moving; that, in turn, would also spark the private sector.

The total housing budget for the year ending 30 June 1984 was \$226.4 million, certainly the massive commitment needed. This resulted in the largest addition of dwellings to the Trust stock of rental homes since 1954. The actual number added was 2 889 dwellings. The previous record was in 1954 when 2 842 new houses were added. That was the establishment of Elizabeth. I will say more about last year's additions later. This record level of additions, resulting from a planned campaign against economic stagnation and to meet a real housing need, has been duly successful in generating employment within the housing industry itself and in many associated and dependent industries. The CSIRO recently completed an extensive study into the impact of housing expenditure on employment. This comprehensive report confirmed that, for every \$1 million spent on housing, 112 jobs are created in the economy.

The report said that, on average, every job in dwelling construction generates another job through production in supplying industries, and up to a further four jobs when spending of wages paid is taken into account. I think the findings of the CSIRO are substantiated by the example here in South Australia where unemployment in building trades has fallen dramatically since the Government injected much needed funds. We have full employment in many trades and little unemployment in any building trade. But not only do employment levels in the building industry benefit; as the CSIRO said in its report, while the direct effect on employment creation (resulting from Government spending on housing) is concentrated in the building trades, a moderate amount of unskilled and white collar employment is generated.

Once the consumption-induced effects are taken into account the largest labour effects are on semi-skilled and unskilled blue collar and white collar workers. This finding too has been substantiated in South Australia's unemployment figures which fell from 11 per cent in mid 1983 to 9.2 per cent in mid 1984. There can be no doubt that the Government's funding commitment to housing played a significant role in achieving this decrease in unemployment.

I heard the member for Goyder make a comment about whether this is a grievance debate. He and his colleague, the member for Bragg, could not understand what I was talking about because they have never represented workers.

**Mr MEIER:** I rise on a point of order. I have just been misquoted by the honourable member when he said that he heard the member for Goyder say this was a grievance debate. I did not say any words at all to that effect. Someone else may have said them, but I did not, and I do not wish to be misquoted in the House.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not quite uphold the point of order. I point out to the member for Goyder that, if he takes offence at anything that the member for Peake may have said, he has the right later to seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation and the Chair would grant that leave. There is no point of order.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Earlier today I was disgusted to hear the member for Goyder make a point about people receiving unemployment payments who may be at Roxby Downs. The reason that I am so disgusted is that the money he is concerned about is a pittance. He supports the Liberal Opposition in Canberra, which has voted against tax avoidance legislation that would have increased revenue by \$270 million. That would mean a tax cut of \$44 for each taxpayer in Australia. Yet, he has the cheek to stand in this House with some of his colleagues and criticise a few people who may have been paid unemployment benefits. That is why I say that these people do not know anything about workers. They have never been workers and they cannot represent workers. The honourable member was not in the previous Government for three years.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I rise on a point of order. I have been misrepresented by the member for Peake. He has suggested that I am not a worker and have never been a worker. I tell the honourable member that I have been a worker and still am a worker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MATHWIN:** In fact, I was a trade union—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the House that if honourable members do not wish to come to order when the Chair calls them the Chair will act. There is no point of order. I suggest that the member for Peake should not bait honourable members opposite, but nevertheless there is no point of order. If the honourable member for Glenelg takes offence, or believes that he has been misrepresented, he has the right later to seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Thank you, Sir. The member for Glenelg should have his ears cleaned out. I specifically referred to the member for Bragg and the member for Goyder. I honestly think that the member for Glenelg sometimes would not know what he is talking about.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair points out to the member for Peake that we are supposedly debating the Budget. Although honourable members have a fairly wide scope in this debate, the Chair believes that the member for Peake is straying a little from what is before the Chair.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. With your protection, Sir, I will return to the speech that I was making before I was rudely interrupted by some members opposite who do not understand why I am speaking in defence of workers and in the cause of workers, because those members are not qualified to understand and never could be qualified in any respect because they have never been workers: they do not know what it is all about. They come from chemist shops and farms. That is all they understand.

With your protection, Sir, I will continue my speech. Unemployment in this State fell from 11 per cent in mid-1983 to 9.2 per cent in mid-1984. There can be no doubt that the Government funding committed for housing played a significant role in achieving this decrease in unemployment. An honourable member opposite has interjected and asked

who wrote this speech. I have been involved in the Housing Trust and have looked after workers all my life. I have never been a fruit block owner. I can well believe that the honourable member could not understand workers. I wrote this speech. Unlike the member opposite, I did not have to seek assistance. The honourable member opposite does not know anything about this. I wrote this speech based on my experience. I do not need assistance from the shadow Minister, who is not too sure whether he will still be a shadow Minister next year. Although the Government is naturally pleased to see its policies having the positive effect expected, it is not complacent. The Government knows it is just a beginning.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** How long is it since you did a day's work, anyway?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I point out to the honourable member that I am about the only member who can inject a little interest into this debate. I have heard members opposite, who have not been able to drag anyone in here. At least I have an audience.

**Mr Becker:** Don't point to the gallery.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** At least a few members of the Opposition are present. Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like your protection. I have a good speech. Members opposite hate to hear what I have to say because they know I have been amongst workers, know workers and am a worker. The economic malaise in which South Australia lingered for several years had a serious impact on the momentum of both the private and public sectors. The Government has now successfully launched its first foray on economic stagnation. We believe we have blocked the backward motion and in fact turned the State's economy around. This fact hurts the Opposition. Members opposite could not do the same thing in three years of Government; instead, they put us further into debt.

I return to the housing situation. The key requirement now is to keep the economy heading in a positive direction. As far as housing is concerned, the State Government does not share the doom and gloom predictions that have come from the other side of the House. The Government has been totally aware from the start of its current housing policies of the potential negative effects from the 'boom-bust' cycle that regularly occurs in the housing industry. The Government has attempted to plan from the beginning to modify this cycle. Through our own funding commitments and strenuous lobbying of the Federal Government for an increased allocation to housing, we hope that a continuing positive economic effect from housing can be achieved. We can see what is happening. Members opposite do not like what is happening in the housing industry. They could not do anything about it during the three years they were in Government. I am trying to tell them what has happened. Members opposite know full well what has happened, but they do not want to hear about it. In fact, they want to stop me from finishing my speech. I have never had any worries about dragging in members opposite to hear me speak. I can always get them in. Even previously when Tonkin was here I used to get him in, too. He was disappointed if he had a meeting and could not stay to hear me speak.

One always knows when one can hear the dog bark. From another aspect, the Government is also strongly motivated to such a course of action by the growing community need for housing. The demand for low-rental housing has never been greater, and I know this is true in my electorate. This Government, as all Labor Governments have done traditionally, will ensure that those who need such help will get it as quickly as possible.

So, for both economic and humanitarian reasons greater funding for housing is required over a protracted period, not just for one year. As I have said, the State Government

made an excellent start in its first Budget in terms of putting up the dollars to meet those objectives. In its second Budget, it is now continuing that unprecedented commitment to housing.

I have used the word 'unprecedented', and that word is worth noting. The Government's commitment of its total Loan Council borrowings to housing last year was an 'unprecedented' and bold action.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat. The Chair is having great difficulty in listening to the honourable member because of the private conversations being conducted on my right. I ask honourable members to come back to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** That would be understandable because, knowing both members personally, that is their type. They know full well that they did not do anything when in Government and they do not want to listen to the true facts about housing. To continue with my speech after being rudely interrupted by the shadow Minister from Kangaroo Island (who may not be there very long, I might add) and the Leader of the Opposition (who also may not be there long, I might add)—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** There is no comradeship on that side. The knives are out over there. We know full well that the Opposition wants to change its shadow Ministry: that is no secret. Members opposite are all after a position in the shadow Ministry. We can see them sitting up there like Jacky.

I would like to return to my speech. A need had been recognised by the Government as having gone unmet for several years under Governments that had let housing assistance in its various forms fall away. I believe that the State Government's action through the Loan Council funds was a brave and praiseworthy initiative that perhaps did not get the recognition it deserved from the news media at the time. Nevertheless, the move has proved to be successful, despite pitiful sniping from the Opposition, and it is good to hear positive comments regarding the Government's actions from the housing industry as well as from other groups in the community.

This year's State Budget reinforces the appropriateness of that word 'unprecedented' in relation to the Government's commitment to housing, for the Government has for a second consecutive year allocated its entire Loan Council borrowings to housing. The amount this year is \$135.9 million. This, of course, is in addition to funding totalling some \$73 million received from the Federal Government. And I might say at this point that the current Federal Government has been most receptive to lobbying from the State Government for an increase in funding for housing and a renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Previous Governments had allowed the CSHA to become a redundant document, out of touch with the real needs in the community and crippled by drastic falls in real funding. To its credit, the Federal Government has taken positive measures which have helped reverse that situation and which are in tune with this State Government's view of the housing sector.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** There is another chemist under cover. I can hear him commenting. He is one of the ones with the knives out; he is one of the favourites, they tell me. I refer to the member for Morphett. Members opposite have to sit up and look straight, too, because he has got a knife in their backs: do not worry about that. He is not as quiet as he looks. Returning to my speech—

Returning to my speech—

**Mr Becker:** That would be a kiss of death, wouldn't it?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** It may be, too. I am not over-rapt in any of the members opposite. They will not get into Government in three years, at any rate. They made such a mess of the last three years when they were in.

**Mr Becker:** You wait until next time.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I will wait; I have never dodged any criticism from the member for Hanson.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I like to give a good speech, but also to knock members opposite as much as I can. The second total commitment of Loan Council funds to housing marks the second phase of the State Government's campaign against housing related poverty. Such poverty is best indicated by the increase in the number of households applying for public housing in South Australia. Figures shown in the corporate plan of the South Australian Housing Trust, released in August, show that in 1979-80 about 10 000 new applications were lodged for Trust housing. By 1983-84 this annual rate had increased to 15 600. Currently, more than 32 000 applicants are waiting for Trust accommodation. The corporate plan says that a vast majority of those waiting for Trust housing are living on low incomes and 'experiencing severe housing stress'.

The plan goes on to acknowledge that the increased level of funding has made it possible to increase the number of applicants housed, but that supply of Trust housing is not keeping pace with demand. Applications have reached record levels in each of the past five years. The Government is most concerned about this dilemma and for this reason alone intends to maintain Trust additions to its rental stock at least to the same level of the record year just ended. The pathetic attempt at criticism of this programme by the member for Light recently indicated his lack of grasp of the real issues. It is true that the Trust added just under 2 900 dwellings to its stock in 1983-84, as opposed to the 3 100 for which the Government was aiming, but about 200 further dwellings were handed over by builders within the first few weeks of the new year. This simply reflects the complexities of a busy industry faced with high demand and tight schedules.

The important point is that annual additions to the Trust's rental housing stock are now at the highest level for many years. The Government will continue this level and increase it if possible. It is a reflection on the Opposition spokesman's lack of issues that he had to highlight the actual figure for the year ending 30 June. Obviously, he is out of touch with the real needs in the community and how those needs are being addressed.

The Government's target of Trust additions for the current financial year is again about 3 100. If the programme falls short by a few dwellings again, I am sure that those on the Trust's waiting list will not object to a delay of a few weeks. They will be glad, however, that the houses are actually in the pipeline and will be shortly occupied, if not by themselves then by people in similar needy circumstances as themselves.

There can be no doubt that the State Government's continued unprecedented commitment to housing in this Budget is needed, wanted and applauded by the community and the housing sector. Economically, it is essential; from a welfare point of view, it is essential. I only wish we could do even more. As it is, however, this Budget's total housing allocation of \$212 million will enable the Government to extend into a second year its economic strategy based on building industry revival, and to continue its attack on housing related poverty.

The reason why I am so interested in housing may surprise people on the other side. I represent an area that includes Torrensville, Mile End and Hindmarsh, where people suffered through the Liberal Party's action when last in Government when it took off the fair rental allowance.

I can recall the then Minister of Tourism opposite saying that these people should be able to get a return. The rents went from between \$35 and \$40 up to \$100 and the houses are not worth that. In my area a lot of old homes are being rented for \$100, and it is a disgrace to the Liberal Party that this occurred. Members opposite supported it in this House.

I have heard a lot of criticism of the Minister of Transport and the action he has taken concerning South Road. What did the Liberal Party do in three years? What did the Minister of Transport do? He did nothing! He did not have the guts to say anything! I wrote letters to him but could not get a decent answer. He made a few rash promises but did not do anything. He did not have any guts at all. The present Minister of Transport has come out and made a decision which the Liberal Party did not have the guts to make. Councils in my electorate, including Thebarton, are pleased that the Labor Government has made the decision. They support the Minister of Transport wholeheartedly, because he has had the guts to come out and say something and to do something.

The previous Minister of Transport does not have the guts to get up and speak. He gives the job to the person who hid the Cawthorne Report—the member for Davenport. That member knew very little about employment when he was the Minister for three years, but he knows nothing about transport. However, the previous Minister, the member for Torrens, is only too pleased to get out of it, because he did not have the guts to make any decisions, as a lot of members opposite do not have the guts to make decisions. Members opposite are of no account; they just sit there in fear. They have someone coming up over there who has opened his mouth a few times, but he has been cut down, too. He needs to get off the back of the workers. Two of his colleagues who were here when the Opposition was in Government always criticised workers and the unions. Where are they now? They are outside. One of them is trying to get the honourable member's seat from him. He had better be careful and not fall for the trap. If members want to criticise workers, they should do their own dirty work. Everyone has a certain number of workers in his district and should get to know them and represent them. I am 57 years old and do not have long here, but I can give a little advice.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think it is time for the Chair to intervene again. I have pointed out on several occasions during this debate that we are talking about the finances of the State.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** You could have fooled us.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Whether or not it could fool the member for Alexandra is irrelevant. I am pointing out to the member for Peake that we are dealing with the finances of the State. I point out again that the Chair believes that the honourable member has slightly strayed from the matter before the Chair, and I ask him to come back to it.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Thank you for your advice and protection, Sir. Members opposite do upset me and get me off the track. I am also talking about the Budget, because the transport corridor has a lot to do with the Budget. My electorate has a fair bit to do with that same corridor, because it has been involved with houses that cannot be touched, because the Highways Department owns them. There could be no progress. Since the Minister of Transport, along with the Highways Department, has made the decision on what will happen, we now know where we are going.

**Mr Oswald:** It's a disaster.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The member for Morphett would not know what it is to have a transport corridor going through

his area: he represents an elitist area. I am talking about the workers.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Goyder has already been advised by the Chair that the time and place to seek leave to make a personal explanation is just prior to this debate being adjourned this evening and I will not accept that at this point the honourable member has the right to seek leave.

**Mr MEIER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the motion to adjourn the House is to be moved just before 10 p.m., there could be problems if I wish to seek leave to make a personal explanation at that time, straight after the debate, because it will throw things out of kilter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I thought the Chair made it quite clear to the honourable member that there is no way that the Chair can allow any member, including the member for Goyder, to seek leave to make a personal explanation in the middle of a debate: there is no way that that can happen. What the Chair has suggested to the honourable member is that prior to this debate being adjourned this evening then he has that right to seek leave, and the Chair will recognise that. The honourable member for Murray.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** There is a great deal to be said about the contribution made by the previous speaker.

**Mr Mathwin:** You must be kidding!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** One would have to be kidding to take notice of a lot of what was said in the last half hour. However, I have too much to talk about in the time allotted to me, because I want to refer to matters pertaining to my own portfolio responsibilities in Opposition. However, before that, in rising to speak in this Budget debate, I want to join with my colleagues in paying respect to the Under Treasurer (Mr Ron Barnes) who has again brought down the Budget for this Government. Recently Mr Barnes announced his intention to retire, and I would like to commend him for the excellent way in which he has served a number of Governments over a period. I refer particularly to the support that he gave me and the advice that he was always prepared and willing to provide to me as Minister during the previous Government. He has certainly won the respect of those who have served under him in Government and those who have represented this Parliament on both sides. I would personally like to thank Ron Barnes for the contribution that he has made as Under Treasurer.

In the first instance I want to refer to matters relating to correctional services and to the Budget papers, the Estimates of Payments, the Financial Statement and also the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1984. I will be referring to those three documents during my speech.

I turn now to correctional services. I was pleased to see (and I give credit where credit is due) that an amount of \$12.6 million has been set aside for capital works in the area of correctional services during the next 12 months. However, when one looks at the detail provided in the Estimates relating to those capital works, one finds it rather difficult to find anything that has not been referred to previously. For example, \$4.4 million will be made available for the Adelaide Remand Centre. I have indicated in this House on a number of occasions the importance of that Remand Centre's being built as quickly as possible and

being functional. We are told that it will be completed and functional by the middle of 1986.

**Mr Mathwin:** The bulldozers are in at the moment.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I know that work has commenced. It is good that the Adelaide Gaol is to be replaced by this Remand Centre. If one looks a little further one sees something of the work being done at the Yatala Labour Prison, although I am rather surprised, Mr Deputy Speaker, that after you referred to the 'grand plan' introduced by the previous Minister some time ago regarding the redevelopment of the Yatala Labour Prison there is a relatively small amount set aside for that project during the next 12 months. One sees that \$1.4 million has been set aside for the new security perimeter, which I understand is almost completed. However, apart from that very little is being spent in that area. And so one could go on.

The detail in relation to these matters is spelt out in this document. I repeat that most of the \$12.6 million to be spent will go to the Adelaide Remand Centre and the areas I have referred to in relation to the Yatala Labour Prison. I was interested to see that there is no mention of a sum being set aside for the Murray Bridge medium security gaol, which was announced with much fanfare over a period of time. It was suggested that a gaol was to be built in the vicinity of Murray Bridge that would remove much of the pressure previously experienced at Yatala.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is in the far distant future now.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is in the far distant future now, because I understand that it has been more than just put on the slow burner; it has virtually disappeared off the books altogether. I suggest to the Government, and in particular to the Minister in the other place, that it is only fair that, if it is not the Government's intention to proceed with this project, it should notify the Murray Bridge council and the people in that area that this is the case. Those people have expressed concern over a period of time regarding devaluation of properties and other concerns they hold because of this project. Therefore, it is only fair that the Government should indicate what it intends doing so far as this gaol is concerned. I repeat that when one considers the fanfare that surrounded the announcement of this project (I think it has been announced two or three times), it now appears that that is all out the window. The Financial Statement refers to the community service order scheme.

In regard to correctional services, the statement is made that the Government continues to recognise the need to upgrade correctional services. In regard to additional full time jobs, the statement is made that:

Much emphasis is being placed on the extension of the community service order scheme to the remaining area of the State where that scheme is not yet available.

Again, I am particularly pleased that that is the case because for some time the Opposition has suggested that that programme needs to be expanded. It is an excellent programme, introduced by the previous Liberal Government, and offers a positive alternative to the prison system as it was known in this State prior to the introduction of that scheme. Despite its having a few teething problems to begin with, the scheme is now working well and it should be expanded. It appears from the Budget documents that that will happen within the next 12 months. I can assure the Government, and the Minister in particular, that the Opposition will be watching closely to ensure that that occurs.

I refer now to the Auditor-General's Report, because that report contains some rather staggering information. I raised a matter in a question that I asked of the Premier earlier today, but it was treated in a very half-hearted fashion by the Premier, and he did not seem to take my question very seriously. However, certain matters are causing significant concern in the general community. I have received a number

of calls today from people who have expressed their concern, and I want to refer now to some of the facts involved. In the section of the Auditor-General's Report on the Department of Correctional Services, significant features are referred to. For example, information is given that the average annual net cost per prisoner has increased in South Australia by \$8 900, or by 36 per cent, to a total of \$34 000 for the year. I find that staggering. I asked the Premier today whether he had any explanation for the dramatic increase in the net cost per prisoner in the running of the prison system. I asked what action would be taken to rectify the situation, because the South Australian community expects the Government to take some action.

The 1983 report of the Auditor-General showed that the average annual cost for the 1982-83 year was \$22 500. Within 12 months it has risen from that amount to \$34 000. It is fine for members on the Government benches to smile about that: obviously they are not concerned about that expense to the community. As has been pointed out before, for that amount of money we could keep all the prisoners in the Hilton Hotel.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** You were given your answer today.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister is very much aware of the answer that was given. It was tripe. The matter was not taken seriously by the Premier. In regard to the Yatala Labour Prison we have learnt that in 1982 it cost \$20 000 to keep a prisoner in Yatala but that in two years that amount had increased to \$50 000 per prisoner. The average annual cost is \$50 000 for each prisoner, and of course, that does not take into account expenditure on capital works.

I believe that figure to be quite staggering. As more people in the community are made aware of that, they will continue to express concern and look to the Government to take some action in that regard. We also learn from this year's Auditor-General's Report that there are now 727 staff overseeing 700 prisoners—well over one staff per prisoner presently in the gaols. The Premier suggested that that was because there had been a reduction in the number of prisoners in gaols. We all know why that has come about: the new parole legislation was introduced by the Government earlier this year. A number of prisoners have been released through the automatic system of parole, which in itself has caused considerable concern in the community. A number of prisoners have attempted to get over the fence and have been successful. Most have been brought back but, again, that matter has been referred to on a number of occasions in this House and concern has been expressed about it and will continue to be expressed by the community.

There is a need for action to be taken by the Government and it is not good enough to look at that expenditure. The community in South Australia will not stand for it. The Auditor-General's Report under 'Callbacks and Overtime' indicates that this cost increased this year by \$400 000 to \$2 million and represented 11.4 per cent (or 10.2 per cent) of the total cost for salaries and wages. I know that this has been causing concern for some time. The Auditor-General's Report states:

The Department continues to be concerned at the high level of callbacks and overtime and proposes to improve budgetary control and management information.

It is important that that should happen. It is not just a matter of saying that something should be done about it—action needs to be seen. One finds under 'Yatala Labour Prison Industries Complex' (referring again to a matter that

has been raised in this House on a number of occasions) that the expenditure to 30 June 1984 was \$5.5 million. The Auditor-General continues:

These facilities were ready for use in April 1982 but remain only partially utilised. It is anticipated that the complex will be fully commissioned in early 1985.

That is a scandalous situation. In 1982 the previous Liberal Government completed that complex, which cost in the vicinity of \$5.5 million. It is still not being used, although the report indicates that it is partially being used. I know that only a small section is being used as an industrial complex to provide the opportunity for prisoners at Yatala to learn trades and fill in their time more constructively than is presently the case. It is staggering that the Minister and the Government are prepared to sit back and allow that to continue. Again, I hope that, because it has been brought to the notice of the public through the Auditor-General's Report, the people of South Australia will recognise the irresponsible action of the Government in continuing to have that facility sitting there at that cost to the taxpayer—not Government money but \$5.5 million of taxpayers' money—and not being used. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Peake in his speech on the Appropriation Bill made various comments that I believe in many cases were ill considered and possibly untrue. The member for Peake said that many members on this side of the House (and I believe by imputation in earlier references he referred to me) have never been workers. That comment reflects not only on me and my former occupation but also to many other members and their former occupations. I therefore believe that the member for Peake was therefore reflecting on South Australia's teachers, senior masters and—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Last night I explained that it was in order for an honourable member to deal with matters that he believed could bring him into bad repute as a person, but that it was not in order for members to deal with groups of people.

**Mr MEIER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will not continue on that line. Reference was also made to the fact that other members and I are not qualified. I point out to the House that I spent four years obtaining appropriate qualifications, and I believe that many other members also obtained appropriate qualifications and that that statement is completely untrue. In addition, the member for Peake referred to the unemployment benefits when I asked whether the Premier was seeking from the Federal Government information on whether unemployment benefits were being paid to the demonstrators at Roxby Downs. In his speech the member for Peake said that I was not interested in the unemployed, or in the workers.

If the honourable member had been listening earlier, he would have heard that it was on the very point of unemployment that I had been concerned in regard to the possibility of people possibly abusing the system. It would seem from the remarks by the member for Peake that he is quite happy if people abuse the system and go against the law, because my comments related to a person who had decided to undertake a course at a cost of \$400 and, having done so, lost his unemployment benefit for the period of that course. I point out to the member for Peake and the House that I do not believe that this is a place in which statements

that are ill considered, outrageous and untrue should be made.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** In the 10 minutes that are available to me, I wish to raise one or two topics, the first of which relates to the Archives. I will refer to a letter that I received from a constituent who expressed his concern about the Archives, having had some contact therewith. He points out the problems experienced by people who wish to carry out research constantly or who, more importantly at the moment, are trying to trace family histories for our J150 year in 1986. The letter reads:

I write to draw your attention to two matters which may not be of burning importance to the general public. They are, I think, worth considering: one is the current staffing situation in the South Australian Archives. It has been evident for a long time to anyone who wants to undertake research in the Archives that the staff there work under considerable pressure, and that pressure is mounting each year. The family history side of the archivists' work is mushrooming, and will continue to do so as 1986 approaches, while the demands Government departments make for documents held in storage are huge compared with the situation even a few years ago. The result has been a curtailing of services offered to researchers; there is no stacks service, for instance, for certain periods each day. I have been told that attendants have had to be on duty at other repositories scattered around the city and suburbs. In the circumstances the archivists do the best they can.

There is also a longer term question about the future of the Archives. The Mortlock Library project is an important one, and I am glad to see that the State Library has launched an appeal to get it off the ground, but it does have implications for the Archives. One is the removal from the Archives of perhaps 20 per cent of its holdings—I think the figure is about right—to be made up of private record groups (PRGs), business record groups (BRGs), society record groups (SRGs), and the like. It may well be that the Mortlock Library is the proper place for such holdings, though in a way it is a pity to see the collection fragmented.

My point is that the Archives will be left mainly as a repository for its very rich but unglamorous holdings of Government record groups (GRGs), and that this collection will be treated with less than the importance it deserves when put alongside its showpiece Mortlock cousin. Already there are rumours that when the non-government record materials are moved out of the Archives other sections of the State Library will claim that part of the shelf space and more. The result will be that more and more of the GRGs will have to be dispersed around Adelaide in repositories which are quite unsatisfactory from the point of view of both archivists and researchers like myself.

There is a solution and it would take the form of a public records office (PRO) on the British model. I understand that the present Ministry is giving some consideration to establishing a PRO, perhaps in conjunction with the Commonwealth authorities. Legislation is afoot, I think. I wonder if you might take these matters up with the appropriate Minister or in Parliament as you see fit. Someone once said to me that the Archives are the memory of South Australia. One would think that with 1986 approaching fast it would be a good opportunity to do something about preserving a large part of that memory which will not go into the Mortlock collection.

I raise this subject because I believe that it is very important that we, as much as is humanly possible, keep all records in relation to the Archives in one storage area, which makes it easier for people carrying out research.

As much as many people in society might think that what has happened in the past has no real bearing on today, there will always be a time when people will wish to research the history of a town, family, or the State, or indeed Government records, and the availability of material will then become very critical. We all know that the Archives until now has been a place up the road that no-one worries about very much. It is out of sight, out of mind and out of consideration for Budgets as far as Governments are concerned.

I take this opportunity to ask the Minister present whether he will bring the contents of that letter to his colleague's notice so that the Government might move a little more rapidly and so that those who want to carry out research (particularly into family or town histories as we come closer to J150 (1986) or the bicentenary year, (1988) will have a better opportunity to do so than they have at the moment.

I think that the creation of a public records office is an excellent idea. I know that some people say that what the United Kingdom Parliament does is not always something that we should follow, but when I received this letter I took the opportunity to speak to other people who are involved in looking after some of our archives. In particular, I spoke to those who do some research work in that section on a regular basis. They pointed out to me that they were very keen to see the English system implemented in this State. In the near future I hope that I can raise this question in the House with the appropriate Minister. I hope that he can provide an answer, seeing that I have given him warning about it tonight.

I refer to another letter which causes me concern. I do not raise this matter on the basis of attacking individuals. I believe copies of this letter were sent to every member of Parliament. This matter involves a point which people have been trying to make for some time, that is, that the Housing Trust has a responsibility to consider all people, including neighbours of tenants. The letter comes from Christie Downs, and I will not identify the authors. I have not inquired of my colleagues but, because I have received the letter from outside my district, I take it that other members have received similar letters. The letter states:

We feel compelled out of sheer frustration, anxiety and anger to draw your attention to a matter that we have endured for nearly two years involving the South Australian Housing Trust.

We ourselves have lived in a Trust home at the above address since February 1971 under a scheme called 'rental purchase', in which we buy the basic home and make our own improvements—which we have vigorously and enthusiastically undertaken, despite a modest single income for most of the time. Our house adjoins others completed and initially occupied by people under the same excellent Trust scheme. Most (as we did) worked diligently to improve and take pride in their homes in the spirit of the purchase agreement which made our district pleasant to live in. However, over the past few years we had noticed a decline in these standards and in particular I refer you to our specific problem. In August 1982 the house adjoining our own—

they give their address, but I will not read it out—

was sold by the original owners back to the Trust. Initially the house was to be used in a refugee . . . programme operated by [a particular service club] but this did not eventuate. Trust tenants moved into the house in November 1982 under a 'rental only' agreement—the family comprising a man, woman and two small children. The house then became a focal point for a large number of people particularly at night and at weekends. We tried to tolerate a variety of anti-social behaviour including: foul and offensive language; loud vehicle noise (frequently late at night); trespassing; domestic disturbances and fights; loud rock music; rubbish and litter.

We met with the Southern Regional Manager of the Trust in February 1983 in the hope of obtaining a solution, but were told most of our problems were police matters! In fact, we gravely feared severe retaliatory action by the 'undesirable characters' frequenting the address (some used it as a motel) if such action was undertaken. These situations produced a most unpleasant environment to live in and as a result we suffered anxiety, stress and depression which required treatment by our local family doctor. We consulted with a solicitor to establish our position but were advised to move as the costs of taking legal action in the courts could be high and we would still be open to retaliation. Unfortunately, we felt we were not in a financial position to move—we were in a 'catch 22' situation. Mercifully, in August 1984 the tenants quickly moved out (unbeknown to the Trust) leaving the house vacant.

The letter goes on and the authors state that in their opinion the stance taken by the Trust was 'disgraceful and represents a public scandal'. I am aware that quite often the Trust picks up tenants who are most difficult to handle. I respect

that difficulty for the Trust. However, I do not believe that any family, no matter where they are, should have to suffer what these people have had to suffer because their landlord does not take action. That is particularly so when the landlord is a Government agency and has closer contact with the police than does the average individual.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Tonight I will address an issue which I believe has the support of all members of Parliament. This matter has been addressed by a number of my colleagues, including the member for Brighton and the member for Henley Beach. I refer to the needs of the disabled. A constituent of mine has also raised this issue in relation to facilities for the disabled in the South Australian community. Members will recall that on a number of occasions I have raised in this Parliament the transport difficulties experienced by and confronting disabled persons within this State.

I refer to a wellknown constituent of mine, who regularly frequents my office and raises many issues, particularly those affecting pensioners and the disabled. I place on public record my appreciation to him for raising these issues, particularly because his wife is a disabled person, but he also does it on behalf of many people in a similar situation, a matter on which I will elaborate later. My constituent came to see me on about 25 July and raised a number of questions with me, which I will relate to the House later given sufficient time, in relation to the needs of the disabled. I would like to place on record the following letter addressed to the Minister of Tourism:

I have been reading and listening to a great extent as to your people promoting tourism for this State. Have you or your Department ever given it a thought with regard to disabled people that could be visiting this State or do you think there are no disabled people about?

As one who has a wife in a wheelchair and looking around Adelaide and trying to find a handicapped toilet, especially on public holidays, I think there are two; one in James Place and the other in Hindmarsh Square. It would be to the Adelaide City Council's advantage if they kept the one in Hindmarsh Square on ground level instead of down in a hole. It would be nearly impossible to push a wheelchair up the ramp.

Just to give you an instance in lack of building and foresight in the building of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, on 17 June I took my wife to see a friend from Alice Springs, who was in the East Wing. There was not a public handicapped toilet available in the building, only ones that were used for the patients. In the past they only had one handicapped toilet in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Since they have been doing quite a lot of alterations there are two made in the outpatients department.

Also I believe they are promoting the Riverland as a great tourist attraction. Well, as one who has had the experience, my wife and I spent three weeks at Barmera Caravan Park which was equipped for handicapped persons. We had a cabin which was really good, and self-contained. On travelling around the Riverland towns handicapped toilets were just about non-existent. The one at Renmark Dinosaur Park, I doubt whether an ordinary person would be battling to get into it. The one at Loxton Pioneer Village was just as bad. This one was up on a rise, plus there was about three inches of gravel to pull the wheelchair through. Apparently these people do not think there are any disabled people around.

I know of a person who has a nightclub and he was given a certain time to put in handicapped toilets for both ladies and gents, otherwise they would revoke his licence. I am just wondering how many nightclubs around Adelaide and suburbs are equipped with handicapped toilets, or the people that grant the licences to these places do not worry.

When my wife and I want to go out of a night, I have to make inquiries as to the toilet facilities, unless someone from the family comes too. I am aware that some of these things do not come under your jurisdiction, but surely they could be made aware of these things. Trusting you can help me in these matters, as I know that I am not the only one with a wife in a wheelchair.

I took up this matter on behalf of my constituent and raised a number of questions to which perhaps I can come back later. However, it was rather interesting to hear the member for Hanson say, 'It's a wonder that they can afford to go.'

**Mr Becker:** Well, how can they?

**Mr HAMILTON:** If I was outside I would give this man the biggest Billy Graham he ever received in his life. The gall of this man—to sit in this place like a silver tail, denying the rights of the handicapped in this community to go out one night and enjoy themselves! The gall of the man! He has the effrontery to say, 'How can they afford it?' Why can they not afford it? Why should they not have the opportunity to go out to a nightclub? I find it disgusting.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There seems to be a lot of ill will between the persons located at the far end of the Chamber on both sides. I hope that some of the ill will can evaporate; otherwise, I will have to take appropriate action.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am absolutely incensed by the stupidity of that remark. Why should not the handicapped, like any other person in the community, have the right? The member for Hanson knows only too well by his interjection here tonight that he made a stupid and inane statement, which is on public record. I have respected the member for Hanson over the years in this Parliament in his attempts to assist the disabled and handicapped in the community, but for him to make that statement tonight is beyond the pale, clearly. It is an outrageous statement.

I know from my own experience in the community about people like him, who sit here in this place and who live on the best of the community. The member for Hanson made a statement like that, although he probably did not know that I picked it up. However, I am not prepared to let that sort of issue rest.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** We will debate that about a blockhead later on. I know who the blockhead is, and I know the stupid person who made that mistake. It certainly was not I in terms of reflecting on the disabled, and I will be most interested when my constituent reads this response made in the Parliament tonight.

There are those people who have the right—and this is what the International Year of the Disabled was all about—to assist those persons in this community. It is difficult for those disabled persons, not necessarily those in wheelchairs, even to get into this Parliament. They must walk up these steps in front of this place; yet we say that this place is accessible to any member of the public when the Parliament is sitting. But do they get the opportunity?

I know that the Government is looking at this matter, but for too long the ordinary disabled person in the community has had to come through the back door. It is not good enough for disabled and elderly people to have to walk up these steps with nothing to hang on to; I have raised the question in this Parliament on a number of occasions.

My father, who is 85 years of age, has tried to get up those steps and has experienced problems in trying to get into this place. Years ago, for the then Leader of the Opposition we had to take disabled people down the side of the Constitutional Museum and through the lower ground floor to get into Parliament House. Clearly, if we believe that we are trying to do the utmost for the disabled in the community, a lot more should be done.

I hope that the media picks up this issue of the disabled, particularly in terms of car parks, which my colleagues have mentioned, and hopefully prevails on those unthinking people in the community who deny access to car parks and those facilities for the disabled. This is another of the areas where those unthinking people in the community, particularly in car parks, malls, and the like, are denying disabled persons the right to park in those areas that are set aside for them. I know from the questions of the member for Henley Beach and the member for Brighton that the Government is at least looking into this issue.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I wish to take this short period of time to refer to a matter of concern to me. It relates to the very real need in this State for a new tropical conservatory. The matter is well known in this House, because it has been raised on a number of occasions. On two or three different occasions I have asked questions of both the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning as to the possibility of such a conservatory being established in this State. I want to refer to it again tonight because there is absolutely no action being taken by the Government to press ahead with this much needed conservatory.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In support of what the member for Torrens said, it would be an excellent project for the 1986 celebrations, and I will say more about that later. It would be a worthy project for either 1986 or for the 1988 bicentennial celebrations.

I have the greatest respect for the board of the Botanic Gardens in this State. A number of members on this side have had the opportunity to serve on the board, including the members for Coles and Light who have just entered the Chamber. The member for Davenport has also served on the board. As one who has served on the board for some two years, I can say that it was a very pleasant experience and one that I enjoyed immensely. I learnt a great deal in the time that I served on that board. I discussed this matter earlier this evening with the member for Light, who indicated that while he was on the board the need for a new tropical conservatory was discussed. I know that the board has referred to this matter on a number of occasions and in recent times it has become very keen to promote action to provide such a facility for this State.

We in South Australia can be very proud of the botanic gardens, the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, the new Mount Lofty Gardens, the Wittunga Gardens, and so one could go on. It is recognised, and has been recognised for a long time, that a need exists for a conservatory to house tropical plants, and this matter is of very real concern at this stage. I wish to ask a question of the Premier or the Minister for Environment and Planning—whoever might be the most appropriate person within the Government.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** I do not think either is very appropriate.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I will be generous on this occasion: I would hope that all members opposite would recognise the need for that facility and would support it. I ask the Premier or the Minister whether a decision has been made regarding the selection of an appropriate project within the metropolitan area of Adelaide as part of the bicentennial celebrations and, if so, what is that decision? What progress has been made following the establishment of a working party representing both the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Transport to investigate the feasibility of the siting of a tropical conservatory on the Hackney bus depot? I had hoped to ask that question at the appropriate time, but I have not had that opportunity, so I hope that the Minister and the Premier will provide an answer. If necessary, I will take it up in writing again with the Minister. In recent times I have had the opportunity, with some of my colleagues, to talk with members of the board about this project. We visited the site proposed in the Botanic Park. We spent some time looking at the model and discussing the facility in detail.

Personally, I would have been happy to see this facility built on the site first recommended by the board in the Botanic Park. I recognise the attitude that has been expressed



by people in the community about part of that valuable park being taken up for the facility, but I think it would have added to the Botanic Park rather than detract—

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** It still could.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It still could. However, the Minister and the Government have made clear that they do not support that site. They have been put off by public pressure, and they have made clear that they do not support that site and that they have been looking at alternative sites. If they are genuine about that the only alternative is that at the STA premises at Hackney. That would be an excellent site. When in Government I consulted with my colleague, the then Minister of Transport and member for Torrens, about the possibility of coming to an agreement for the use of part of that land by the Botanic Gardens.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** I remember his giving you a very sympathetic hearing!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister did. I only regret that we had to leave office, otherwise we would have been, I am sure, well and truly down the track towards the construction of this tropical conservatory on that site. The Minister for Environment and Planning made it known some time ago that he would be meeting with the Minister of Transport. Then it was suggested that a working party would be established, representing both of these portfolio areas, so that the matter could be looked at and a determination brought down. I am aware that this working party has met, but I am not aware of any decision being handed down at this stage.

So, I ask the Premier or the Minister for Environment and Planning to indicate whether a decision has been made and, if so, what that decision is. I hope that it is positive and that we will see a start made on the Hackney site for the tropical conservatory. I must refer to the survey carried out some time ago and organised by the Friends of the Botanic Garden—the friends are a magnificent group of people and the contribution they are making in working towards the Botanic Gardens is quite exceptional in this State. They organised a survey. People were asked to indicate whether they approved the need for a tropical conservatory and were asked to give their comments as far as the site was concerned. That survey was carried out, and a very large proportion of people questioned indicated their full support for that project.

My concern is the absolute need for a decision to be made now so that the facility can attract funding as part of the bicentennial celebrations. I urge the Government to stop procrastinating, to make a decision, and to give its whole-

hearted support for a tropical conservatory within the metropolitan area of Adelaide and, if possible, on the site of the Hackney bus depot.

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

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** I will grant that leave but I also indicate that I will make a statement at 2 o'clock tomorrow, because the adjournment debate should not be allowed to disintegrate into a situation where, after the allotted 30 minutes has expired, statements are made by one person, no matter how genuine those statements may be or how genuine the feelings are. The whole thing can snowball out of hand—that is what I am suggesting. However, I will allow the personal explanation on this occasion.

Leave granted.

**Mr BECKER:** I will not be insulted, abused or intimidated by any member in this House and I believe that on this occasion the member for Albert Park, as a result of an interjection which I made and which was out of order, proceeded to insult me. He was referring to toilets for the disabled in reference to a night club. I said, 'Who can afford to go to a night club?'

I have had almost a decade of voluntary service to the disabled and have spent up to 30 or 40 hours of my time each week assisting disabled people, whether physically disabled or with a hidden disability. The majority of people I have had to deal with and help at all hours of the day or night are people on the invalid pension. I feel for those people as I believe every member does. I believe that they should have equal opportunity and equal rights, but unfortunately they cannot afford to. That is why I made my interjection: the people I deal with are severely intellectually disabled and simply cannot afford a visit anywhere. They are lucky to get a free trip to the show. I am not going to stand here and be insulted or abused about the work I do for the disabled. If that is the attitude of the member I will soon give it away.

Motion carried.

At 10.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 13 September at 2 p.m.