

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 October 1984

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Aboriginal Lands Trust Act Amendment,
- Commissioner for the Ageing,
- Dog Fence Act Amendment,
- Libraries Act Amendment,
- Wheat Marketing Act Amendment.

## HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## PETITIONS: OPEN SPEED LIMIT

Petitions signed by 489 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject any proposal to reduce the open speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h were presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown and Mr Gunn.

Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

Petitions signed by 149 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from paragraph 10(1) Division 1, Part II of the Anti Discrimination Bill, 1984, and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood were presented by the Hon. R.G. Payne and Messrs Ashenden, Blacker, and Mayes.

Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 72 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form were presented by the Hons Jennifer Adamson and Lynn Arnold and Mr Oswald.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: HENS

A petition signed by 33 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit battery egg production and debeaking of hens and provide for the labelling of free range eggs was presented by Mrs Appleby.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 21, 47, 54, 56, 73, 83, 84, 85, 89, 92, 97, 101, 109, 115 and 123; and I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## RADIO STATION 5AA

In reply to Mr **ASHENDEN** (18 September).

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: The matter of the acquisition of a radio station to further improve the services to the racing industry had been the subject of discussion within the racing fraternity for some considerable time. I was aware that investigations and research were being undertaken by TAB management to achieve this objective and to guarantee the long term broadcasting of races covered by the TAB. An interest in acquiring the shares of Festival City Broadcasters arose specifically in early 1984 and the TAB conducted a financial evaluation of the station. At this time, a number of other parties were making offers for the shares. I was advised and kept informed of developments. As a matter of courtesy, I also receive the minutes of the Board's meetings.

On 17 February 1984, a special Board meeting was held. It was resolved at that meeting that the Board make a takeover bid for all the ordinary shares of Festival City Broadcasters, subject to the necessary approvals of the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Treasurer pursuant to the provisions of the Racing Act, 1976. That afternoon, the Chairman of the TAB and the General Manager met with me to inform me of the resolution and a meeting with the Premier then followed in order to obtain his approval to borrow from the South Australian Government Finance Authority for the purchase of the shares. In view of the fact that approvals were given in accordance with the Racing Act, 1976, the matter was not discussed at Cabinet level, and the purchase of the shares was negotiated by the Totalizator Agency Board.

## MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the statement from the Registrar of members' interests as at 30 June 1984.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
i. Public Service List, 1984.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
i. State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1983-84.  
ii. Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report of the Auditor-General on—1983-84.

By the Minister of State Development (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
i. Technology Park Adelaide Corporation—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
i. Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1983-84.

- ii. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.
- iii. State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Farm Practice.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
  - i. Construction of Classroom at Smithfield Primary School.
  - ii. Unisex Toilet at Chookarla Camping Area, Kuitpo Forest Reserve.
  - iii. Camping Shelter and Toilet in Wirrabara Forest Reserve.
  - iv. Erection of Classrooms at Point Pearce Aboriginal Mission.
  - v. Redevelopment at the Mount Compass Area School.
  - vi. Construction of Covered Area at Mylor Primary School.
  - vii. Construction of Stormwater Drainage at Kingscote Area School.
  - viii. Construction of Laboratory at the Parafield Poultry Research Centre.
  - ix. Erection of Classroom at McDonald Park Primary School.
  - x. Quarry for Gulnare to Spalding Road.
  - xi. Borrow Pit on Section 8, Hundred of Murrabinnia.
  - xii. Borrow Pits for Yunta to Tiverton Road.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Lands, Department of—Report, 1983-84.
- ii. State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board—Report, 1983-84.
- ii. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—Accident Towing Fees.
- iii. Highways Department—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Dairy Industry Act, 1928—Regulations—Fees and Farmers Requirements.
- ii. Education Act, 1972—Regulations—Teachers Registration Fees.
- iii. Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—
- iv. West Coast Experimental Prawn Fishery.
- v. Port Broughton.
- vi. Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1983-84.
- vii. Pest Plants Commission—Report, 1983.
- viii. Flinders University of South Australia—Report and Legislation, 1983.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—
  - i. Cakes, Cocoa and Phosphates.
  - ii. Food Additives.
  - iii. Labelling.
  - iv. Health Act, 1935—Regulations—Swimming Pools.
  - v. Natural Death Act, 1983—Regulations—Prescribed Form.
- vi. Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Local Government Finance Authority—Report, 1983-84.
- ii. Corporation of Glenelg—By-law No. 67—Traffic.
- iii. Corporation of Victor Harbor—By-law No. 26—Traffic.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Report, 1984.

- ii. Mining Act, 1971—Regulations—Fees.

- iii. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—

- i. Administration and Probate Act, 1919—General Rules, 1984.
- ii. Supreme Court Act, 1935—Legal Practitioners Fees.
- iii. Companies (South Australia) Code—Solicitors Charges for Non-Litigious Work.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Racing Act, 1976-1983—Rules of Trotting—

- i. Heats.
- ii. Official Scratching Time.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Adelaide Railway Station Development Act, 1984—Regulations—Promulgation of Development Plan.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** Over the past two years there have been a number of reports and investigations concerning the financial administration of the Country Fire Services. These have included special reports to the Treasurer by the Auditor-General, the Public Service Board, the corporate review by external consultants and, of course, the recent substantial report of the Public Accounts Committee of this House. In addition, there has been the Lewis-Scriven Report and the report of the Coroner following the Ash Wednesday bushfires. These reports have also impacted on the administration of the CFS.

For the benefit of honourable members, I would like to place on the record the chronology of recent events which relate to the management and control of the CFS. In June 1983, the CFS Board engaged Arthur Young Services to undertake, in consultation with the Public Service Board, a corporate review of the CFS organisation. The original proposal of the CFS Board for a narrowly based organisation review was significantly expanded at the request of the Minister of Agriculture, who was then the Minister responsible for the CFS. The corporate review was handed to the CFS Board in January 1984, and was subsequently released for public comment. By that stage, the review recommendation that the CFS be transferred to the portfolio of the Chief Secretary had already been implemented by the establishment of a Ministry of Emergency Services.

The Auditor-General reported to the Treasurer in March 1984 that he was seriously concerned about aspects of the financial management of the CFS. The Treasurer referred the matter to the Chairman of the Public Service Board for consideration in conjunction with the corporate review. The Public Service Board subsequently approved the review recommendation that a senior public service officer with financial management expertise be seconded to the CFS. Cabinet adopted this proposal immediately and Mr D. Mutton commenced duties as Manager, Support Services, on 4 June 1984.

In July, the Coroner handed down his findings on the Adelaide Hills fires of Ash Wednesday 1983. This report was critical of some aspects of CFS headquarters management and communications, but made no findings of negligence in respect of the CFS. In August, the review of electricity distribution in bushfire prone and environmentally sensitive areas was publicly released. While the bulk of the review will be dealt with as a separate matter, the review does recommend the establishment of a State bushfires co-ordinating and control body.

On 11 September the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee report on the cost and operations of the CFS was tabled in this House. The PAC report criticised the financial management of the CFS by its Board in the strongest possible terms and recommended that the Board be replaced. I refer to recommendation 1 of the report:

The PAC believes that the CFS Board must be restructured and replaced with a membership able to exercise the control and direction required, particularly in relation to financial decision making.

The PAC report was also very critical of the Director of the CFS for his lack of administrative and project control.

As I indicated to this House prior to the recent break, in these circumstances the Government had an obligation to allow the CFS Board and the Director to place their comments on the PAC findings before the Government before any decisions were made with respect to the report and the future organisation of the CFS. Accordingly, I wrote to the Chairman of the Board and the Director, offering them seven days in which to respond to the PAC report. I subsequently received their comments and considered them in the light of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the PAC report.

The Government has now had the opportunity to take into account the various and substantial documentation in respect of the CFS which has become available during the course of 1984. The Government has also taken into account the many letters and submissions which have been received from interested parties such as local councils and CFS volunteer brigades.

The Government has also had the benefit of a substantial report prepared by the Public Service Board, which was prepared in an effort to bring together the massive amount of information available with respect to the management of the CFS. One of the most important decisions before the Government relates to the future of the Board and, indeed, to the use of a corporate board as a means of management control for a fire service such as the CFS.

The Government has decided to abolish the existing Board and replace it with an interim Board along the lines recommended in the corporate review. The new Board will consist of the following persons, to be appointed by the Governor: an independent Chairman with management expertise; the Under Treasurer or his nominee; a representative of local government; a person representing volunteer fire fighters; and, the Director, *ex officio*.

The decision to replace the Board is not a reflection upon the individuals who make up the Board but rather a reflection of their collective inability to undertake the functions required of them by the Act. As the PAC and the corporate review both indicate, for a Board such as this to operate effectively, it must be small, and its membership must reflect the management expertise required to undertake the superintendence of an organisation such as the CFS. However, in the long term, the Government intends to do away with the Board structure as the authority in charge of the day to day administration of a fire fighting service. As has been well demonstrated by the Metropolitan Fire Service, it is preferable to appoint a suitable professional to head

the Service with a direct reporting line to the responsible Minister of the Crown.

In order to ensure that this transition is achieved with the minimum of disruption to the CFS, the Board I have outlined will be an interim authority only, to operate until such time as the legislation to establish the permanent Bushfire Authority recommended in the ETSA report can be introduced. At this time, I anticipate that this will be early in 1985. When the Bushfire Authority is established, the interim board will be abolished and the Director of the CFS will be responsible to the Minister of Emergency Services for the day to day administration of the Service.

The new Authority will undertake those duties prescribed for it in the ETSA report as well as acting as an advisory body to the Minister in respect of the CFS. This will ensure that the many interests such as local government, the volunteer fire fighters, the regional fire fighting associations, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Woods and Forests Department, the insurance industry, the Department of Lands, and other interested parties will all be able to be represented on a permanent authority with an appropriate advisory role in respect of the CFS and statutory powers in respect of bushfire prevention. Such a high degree of representation is simply not practical on a body which is charged with the management of a fire service.

The Director of the CFS has offered to stand aside to allow the position of Director to be advertised on a national basis. He has indicated to me that he will be an applicant for the position but, in the event that he is not successful, is prepared to continue to serve the CFS in another capacity. The Government has decided to accept this offer. In the meantime, Mr Johns will continue to act as Director. In order to ensure that as wide a field of applicants as possible is available for selection, it is proposed that the qualification contained in the Act for the position of Director will be broadened to include any person with the appropriate qualifications and experience to head an organisation such as the CFS. Naturally, a person with a strong background in the fire service will be preferred, but this will not be the only consideration.

In order to ensure that a person with wide and comprehensive experience in fire fighting is available in the senior management of the CFS, it is proposed to establish under the Act a position of Chief Officer in the terms recommended by the corporate review. The person appointed to this position will be required by the Act to have wide knowledge of, and experience in, fire fighting. The Chief Officer will be the Director's deputy and will have control of the operational arms of the CFS. It is also proposed to adopt the recommendation of the corporate review for the appointment of a Manager, Support Services, on an ongoing basis to take over from Mr Mutton, who is filling this role on a temporary basis on secondment. This should ensure that adequate financial management expertise is available to the organisation as a whole.

I now turn to the fire fighting role of the CFS and the equipment that is required to undertake this task. The corporate review made a number of recommendations with respect to the adoption of standards of fire cover methodologies. The adoption of this strategy has already commenced and its implementation is vital to the development of fire cover standards that will best meet the needs of the State. The Government has endorsed the action taken so far to implement the standards of fire cover methodology and supported its continued development in future years. The question of how the Government can best allocate funds for the upgrading of the fleet has been referred to the Treasury to enable detailed discussions to take place between the CFS and the Treasury in time for the next Budget.

The Government has also endorsed the specific recommendations in the report for the preparation of standard specifications for fire appliances for various purposes as well as the concept of a basic equipment allocation for each brigade to ensure that the available resources are distributed in accordance with the need. The subsidy system will also be reviewed to ensure that the funds are allocated for the purchase of appropriate equipment for the job that it will be required to do. Implicit in these recommendations of the corporate review and in their adoption by the Government is a commitment on the part of the Government to ensure that each volunteer brigade has the right equipment to protect the community for which it is responsible. Without the volunteers, there would be no Country Fire Services.

Uppermost in the thinking of the Government in considering the changes to the CFS which I have outlined today has been the need to provide the volunteers with the equipment and headquarters support which they need to undertake the duties that they have accepted on behalf of their local community. I believe that by streamlining the headquarters organisation and by improving financial accountability, the CFS will benefit as a whole. These changes are significant, as they are intended to be. Given the problems, which the various reports and inquiries have identified over the past 12 months, anything less would have been an inadequate response to the issue which confronted the Government. It is vital that the community have an effective country fire fighting service and that the volunteers who risk their lives on behalf of the community are provided with the best in support services. I believe that the steps which I have outlined today will achieve these aims. I will be introducing a Bill at a later hour this day to give legislative effect to these proposals. I seek the support of all honourable members in the implementation of these changes which are so vital to the rural and near metropolitan areas of the State.

### QUESTION TIME

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Question Time conclude at 3.22 p.m.

Motion carried.

### BUILDING INDUSTRY

**Mr OLSEN:** Is the Premier aware that Mr Norm Gallagher intends to step up demarcation disputes in the building industry in South Australia to enlist more members for the Builders Labourers Federation, and will he give an assurance of Government support for any action that the industry needs to take to resist Mr Gallagher and his henchmen? In the past week all South Australian building companies have received a letter of demand from Mr Gallagher. The letter contains a 39 point list of claims for higher wages and improved conditions. While this is obviously an ambit claim, I have been told by industry groups that it signals Mr Gallagher's intention to intensify a demarcation row within building industry unions in South Australia, as South Australia is the only State to be hit with this log of claims.

Recently, Mr Gallagher has been identified with and involved in what can only be described as gangster-like activity in the Eastern States, and particularly in Victoria, to enlist more members for his union and secure more work at the expense of other unions. I understand that his particular target in South Australia now is the Building Workers Industrial Union. Earlier this month the Victorian Government joined with the ACTU and the Federal Government to take action to force Mr Gallagher to sign an industrial

peace agreement for the building industry. I seek an assurance from the Premier that the Government will take similar action to support the South Australian building industry and bring Mr Gallagher to heel, certainly if he attempts any disruption to work in South Australia.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I was not aware of the log of claims to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. My colleague the Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour informs me that he has been advised of its service. Naturally, I am very happy indeed to have the matter in the Deputy Premier's hands. Of course, the point has already been made by the—

**Mr Olsen:** What about a Government assurance?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will ignore peevish interjections. I would have thought that we were on the same wavelength on this, but apparently we are not. Let me go on by pointing out that, first, it would appear that the log has been served under the provisions of the Federal awards. They are naturally, as all those who are acquainted with industrial matters would know (but, unfortunately, that does not include the Leader of the Opposition), always proposed in the form of an ambit log.

Most importantly also, I point out that the jurisdiction in this industry is with the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The role that the State Government can play will depend on the extent to which State industrial legislation or tribunals are involved and also, of course, on the conciliating role that may be played by the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier has a national reputation in terms of his abilities in this field; he has close and constructive contacts with both the union movement and employers. Not only has this been recognised by those on our side of the House, but also special tribute has been paid to him in the past by a former Federal Liberal Minister in this field. So, I believe that in my deputy we probably have somebody with qualifications second to none in his being available to assist if situations of conflict arise that cannot be handled in the normal course of events. Also, we are operating in this State in a context of a quite remarkable record of industrial peace. We on this side are constantly criticised for our links and relationships with the trade union movement. In fact, they are something that we value. I should have thought that any Government in any State or the Commonwealth would value such links and relationships.

Look at the major impact that the accord has had in terms of the relationship between the ACTU and the Federal Government: look also at the industrial record here in South Australia. I think it can be very clearly demonstrated that a Government which is prepared to work with industry totally and which does not seek to abuse and confront the trade union movement or the employers is a Government that is able to get results. In terms of our general industrial scene since the Federal Labor Government came to office, in the past 12 months working days lost per 1 000 employees in Australia was 246—a considerable reduction. However, in South Australia the figure was only 46 days lost per 1 000 employees.

While Australian dispute losses fell fast from 290 to 240 per 1 000, this State's figure fell from 114 to 46. That means that in the latest 12 month period—a period of remarkable industrial peace in this country—we have in fact had a dispute rate of 1.6 per cent of the Australian total compared with 8.6 per cent of total employment. The results speak for themselves. A Government that is prepared to work constructively in the sort of attitudes and policies on industrial affairs is a Government that is able to secure the productivity and industrial climate that can produce those remarkable results, which are a tribute to trade unions in this State, to our workforce and to the relations that they

are able to develop. Of course, it is one of our key pointers when we talk about South Australia being a good environment in which business can establish and develop.

#### DOCUMENTARY FILM PROGRAMME

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Premier, as Minister for the Arts, give the House some details of the Government's documentary film programme? I notice that *One Last Chance* received the Australian Film Institute award for best sponsored film. I understand that this film was a South Australian production.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for her question. However, I think that it has gone unnoticed that the film *One Last Chance*, which received the national award at the AFI presentation night recently, was a fully South Australian production. One thing that is worth highlighting is that that film represents part of a series of programmes of documentary film making in this State which has been developed to extremely high standards of excellence by conscious Government policy and decision making. The film itself was a wholly South Australian production: produced, directed and scripted in this State by South Australians. It was produced for the Department of Correctional Services through the South Australian Film Corporation.

The programme under which it was produced, that is, the South Australian Government Film Programme, which is superintended by the Government Film Committee, works off an annual allocation, a yearly budget, which we have increased successively in the period we have been in office. Under the previous Government, it was allowed shamefully to run down, and documentary production in a number of areas in this State was threatened. With last year's allocation of \$400 000 and \$600 000 this year, we are attempting to build it to a level to ensure that an ongoing Government film programme undertaken through the Film Corporation can be developed.

We are looking forward to some of the other films, which cover a wide range: a film on opals has just been completed for the Department of Mines and Energy; near completion is a film on abduction which has been sponsored by the Police Department; various State development and other related films are also in production; the Highways Department is producing a film on the Stuart Highway; there are environment and planning films on national parks and heritage issues; there are educational films on post disaster school support and on schools and their purposes; and a community welfare film on the Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme, all produced to extremely high standards and, I believe, contributing greatly not only to the particular subject areas they cover but to South Australia's reputation as a film producer in Australia.

#### BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has the Minister of Housing and Construction assessed the effect the BLF's log of claims on South Australian builders will have on the South Australian building industry, particularly its vital housing component? I acknowledge the fact that the Minister forwarded to the Deputy Premier the document to which I refer.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** No, I have not assessed the log of claims the BLF has presented to the industry. However, I think it shows the lack of knowledge the member for Light has of industrial relations. He looks at the 39 points or requests that the BLF is making of members of the industry, but does he understand what is known as an ambit claim (which is what it is) by which means the people

concerned can go before the Industrial Court and say that there is a dispute? All that question proves is that the member for Light knows nothing at all about industrial relations.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

**Mr MAYES:** Can the Minister of Local Government assure the House that, if the Government adopts the Waste Management Commission's 10-year plan, Mitcham council will not be forced to scrap its dumps and thus force residents to drive to Wingfield or Tea Tree Gully? In the *Community Courier* (which is distributed in my district) of 12 September and 10 October the member for Mitcham has made some comments which have caused alarm to my constituents, several of whom have contacted me and put to me some of the rubbish that has been spoken by the member for Mitcham about the matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. I ask the honourable member for Unley to resume his seat. I would be pleased, in accordance with the written guide that I sent to all members, if the honourable member would explain the circumstances in which these comments were made by the honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr MAYES:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will do that. I am referring to the *Courier* articles of 12 September and 10 October, and I will quote from those articles regarding the particular inquiries that I have had.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member does so with care.

**Mr MAYES:** I refer to the article, under the headline 'Threat to rubbish services: MP,' as follows:

Mitcham residents could lose their local dumps and face rate increases if the State Government adopts new plans for waste disposal . . .

'If the transfer station proposal falls through they might have to take rubbish to Wingfield or Tea Tree Gully,' he said.

The article in the October 10 issue of the *Messenger*, under the headline 'Row over plans to shut tips,' states:

Mitcham Liberal MP Steven Baker claims Mitcham residents will face steep rate increases and be forced to drive to Wingfield or Tea Tree Gully dumps if the State Government adopts a recently released Waste Management Commission report.

The article states that it will:

Force residents to take their rubbish to Wingfield or Tea Tree Gully dumps if the southern transfer depot falls through.

Those quotes explain my question and outline why I have raised it with the Minister.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which is not totally unexpected, because I also have read the comments of the member for Mitcham. Quite frankly, I am disappointed that he has made these comments, because they are obviously designed merely to frighten the people in his electorate and to make some political points. Therefore, I am pleased to have the opportunity to explain just exactly what the situation is, and I will certainly not seek to make any political points in doing so. Before commenting on the specific matters raised, I believe that it would be pertinent to place in perspective the rationalisation and regionalisation of the depots proposed by the Waste Management Commission.

Of the 24 depots in metropolitan Adelaide currently licensed by the Commission, nine depots together receive 90.4 per cent or 630 000 tonnes out of the total quantity disposed of nearly 700 000 tonnes. Although nearly all of these can be considered as regional depots, only two are receiving annual quantities above that which the Commission considers necessary to achieve the full benefits of economies of scale. Therefore, it is desirable to increase the waste

intake quantities at the other seven depots. In respect of the remaining 15 licensed depots, including the three operated by Mitcham council, they receive only 9.6 per cent or 70 000 tonnes out of the total of 700 000 tonnes disposed of in Adelaide.

Of those 15 small depots, it is expected that eight will be phased out automatically by attrition (due to filling up) over the next two to three years. Therefore, people currently served by these depots will have to be provided with an alternative disposal service, which in all likelihood will be one of the regional depots. The seven small depots which will then remain (including two of Mitcham's depots) and which currently receive 5.7 per cent or 40 000 tonnes of Adelaide's total disposal waste '... may have to be phased out by June 1985 unless immediate action is taken to upgrade operating standards and reduce environmental impacts' (10-year plan, page 16, if the honourable member wishes to refer to it). There is no mention in the plan of forced closure.

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Whether or not these depots, taking only 5.7 per cent of the total waste disposed, remain open and in use has little or no effect upon the plan's concepts of rationalisation or regionalisation. However, these small depots must be brought up to an acceptable operating and environmental standard immediately. The Commission's staff are already working with the operators with a view to overcoming existing problems. If these can be overcome to the Commission's satisfaction and the licensee wishes to continue operating the depot, albeit uneconomically, as a service to residents, then the depots will continue to be licensed. Sooner or later all depots fill up, and alternative services are required. That is what the rolling 10-year plan is all about—planning for such requirements in the future.

Specifically, Mitcham council's residents will be catered for in all future planning with facilities and services being planned and provided which will offer the best cost waste management solutions under the circumstances prevailing at the time. If local government or private enterprise is unable or unwilling to provide adequate services and facilities there is provision in the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act to allow the Commission to provide needed services and facilities; this would include the power for the Waste Management Commission to take the initiative and construct a large regional transfer station. So it is 'rubbish' for the member for Mitcham to suggest that residents will be forced to drive to Wingfield or Tea Tree Gully to dump their rubbish. Finally, it is not proposed that the Commission will force any service on any council or resident.

### ROXBY DOWNS

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In view of discussions at the weekend with residents at Roxby Downs, does the Premier agree with the view expressed from the bench by Mr R.D. Brown, SM, that the crime of trespassing at Roxby Downs fades into insignificance compared with crimes committed by the uranium industry and, if not, what does he intend to do about it? Mr Brown, SM, made this comment last week when dealing with a number of people charged with offences at Roxby Downs. In the particular case before him, he imposed a nominal fine of \$40 on a trespassing charge which carries a maximum penalty of six months imprisonment and a \$2 000 fine. It has been put to me that penalties like this and the magistrate's comments do not reflect the true position at Roxby Downs.

In the *Advertiser* on Monday, a report of a meeting between the Premier and residents at Roxby Downs stated that

employees and their families had felt terrorised by protesters. Some of the incidents referred to included people creeping around at night dressed in camouflage gear with faces painted black, a woman and her children being accosted by protesters after a visit to the library, and harassing people in the caravan park. I also had a report that protesters had got in and painted out an office at Olympic Dam. In a statement in this House on 21 August, the Premier referred to 'good humour and a reasonable atmosphere' existing between the protesters and residents. Rather than this being the case, it appears the civil liberties of the residents are being seriously eroded by the continued presence and behaviour of the demonstrators.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would agree with the last point made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that what was a correct characterisation has in fact deteriorated over the last couple of weeks, particularly as the demonstration has persisted. There is, in fact, a good deal of deeply felt hostility among the residents towards the demonstrators. It is also fair to say that the remaining demonstrators have, by and large, departed from the generally orderly way in which the demonstration was conducted in its earlier stages. I have already made public statements about that, as has my deputy. I am quite happy to be on the record again on that issue. It is time that the protesters packed up and left the area. I do not believe that they are serving their cause or doing the general interest of the State much good.

It is clear that, in the present circumstances, what was conceived as a protest against the nuclear fuel and energy industry and nuclear arms—many elements of which would gain a great deal of community support—has now turned into harassment of those legitimately going about their business on the mine site. However, as members opposite and any thinking member of the public would know, short of introducing legislation unprecedented in this State, it is the right of those demonstrators, provided they comply with the law, to remain where they are. While I made clear what I believed should be done (and I think it has reached that stage), nonetheless, I am not prepared—and I doubt that this House would be prepared—to enact legislation that would withdraw civil rights to that extent. I would also suggest—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Rather than interject, I ask that members approach this matter a little more seriously. I suggest, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** —that to take action along those lines will change what is a demonstration or protest around a particular issue into an issue of civil liberties; it will completely distort the very things that are being talked about in this area and it will encourage all sorts of other people to arrive and to wage their protest. The ability to police a situation of that kind would be beyond the civil authorities that we have. For instance, what it presupposes is a pass and search area, an inspection of every vehicle going down that road, and certificates of road travel and transit. It is very odd that the very members opposite who made such an extraordinary todo about this in relation to Aboriginal lands and rights of access on public roads are in this instance prepared to see—and I imagine that this is what they want—a special kind of legislation passed. I do not think that that is acceptable.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think that I have said enough.  
**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier is attempting to answer one question only.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** 'Attempting' is the key word.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am attempting, as the Leader of a Government that has responsibility in this area, to act in the public interest. If Opposition members have constructive suggestions to make, I am quite willing to look at them. However, all we have had is airy rhetoric and grandstanding, which does no good for the residents, no good in terms of the demonstration and no good in terms of public interest. Heaven help us if a group of irresponsible people like this occupy the Government benches because, quite frankly, they would be in an impossible position.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have been asked to comment on a magistrate's statement in the course of judicial proceedings, but I am not prepared to do that. I have made my views clear; they can be set against other views, if people wish to do so. I will leave the conclusions to be drawn appropriately.

### EGG MARKETING

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether he would be prepared to approach the South Australian Egg Board to seek the introduction of a new package for eggs to be packed in sixes? The Consumer Association of South Australia has sent a petition to the South Australian Egg Board calling for eggs to be packaged in sixes. The petition was signed mostly by elderly pensioners for whom the present one dozen carton, designed to prevent halving, is a real inconvenience. Pensioners have stated that it could take up to one month before the twelfth egg is used in a single pensioner household, especially in the case of elderly people who, on medical advice, limit the number of eggs in their diet. Senior citizens have stated that they do not want to eat month old eggs but that the one dozen egg carton leaves low income groups, especially elderly pensioners, with no alternative. Constituents have also stated that they have seen egg cartons displayed in supermarkets stating, 'Please do not break these egg cartons in halves.'

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In relation to this question I find the mirth of the Opposition a little disappointing. It is in fact the case that some people are given medical advice by their doctors to limit the number of eggs that they eat due to their cholesterol content, so I thought that the mirth about that part of the honourable member's question was most distasteful. As it happens, in recent weeks I went into a supermarket to buy some eggs. I wanted only half a dozen eggs, and I came across precisely the type of problem that the honourable member mentioned, because the top part of an egg carton is no longer designed for easily breaking the carton into two. On that occasion it occurred to me that this could cause some difficulties.

I shall certainly refer the matter to my colleague in another place and will ask him to draw the matter to the attention of the Egg Board. May I say that the Minister has already passed through the Parliament legislation that provides for the reflection of consumer interests on the South Australian Egg Board. Therefore, this kind of question is well and truly appropriate for the Board to consider. I can well understand the concerns of the pensioners in the honourable member's electorate when they want to purchase not a full dozen eggs but rather just half a dozen, because of the rate at which they consume eggs. This matter is not one of a lack of seriousness but is a matter that is worthy of consideration.

### HEROIN OVERDOSE

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Will the Premier order an immediate and full investigation into all the circumstances surrounding an incident that occurred yesterday at the Yatala Labour Prison in which an inmate suffered a heroin overdose? This incident raises a number of serious questions about how heroin can be available inside what is supposed to be a maximum security prison. Also, there are suggestions by the father of the inmate involved of a cover-up. On radio this morning the father said that the media had informed him of the incident and that no attempt was made by the Government to do so. The father believes that an attempt may have been made to keep information from him and the public. A report in this morning's *Advertiser* also indicates that the Government was reluctant to provide information. The public needs assurances that drugs like heroin are not becoming freely available in our gaols. I therefore seek an assurance from the Premier that a full investigation of all the aspects relating to this incident will be undertaken.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I, together with all members of the Government, share the concerns expressed by the honourable member. These things should not be tolerated. In fact, my colleague the Minister of Correctional Services is undertaking just such an investigation, as is only right and proper. I hope that we can ensure that these practices are eliminated.

### CLARK TERRACE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister of Transport advise when the Highways Department intends to replace the existing yellow flashing lights installed at the pedestrian crossing on Clark Terrace, Albert Park, with pedestrian activated push button signals? As the Minister would be aware, the type of pedestrian crossing lights that are presently in operation at this pedestrian crossing leave a lot to be desired in terms of pedestrian and motorist safety. The Minister would also be aware that for the past four years I have sought through successive Governments to have the situation remedied because pedestrians have been seriously injured on and near this pedestrian crossing while attempting to cross Clark Terrace, which is a very busy road.

On Sunday when I was at a fete at Botting Street, Albert Park, I was approached by a number of residents who expressed anger at a recent incident whereby a resident of the area had to pull his grandson back from the crossing in order to save him from being hit by a motorist who had failed to stop at the crossing. Residents, police officers, those associated with the local schools and, indeed, I, too, believe that much confusion reigns in the minds of motorists in respect of what is required at crossings such as that to which I have referred. Therefore, I hope that pedestrian operated push button signals will be installed at that location as quickly as possible.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The crossing to which the honourable member has referred is one of only two zebra crossings remaining in the metropolitan area, and it will be changed to a pedestrian actuated signal. The other zebra crossing in the metropolitan area is on Prospect Road, but I have no knowledge at this point of any contemplated change to it.

This will provide more positive directions to motorists and pedestrians and will overcome any confusion to which the honourable member has referred. It is proposed that work on the installation of the crossing will commence in early December and that the switch on will take place prior to Christmas. Therefore, this will enable those pedestrian



actuated lights to be operating well prior to the 1985 school year.

### STATE SPEED LIMIT

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Does the Premier still stand by his Budget speech in which he said that the maximum speed limit on the open road in South Australia would be reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h? If so, why is the Minister of Transport now proposing to retain 110 km/h as the maximum speed limit?

**Mr Olsen:** A difference of opinion!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Yes, it certainly is. On 30 August in this Parliament, when bringing down his Budget, the Premier said that the maximum speed limit would be reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h. Then, on 2 October (approximately 33 days later), in the Budget Estimates Committee the Minister of Transport said:

The matter will be discussed by ATAC—

that is, the Australian Ministers of Transport meeting—in conjunction with all the other Ministers, to try to achieve uniformity. If we decide that the general limit should remain at 110 km/h, the limit may be reduced to 100 km/h on certain arterial roads. It may well be that the limit on the open highway will remain at 110 km/h, being reduced to 100 km/h in some areas.

That is quite different from what the Premier had said approximately one month earlier. On 9 October, an article in the *News*, written by Craig Bildstien and headed 'Limits on speeds for review', states:

Plans for a blanket cut in South Australia's country speed limits from 110 km/h to 100 km/h are under review . . . The proposal was part of a package of road safety reforms announced by Mr Bannon. But Mr Abbott has revealed a firm decision on the speed issue has not been made . . . And he has indicated a final decision is unlikely before February.

Earlier this year, the Permanent Head of the Premier's Department chaired a road safety seminar, and I understand that this recommendation to reduce the speed limit came out of that seminar. When I rang the office of the Minister of Transport to ask whether I could attend the seminar, the Minister's staff indicated that they were not organising it and knew nothing about it. I have since read in the paper that even Mr Keith Cys (Secretary of the TWU) has made a public request that the speed limit remain at 110 km/h. A number of people have now come to me and asked who is the real Minister responsible for road safety here in South Australia. Is it the Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** —or is it the Minister of Transport, and who should they believe?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The leadership pretender rides again.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am pleased that the member for Davenport has addressed the question to me. It is a good style. I expect to hear more questions from him over the years from that side of the House. I would have thought that the questioner would be congratulating the Government on the way in which it has approached this matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a strictly limited amount of Question Time, which is being taken up by hilarity.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The fact is that certain members opposite (I particularly recall the member for Eyre) have made representations about this matter and suggested that there should be some fine tuning or that it should be looked at. The Government is perfectly prepared to do that, and I

have no qualms or problems with that whatsoever. In announcing the package of road safety measures, it is true that one of them was a reduction, in order to seek uniformity with the Eastern States of Victoria and New South Wales, to a general limit of 100 km/h on the open road, and that was announced as such.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** It was part of the package.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes. That package is quite comprehensive and is being followed by some detailed organisational arrangements and improvements, and the Minister responsible for it is my colleague the Minister of Transport. There will be announcements about this matter soon. Against the background of very considerable improvements in road safety in this State over the past 12 months or so, which we have really to keep working on, the package was announced, and that was an element of the package. It so happens that ATAC is also considering this issue of uniformity. We produced at the time, members may recall, some detailed figures on overseas experience in relation to speed limits and the quite considerable improvement in road safety that occurred from a reduction in those limits.

**Mr Lewis:** Oh, bull!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is not so. We produced figures showing that quite considerable improvements in road safety have been brought about. Those figures are available, and if the honourable member has not seen them I will be happy to make them available. Again, I am not approaching this as an issue of combat: I thought that if there was one faint tiny area on which there could be some uniformity of agreement, it would be road safety, but apparently that is not possible, so let us ignore that. I am quite happy to supply the honourable member with details. I am also (and I would have thought the member for Mallee would give us some credit for this) prepared to listen to submissions, as my Government always is, if it sees that a measure as announced, or introduced in a particular form, is not going to achieve the full result that is required, and we have certainly paid attention to that.

We are interested in uniformity, but my colleague's further consideration has suggested that there may well be a case in the interests of road safety—and that is our primary aim—to have a series of graduated differences in speed limit. Again, we have to look at this in the interests of uniformity and road safety, but it may well be that in certain areas, as has been submitted by members and others, a higher speed limit could be justified than the 100 kilometres an hour. However, that matter is being subjected to a fairly intensive investigation. We have made the decision in principle, and we are prepared to look at its actual practical implementation and ensure that it works in the interests of road safety. I appeal to members opposite to support the Government's road safety campaign and initiatives.

### CLASS A PRINCIPALS

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Will the Minister of Education explain the reasons for appointing certain secondary school principals to class A status and say what the appointments might mean to the schools involved? Recently two principals in Whyalla were elevated to class A status, and an article appearing in yesterday's edition of the *Whyalla News* quotes the Project Officer of the Education Department (I understand Mrs Dinitri Adis) as saying:

There was a high demand for the positions because for many it was like buying a 'tumble-down house' and being given a five-year contract to do it up.

I find that an extraordinary statement, if it is correct. One of the schools involved (and there may be others in the State) is Eyre High School, which I can hardly describe as



being a 'tumble-down house' either administratively or constructively.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question about the article in yesterday's *Whyalla News*, because it does need some clarification. An article will appear in the next issue of the *Whyalla News* from the Area Director of Education, who is based in Whyalla, Mr Dennis Ralph, putting the whole picture into context.

The Project Officer mentioned (Mrs Dinitri Adis) has advised the Area Director that she cannot recall having made those particular comments at all and also that an undertaking had been given to her by the journalist that he would show her anything that was to be printed in the paper before it appeared, but that did not happen.

With regard to the appointment of principals class A to various schools (it does not happen in secondary schools only but also in primary schools), five criteria are examined: size; nature of the student population; community setting; the school's development potential; and the school's potential to assume an innovative role pertinent to the needs of the total system. The first two of those are matters upon which the Department relies for demographic data from within its own resources. However, the last three are matters concerning which the Department relies not only on its own internal departmental advice or the advice of staff in schools but clearly also on the advice of school communities. Members of the respective school communities that have had class A principals appointed to them in Whyalla were consulted, and their opinions had a pertinent and important part to play in the decision as to whether or not those schools were made class A positions for the next five years.

The next point to make is that it is a five-year position, because we believe that we should be going to various schools in the State from time to time and picking up different issues in various areas. If one looks at the range of schools that presently have class A appointments, one finds that they represent a wide variety of schools in this State. One certainly cannot use the categorisation of a school as a class A principal school to put it in either one stereotype or another. They reflect a large number of different types of community setting and educational situation, and that is exactly the sort of context in which the two schools in Whyalla have been included within that list.

Certainly, special needs of the students are taken into account in that, but educational needs and the development of programmes in the school have an important part to play as well. The decision to make a school class A offers schools an exciting opportunity to develop educational programmes over five years but is not a reflection that what happened before is not respected by the Department. In fact, the work that has been going on in the previous five years may even be one of the predisposing factors for the Department saying that it is pleased with what has been happening and would like to see that develop further and that, to assist that, it will appoint a class A principal. We are limited to the number of class A principals we appoint, so it is not simply a matter of making all schools class A: we try to keep the number down because the selection process (as I have already mentioned in this House) is quite different from the selection process for principals in other positions.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND POLICE

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Will the Deputy Premier consider reopening and manning the police station at Penneshaw on Kangaroo Island or, alternatively, increasing the number of personnel at the Island's single police station at Kingscote in readiness for what is an expected and indeed

unprecedented influx of tourists and vehicular traffic to Kangaroo Island in the near future?

Of course, it is without reflecting on the sterling effort by that staff currently stationed at Kingscote in seeking to cover the whole community that I raise this matter with the Deputy Premier. As he would know also, I have recently cited in this House the conditions of the Island roads; the absence of public facilities generally and, in particular, sanitation facilities for campers, picnickers and short-term and motoring tourists; and a lack of safe fire place areas, etc. I now have a report of certain details applicable to the new vessel *Philanderer III* which will when revealed certainly indicate to the Minister and the Government the need for, other than upgrading requirements, an additional police station in the region.

The new vessel carries some 200 passengers and 25 cars. As an example, on 26 December this year there will be four return trips, which are already fully booked of course, followed by definitely three return trips daily, with a fourth if demand is there. At this stage to the end of January, there are almost 5 000 extended stay bookings for that vessel. It is believed that day trippers will book at the last minute and therefore add to that significant additional number of tourists to the Island. Therefore, if three trips a day bring 75 cars and each car stays, say, three days, there will at any one time probably be an average of 300 additional cars on the Island from the *Philanderer* service alone, and if each car carries an average of four people that represents a further 1 200 tourists. In addition, there will of course be the patronage via the four permanent airline services and a number of other charter airline services, and the passengers and the cars that come during that same peak summer period in particular via the *MV Troubridge*.

In January there could each day be at least 70 hire cars on the roads, 300 cars from the *Philanderer* and at least a further 100 from the *Troubridge*, plus visitors borrowing residents' cars and travelling in coaches, etc. In the interests of that already laden community, I ask the Minister to give the question serious consideration if he does not already have the matter in hand.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I want to assure the honourable member that I give very serious consideration to every question asked in this House, irrespective of what the subject is or of whether it concerns my portfolio or that of any other Minister. I listen with great attention and do whatever I can to assist in those matters. The matter to which the member refers today, involving an influx of tourists on to Kangaroo Island, is greatly appreciated. I am delighted to hear that, and I must give credit to my colleague the Minister of Tourism for stepping up the promotion of tourism. There is no question that during his period as Minister he has been very successful indeed, and we are getting more tourists in South Australia.

Indeed, I hope that the honourable member is accurate in his forecasts of the number of people that he suggests may be going to the Island. That is very good for the Island and South Australia, and it helps put South Australia on the map, so I am delighted about all those things that the honourable member has raised. Regarding the significant part of his question, asking me to give some attention to re-establishing and manning the police station at Penneshaw, I am not familiar with the circumstances relating to the closure of that police station. The honourable member did not refer to the actual date, and it must have occurred some time before I was the responsible Minister, so I cannot tell the honourable member at present why it was closed or what other alternatives the police considered in order to overcome that closure. However, I will certainly raise the matter with the Police Commissioner and will forward the honourable member's question to him.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** That police station was closed when the last shipping service ceased.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I think that there is new evidence from what the honourable member has said and, if the honourable member's forecast of the influx of people to Kangaroo Island is correct, it is clear that the matter needs to be examined; I give the honourable member an assurance that that will be done.

### HOUSE BUILDING CONTRACTS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate house building contracts to ascertain whether they are fair and reasonable to both parties concerned; and, secondly, if it is established that widespread bias exists in favour of the builder and against the purchaser, will the Minister consider introducing legislation to redress this situation? I was recently approached by two constituents who had signed a contract with Habitat Today, a division of the Hickinbotham group, on 26 November 1983. My constituents have recently taken possession of their home—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Fisher.

**Mr EVANS:** I rise on a point of order. In view of the recent instruction in relation to questions, I query whether it is permitted to emphasise names of individuals or companies for the sake of highlighting a situation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The point of order was quite properly taken, because I was listening to the question, and I was aware that two names had been used. As I think I explained in the document dealing with inadmissible questions, part of what we deem to be inadmissible comes from practice over the years. I can remember from time to time that, where there has been proper evidence, companies have been named in this House, and I assume that the honourable member has been fully aware of her responsibilities and has acted with proper advice in asking the question and giving her explanation.

**Ms LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will continue, and I think that it will become clear that proper legal advice has been sought. My constituents have recently taken possession of their home, some 10 months after they signed the contract. My constituents approached me with two specific complaints: first, that the completion of their house was three months overdue; and, secondly, that they were requested to pay a considerable amount over and above the contract price. I suggested to my constituents that they seek legal advice from Noarlunga Community Legal Services. A letter that my constituents sent me, following their visit to Noarlunga Community Legal Services on 28 September, states:

On examination of the contract [the solicitor] informed us that all the clauses and conditions set out in the contract are devised so that the builder has complete cover and there is no consumer protection. Two days prior to the final inspection on our house, the builder rang and informed us of extra costs, which consisted of \$1 397 for site costs, \$259.60 for extensions to the sewerage, \$82.51 for insurance and \$143 for rise and fall. The only cost that we were previously aware of was the \$82.51 for the insurance. The builder was aware of these extra costs back in May of this year, but due to their ignorance and public relations failed to notify us of such.

On Wednesday 26 September 1984, we were requested to take the \$1 882 to the final inspection at the house and hand over this amount to the assistant supervisor. We were advised by [the solicitor] not to take the money along, as this was an unusual way of conducting business. The supervisor then informed us that because we did not have the money it was company policy for him not to hand over the keys.

It should be pointed out that since 13 May 1984 we have been making a two-thirds payment on the house and since 13 September a full payment. On 26 September 1984 the house was then to be three months over the time that we expected and were led to believe of the finishing date.

My investigations have revealed that the Contract Review Bill, which was introduced into this Parliament by the then Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, and which sought to give courts the power to set aside contracts that were harsh, unjust, unconscionable or unreasonable, was defeated in the Upper House. I therefore request that the Minister examine the whole question of house building contracts.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for raising the matter in the House. In fact, I have had a number of representations from constituents about similar difficulties they have experienced with respect to building contracts. I will be pleased to refer the details of the honourable member's constituent's problems to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The time for questions has now expired.

### COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Country Fires Act, 1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I move:

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

It seeks to give legislative endorsement to the changes to the organisation and management structure of the Country Fire Services which I have already outlined to the House. First, the Bill removes from office the existing members of the CFS Board and establishes a restructured membership for the Board. Honourable members will note that the new membership of the Board reflects a greater importance on financial and corporate management skills and is in accordance with the corporate review recommendation that the size of the Board be reduced to enable it to operate as a more cohesive unit.

In this context, I would like to give an assurance that the Chairman will be a person with practical management skills and experience. The Bill does provide that the Board will include a representative of local government and a person representative of volunteer fire fighters. This has been done because of the very significant interest which both these groups have in the administration of the CFS.

It has not been possible to provide for all interested parties to be represented on the Board. To have done so would have defeated part of the purpose in restructuring the Board. The restructured Board is only intended to be an interim measure pending the establishment next year of the statutory Bushfires Authority. This Authority will be fully representative of the various groups concerned with the threat of bushfires and will play a prominent role in fire prevention strategies for South Australia.

However, it will have only an advisory role in respect of the management of the CFS. Following the establishment of the Bushfire Authority, the interim CFS Board established by this Bill will be abolished and the Director of the CFS will be responsible to the Minister for the day to day administration of the service and solely responsible, with the volunteer brigades, for the fighting of fires. This will bring the benefits of professional fire service management which the same change has brought to the Metropolitan Fire Service following the report of the Select Committee into the operation of the MFS.

In order to ensure that a wide range of applicants with various backgrounds and professional qualifications can be considered for the position of Director, it is proposed to amend section 18 (2) of the Act to broaden the requirements which the person appointed as Director must fulfil. However, the Bill still lays down that the Director must have relevant qualifications and experience such as would best equip him to undertake the duties of Director under the Act. In this context, experience has shown that the Director must not only be competent in the area of fire fighting but must also have corporate management skills.

In order to ensure that the senior person in the Service who has the day to day management of the fire fighting arm is suitably qualified, the establishment of the position of Chief Officer was recommended by the corporate review. The Government has decided to incorporate this position in the Act and to require that the person appointed to the position be fully qualified and experienced in the fighting of fires. The Director will remain fully accountable to the Board for the performance of the Service. However, his is a broad responsibility and in accordance with modern management practices he will naturally delegate his responsibility in specific areas and in particular circumstances to his senior line management officers.

The Government believes this significant restructuring of the Country Fire Service is necessary to ensure that the volunteer brigades receive the headquarters support which is an essential part of the protection they provide to the community. While the changes which are planned in the longer term represent a major shake-up in the management structure of the CFS, the circumstances do not permit us to simply tinker at the edges; significant changes are demanded and the Government has responded accordingly. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts a definition of 'Chief Officer' into section 5 of the principal Act. Clause 4 repeals sections 9 and 10 of the principal Act and replaces them with two new sections that provide a new constitution for the Board, revised provisions as to vacation of office and for the appointment of a Chairman. The Director and the Under Treasurer will be *ex officio* members. The other three members will be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. One member will be appointed to represent the interests of councils and another will be appointed to represent the interests of volunteer fire fighters. Section 9 (5) provides that the existing members of the Board will cease to be members when the amending Act comes into force.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to section 11. Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act to provide for the appointment of a Chief Officer. The appointment will be made by the Board with the approval of the Minister. Clauses 7 and 8 make consequential amendments to sections 25 and 52 respectively. The amendment to section 52 (6) makes it clear that a fire control officer to whom the Director delegates his power to assume command at a fire under subsection (7) will have authority on a Government reserve. That this is the effect of the existing provision is recognised by subsection (9) which limits the Director's power of delegation in relation to a fire on a Government reserve.

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

#### SPEECH TIME DISPLAY UNITS

The **SPEAKER**: Honourable members will have noticed that the speech time display units have been removed this morning due to malfunctioning problems. However, the control console on the table is functioning properly and members' speeches will be accurately timed as usual. To assist members in concluding their remarks within the time allocated, I propose to have a warning bell rung when a member has five minutes remaining.

#### CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (EXTRA-TERRITORIAL OFFENCES) BILL

Second reading.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to form part of a legislative scheme under which offences committed against the law of one participating State or Territory can be investigated under the authority of search warrants issued and executed in another. At present a search warrant issued in one State has no authority outside the boundaries of that State; furthermore, there is no authority to issue a warrant in a State except in relation to a crime committed in that State.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has agreed that corresponding measures be enacted in all States and Territories to ensure that the investigation of criminal offences is not impeded by State or territorial boundaries. This Bill is in the form adopted by the Standing Committee. Under the Bill a member of the Police Force can apply to a magistrate for a search warrant to be issued and, if the magistrate is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence to which the measure applies has been committed, or is intended to be committed, in another State or Territory and there are present in this State objects relevant to the investigation of the offence, the magistrate may issue a search warrant.

Of particular note is the fact that an application for the issue of a warrant may be made personally or by telephone. An application by telephone may be made only in circumstances where a warrant is urgently required and there is insufficient time for the making of a personal application. Stringent procedural rules are imposed in relation to telephone applications including the following: the applicant must provide information establishing his credentials as a Police Officer; he must provide information sufficient to satisfy the magistrate that proper grounds exist for the issue of a search warrant; the magistrate shall not issue a search warrant unless the applicant undertakes to forward an affidavit verifying the facts on which the magistrate relies as grounds for the issue of the warrant; and the magistrate must note on the warrant those facts.

The Bill provides for the making of Ministerial arrangements under which objects seized in the State or Territory in which the warrant is executed are to be transmitted to the Commissioner of Police for the State or Territory in which the offence is alleged to have been committed. When no longer required for the purpose of criminal investigation or as exhibits in criminal proceedings, the objects are to be returned to the State or Territory in which they were seized.

Provision is made for the ultimate return of the objects to their owners.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the definition of expressions contained in the measure. Of particular note are the following definitions: 'appropriate authority' means in relation to another State or Territory (other than the Australian Capital Territory) an authority in that State or Territory that is equivalent in its functions to the South Australian Commissioner of Police, and in relation to the Australian Capital Territory, means the Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police; 'night' means the period between 7 o'clock p.m. and 7 o'clock a.m.; 'offence to which this Act applies', means an indictable offence against the law of a reciprocating State (being an offence arising from an act which if done in this State, would attract criminal liability under the law of this State); 'reciprocating State' means another State or Territory in which a corresponding law is in force and in relation to which arrangements are in force under section 7; 'search warrant' means a warrant under the measure authorising a search of premises; 'telephone' includes any telecommunication device. Under subsection (2), anything obtained by the commission of an offence, used for the purpose of committing an offence, or in respect of which an offence has been committed, anything that may afford evidence of the commission of an offence, or anything intended for use in the commission of an offence, is, for the purposes of the measure, an object relevant to the investigation of the offence.

Clause 4 provides that where a magistrate is satisfied on the application of a member of the Police Force that there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence to which the measure applies has been or is about to be committed and, that there is in any premises an object relevant to the investigation of that offence, he may issue a search warrant in respect of the premises. Under subsection (2), an application for a warrant may be made personally or by telephone. The grounds of the application must be verified by affidavit (subsection (3)). Under subsection (4) an application shall not be made by telephone unless the applicant is of the opinion that the matter is urgent and that there is insufficient time to make the application personally. Under subsection (5), where an application is made by telephone:

- (a) the applicant must inform the magistrate of his name, rank and number in the Police Force, and on receiving that information, the magistrate is entitled to assume that the applicant is a member of the Police Force;
- (b) the applicant must explain the grounds on which he seeks a warrant;
- (c) if the magistrate considers that there are proper grounds to issue a warrant, he shall inform the applicant of the facts on which he relies as grounds for the issue of the warrant and shall not proceed to issue the warrant unless the applicant undertakes to make an affidavit verifying those facts;
- (d) if the applicant gives such an undertaking, the magistrate shall make out a warrant, sign it, and note on it the facts on which he relies as grounds upon which to issue it;
- (e) the warrant shall be deemed to have come into force when signed by the magistrate;
- (f) the magistrate shall inform the applicant of the terms of the warrant;
- (g) the applicant shall, as soon as practicable after the issue of the warrant, forward an affidavit as required.

Under subsection (6), the magistrate must file the warrant or a copy of the warrant, and the affidavit, in the Adelaide Magistrates Court.

Clause 5 provides in subsection (1) that a search warrant authorises any member of the Police Force, with or without assistants, to enter and search the premises specified in the warrant and anything in those premises. Under subsection (2) subject to a direction by a magistrate to the contrary, the warrant shall not be executed at night. Under subsection (3), such force as is necessary may be used in executing a warrant. Under subsection (4), a member of the Police Force executing a warrant may seize and remove any object he believes on reasonable grounds to be relevant to the investigation of the offence in relation to which the warrant was issued. Under subsection (5), such an object shall be dealt with in accordance with arrangements in force under section 7. Under subsection (6) a member of the Police Force who executes a warrant shall prepare a notice in the prescribed form containing his name and rank, the name of the magistrate who issued the warrant and the time and date of issue and a description of any objects seized and shall as soon as practicable after executing the warrant, give the notice to the occupier of the premises or leave it in a prominent position in the premises. Under subsection (7), if a warrant is not executed within a month of issue, it expires.

Clause 6 provides that a person who without lawful excuse hinders a member of the Police Force or his assistant in the execution of a warrant is guilty of a summary offence, the penalty for which is two thousand dollars or six months imprisonment. Clause 7 provides that the Minister may enter into arrangements with a Minister administering a corresponding law under which (a) objects seized under this Act that are relevant to an investigation in the State or Territory in which the corresponding law is in force are to be transmitted to the appropriate authority in that State or Territory and, when no longer required (unless disposed of by order of a court) are to be returned to the Commissioner of Police and (b) objects seized under the corresponding law that are relevant to an investigation in this State are to be transmitted to the Commissioner of Police, and when no longer required (unless disposed of by order of a court) are to be returned to the appropriate authority of the other State or Territory. Under subsection (2) the owner of an object returned to the Commissioner of Police under subsection (1) is entitled to the return of the object. Under subsection (3) the right conferred by subsection (2) is enforceable by action in detinue. Clause 8 is a regulation making power.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr MAX BROWN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr WHITTEN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

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

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

As is usual on this occasion I do not intend to speak to the motion, although I reserve my right of reply at the conclusion of the debate. Suffice to say that the Estimates Committees proceedings were, I believe, extremely well conducted. I would like to express my congratulations, particularly to those members who chaired the respective Committees, for the job they did. It can at times be a difficult job; it is certainly a long and arduous one, and it was very well discharged, indeed. All members had an opportunity to question adequately all facets and aspects of Government policy and expenditure, and the reports as they are now before us I believe should be agreed to.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** In supporting the motion, I first place on record the Opposition's view that the conduct of these Committees was a significant improvement on our experience last year, and I join the Treasurer in acknowledging the role played by the respective Chairmen. Last year we approached this part of the Budget process with the policy that it represents an opportunity for the Parliament, for all members, to obtain information in a constructive non partisan way, and in a calm atmosphere. I had reason to complain last year that our approach was not reciprocated. Most Committees were frustrated either by the reluctance or refusal of Ministers to provide information, or their inability to do so because of failure to come to grips with their portfolios.

I believe that this year most Ministers showed that they had learnt a lesson and were more forthcoming with information to those Committees—even a few of them are on top of their portfolios. They also allowed senior public servants more opportunity to speak in the Committees. This was welcome and it was useful. There were of course one or two exceptions—most notably the Minister of Health. While his behaviour could not be described as anything other than scandalous during his Estimates Committee, that matter will be dealt with by my colleagues in another place.

However, overall it needs to be recognised that the form and purpose of these Estimates Committees, as initiated by the former Government, can be a most useful adjunct to the Parliamentary process if approached in the right spirit by all members of the Parliament, and in that spirit I place the Premier on notice that the Opposition will be approaching him before the introduction of the next Budget with the intention of ensuring that time for some Committees be extended where appropriate and necessary—in particular, in the case of the Premier's portfolio areas and the time that the Committee has to examine the needs for its consideration, and also education. There are one or two significant portfolio areas that need some consideration as it relates to the allocation of time. The Premier's Department, the Treasury, the Department of State Development and the Department for the Arts, are important areas of Government administration which require more than a single day's sitting of the Committee for adequate examination. The former Premier was prepared to grant an extension of time when requested to do so. Unfortunately, there was no reciprocal gesture from the Premier to my request to extend this year's examination.

One of the major reasons that more time is necessary in this case is the amalgamation of the Premier's Department with State Development, assuming roles formerly undertaken

by another Minister relating to trade and some components of industrial development in this State. When they were under two Ministers previously, obviously more time was available to address and question particular areas of those portfolios.

While the Estimates Committees have been sitting, the other Labor State Governments have brought in their Budgets for the 1984 financial year. An examination of those Budgets highlights the extent to which movements in State taxation in South Australia are outstripping those of other States. They show why the Premier is becoming so sensitive to the issue, and provide a clear motive for what one would describe as his extraordinary attack on the media and the Opposition in his speech to the Australian Business Economists luncheon on 20 September. In that speech the Premier accused the Opposition and what he termed 'sections of the media' of ignoring the problems South Australia faced and setting out deliberately to exaggerate the impact of the Government's tax measures. Of course, the Premier did not give any specific examples to justify his accusations, and he did not because he simply cannot. Every statement that I have made on the Premier's record revenue raising spree has been based on facts and figures to support it. This afternoon I intend to give the House further figures to show the extent of this Government's tax rip off—and that is all it is.

The economic recovery has naturally generated higher taxation receipts but, unlike his Labor colleagues in the other States, this Premier keeps all the benefits to himself: he refuses to share them with the community through some tax relief. As a result, South Australian taxpayers now see the Premier's hands dipping into their hip pockets at every turn, grabbing more from electricity tariffs, improved land values, and increased liquor licence fees generated by the Federal Government's sales tax on wine—and the imposts go on. All we get from the Premier are apologies, excuses and promises of reviews.

It is high time that we reviewed the number of reviews that the Premier has promised. In a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 1 November last year, the Premier said that he would review the Government's 5 per cent tax on the Electricity Trust. He has not done so; instead, he will take a further \$26 million this financial year out of the pockets of electricity consumers in South Australia. In August, I asked the Premier to adjust the marginal rates of land tax, which have been unchanged since 1977, recognising of course that the previous Administration abolished land tax on the principal place of residence whilst it was in Government. The Premier refuses to alter the marginal rates of land tax this financial year, but says that the matter will be reviewed in 1985. Even if that promise could be trusted—and it cannot because the track record demonstrates that it cannot and that, for an Administration that said it would not increase taxes or introduce any new taxes, its record is appalling—small business certainly needs relief from land tax now, not the promise of a review in 1985.

In September I pointed out that the Federal Government's new sales tax on wine would increase liquor licence fees collected by the State Government. The Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 13 September as saying that he would consider lowering the licence fees for cellar door wine sales to offset the impact of this Federal impost, but we have heard no more. Last Sunday I showed how South Australians will be paying the highest rate of financial institutions duty in Australia from January, following the decision of the Western Australian Government to lower its rate by 40 per cent. The Premier has responded this time by saying that all State charges and rates are consistently under review. Being 'consistently under review' means consistently under review for an upward trend because, as we would all recognise, we have had increases in some seven taxes, the intro-

duction of a new tax—the first in 10 years, namely, financial institutions duty—and something like 149 increases in individual charges in some two years. We have seen a tax hike of 39.7 per cent in South Australia over the two years—three times the inflation rate, three times the increase in the pay packet of South Australians. This Government wants to limit the increase in the pay packets of individuals but it is not prepared to set the example and limit its own increases.

There is no comfort for South Australian taxpayers in that hollow gesture that we will keep taxes under review. We know what that means. It means continual rises in the tax slug on South Australians. This House needs to remember that, before the last election, the Premier promised an inquiry into all areas of State Government revenue raising and in the meantime he promised no tax increases. The revenue has certainly been raised—but we are still waiting for the inquiry. It has been a sad story for South Australia, and the Premier is simply trying to continue the fantasy with his empty promises of tax reviews.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Are you saying that he is a procrastinator?

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed. To date his promises have been so hollow that no-one could take any promise on revenue raising or tax measures in this State as having any degree of credibility, having come from the present Treasurer. It is not something that we apply but is something that is earned as a result of track record performance in the field. The ABS figures clearly indicate the position. It is now abundantly clear that rising State taxes and charges as well as Government competition and interference with the private sector have become major inhibitors to sustained economic growth in South Australia. Rates of growth in most areas of State taxation that have occurred since 1982 are greater in South Australia than they are in New South Wales and Victoria.

It must be recognised that, to maintain our manufacturing and industrial bases in this country, we must have a competitive edge. In the 1950s and 1960s we had that, and we were able to produce products here and transport them to the major domestic markets on the eastern seaboard of Australia. We had access to those markets on a competitive basis. But now we are eroding that possibility; we are eroding investment potential and the rights and capacity of South Australian businesses to remain competitive not only with the rest of the world but also in relation to the Eastern States of Australia.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** We are in the race to be the most disadvantaged.

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed we are. Let us look at our track record compared to that of New South Wales and Victoria. Since 1982 rates of growth in most areas of State taxation have been greater in South Australia than in New South Wales and Victoria. On a per capita basis stamp duties have risen by 70 per cent in South Australia since 1981-82 compared to 42 per cent in Victoria and 21.7 per cent in New South Wales. Land tax in South Australia has increased by 67.7 per cent compared to 25.8 per cent in Victoria and 47.6 per cent in New South Wales. Liquor licence fees have risen by 94.2 per cent in South Australia compared to 42.7 per cent in Victoria and 37.4 per cent in New South Wales. The cigarette tax is up 160 per cent in South Australia compared to 149.8 per cent in Victoria and 74.9 per cent in New South Wales. In addition, from 1 January we will have the highest rate of financial institutions duty in Australia.

Our rate of stamp duty on workers compensation premiums, already the highest in Australia, will produce an even greater disincentive, following Victoria's decision to reduce its rate by half, from 7 per cent to 3.5 per cent in

this financial year's Budget. Our rate is 8 per cent. Honourable members will recall that last year during the Budget debate the Government increased the rate from 6 per cent. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry has estimated that the benefit of this tax to the Government will be \$11 million in a full year. On the other side of the ledger, the cost to the unemployed is that it prevents industry from creating about 600 jobs.

All the taxes to which I have referred have a disproportionate impact on small business—the sector of our economy with the greatest capacity to increase jobs quickly in response to changing economic conditions. However, that sector of our economy also has the least capacity to absorb rising imposts such as Government taxes and charges. Never before in our history has small business been under such a sustained attack from State Government imposts. Even former Premier Dunstan was prepared to ensure that our rates of State taxation did not get too far out of kilter with interstate movements in order to help our manufacturing industries meet competition for a share of national markets. It is impossible to see any benefits at all from these increases because the Premier still has a record Budget deficit. What is more, he is mortgaging our future to artificially deflate that deficit.

During the Estimate Committee proceedings the Opposition questioned the Premier about his method of financing the Budget through the use of funds borrowed from statutory authorities. We have been joined in our concerns on this matter by the latest half-yearly report of the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, which is critical of what it terms the Government's creative accounting, where borrowings are made to give an impression of a balanced Budget in the cash position on Consolidated Account.

In his latest report, the Auditor-General has also warned that three factors need to be watched carefully in using these funds, sourced through the financing authority and other statutory authorities. They are: that the funds so used are channelled through the Consolidated Account, so that prior Parliamentary scrutiny of their intended use and effect on the State Budget can be made; that those funds are not used as a device to expand the capital works programme in order to avoid difficult decisions with respect to project priorities; and that their use does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of debt deriving costs on Consolidated Account and on taxation. Those comments are made in the Auditor-General's Report. Clearly, the Premier is now indulging in a manipulation of the Budget against the express warning of the Auditor-General.

The Opposition has no objection to the Government's allocating its entire Loan Council borrowings received on concessional rates of interest for housing purposes and for funding capital works programmes through an equal intake of funds from statutory authorities. However, during the last financial year the intake of funds from statutory authorities, including the financing authority, exceeded the needs of the capital works programme by \$6.5 million. That had the effect of reducing the Budget deficit from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million. Then we had the comments from the Treasurer made publicly that he had all but balanced the Budget. It was balancing the Budget by sleight of hand, bringing in funds from statutory authorities in order to reduce the Budget from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million—to make it look good. What is happening this financial year? The Budget deficit is to be further manipulated to the tune of \$14.67 million. This will mean an intake of an additional \$21.2 million over two years in borrowings from statutory authorities to give the appearance of balanced, or almost balanced, budgeting. Helping to fund bigger government in this way simply adds to the long term burdens of taxpayers.



I draw to the attention of members of the House that this involves not only our assessment and information that we obtained from the Treasurer and his officers during the Estimates Committee proceedings but also a report from the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies which also supports the contention that I have just made. In refusing to take action to stem rising taxes and charges, the Premier has turned a blind eye to research conducted by his own Department of State Development, which has found that South Australia rates last amongst potential investors in Victoria and New South Wales and the factors that would encourage them to relocate business activity in South Australia. The Premier smirks, and well he should, because the clear message is that the taxes and charges imposed by the Government are placing an impediment on the relocation of business in South Australia and the State's investment potential, and well the Premier knows it.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Where did you get that research from?

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier is very concerned that his Department is leaking like a sieve and that someone happened to give me a copy of the report. I responded to this matter during the Estimates Committee by saying that the channel from which the Premier assumes I got a copy of the report was not by way of anyone who has joined my staff on a consulting basis in recent times. The Premier's embarrassment well identifies that fact because, before any additional staff were taken on board by my office on a consulting basis, the acting Leader at the time wrote to the Premier asking for a copy of the report, but that was several months before any staff changes in the Department of State Development were made. So, if the Premier does a little figuring (and I know that he has great trouble with maths, because the Budget demonstrates that), it will be demonstrated that that occurred well and truly before anyone came onto my staff on a consulting basis (I am referring to people who were formerly with the Department of State Development but who resigned in total frustration with the operation of that Department).

**The Hon. H. Allison:** The Premier has just gone for his calculator!

**Mr OLSEN:** He had better make sure that it is switched on for a change. I know that the Premier does not like to be reminded of facts like this or to have them debated publicly. It is interesting to note that it is normal courtesy for the Treasurer to stay in the House when the lead speaker of the Opposition presents a response to such budgetary matters, but in this instance he has decided to leave the Chamber.

*Mr Klunder interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Of course, the honourable member would not understand the basic courtesies and traditions of the Parliament: we well understand that.

**Mr Klunder:** I was here before you.

**Mr OLSEN:** The honourable member had been here for a short time and was taken out, as he will be yet again in a short period—about 510 days or less from now. So, he should enjoy it whilst he is here. However, nothing will be done about them unless they are exposed to allow a realistic assessment of the position that we are in. It is a basic and fundamental responsibility of an Opposition to point up factors such as this to the public of South Australia. It is nonsense for the Premier to blame anything but his own economic policies for this perception of South Australia that is held in Sydney and Melbourne. The Premier's efforts to blame the Opposition and the media for negative attitudes to South Australia just fly in the face of reality. They are more excuses, more apologies, and they are in themselves dishonest.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** And they are perceived as such publicly.

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed, they are. The reality of hollow promises of this Government is having an effect in all households in South Australia, and well this Government in its door knocking would be getting that message loud and clear—to the extent that the Treasurer has been prepared to challenge not only the Opposition and me but also the media. Of course, when we laid it on the Premier in Question Time in Parliament to identify the media about which he talked, he then retreated from that position.

The Premier suggests that we can overcome the problems by ignoring them. If the Opposition and the media do not talk about them, no-one will realise, so his theory apparently goes. In suggesting that, the Premier is demonstrating his total lack of business experience and his own fundamental misunderstanding of the way in which business weighs up the pros and cons of locating in one area rather than in another.

Indeed, a glance along the Government benches shows that there is not one Minister who has been out there taking the risks to set up and maintain a business, to seek reward for individual effort and initiative, to compete, to struggle against the mounting wave of Government costs and regulations and still be able to pay wages and make a profit to reinvest in the business to keep it viable and going. About the last person to whom interstate businessmen will listen is a Premier so out of touch—so out of his depth. Even the Premier's own Federal colleagues have stopped listening to him.

We have the wine tax, the end of work on the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, closed uranium mines and many other losses to show for it. Because the Premier's policies are not working and because he is fast losing credibility, the loss of confidence has spread throughout the Government. It is a do nothing Government led by what one could describe as a dull Premier. Hard decisions are being put off. The Government is backtracking at the slightest hint of criticism. Reviews dominate the whole spectrum of Government administration, not just in the taxation field.

I invite the House to consider the following examples, which are just a few of many. I refer, first, to public sector superannuation—I have been calling for a general review for the past 12 months, but the Premier has decided only now to act—forced into it, I might add, by the Hon. Legh Davis and a private member's Bill in another place. He has dithered and delayed to ensure that any results of this inquiry will not come before the next election to prevent problems with public service union officials. If the Opposition's calls for an inquiry had been heeded in the first place, the results could have been available now.

I refer, secondly, to the proposal to reduce the speed limit on the open road. The Premier announced during the Budget, in a softening up process prior to the Budget being presented, why we needed higher taxes and charges, particularly as they related to registration fees in South Australia. It was a *fait accompli*. We were going to drop the speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h. Now the Minister of Transport says that this is being reviewed. The Premier's decision was a nonsense in the first place. There is no need for a review, because it seems to me that not only did we decide to reduce the limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h but also we would review it. However, it was announced today in this Parliament that the Government is now reviewing a graduated scale in reduction in the speed limit in South Australia. Goodness knows what that means! That is a graduated road speed limit in South Australia. What absolute nonsense this Government is talking.

**Mr Meier:** It's a complete turnabout.



**Mr OLSEN:** There was a turnabout because the Government got a bit of a reaction from the public about the reduction in the speed limit. Thirdly, the Premier promised more than a year ago to fix our gas supply problems with New South Wales within a fortnight. One recalls the heading, 'I will fix the gas prices within a fortnight!' However, there is still no solution in sight. New South Wales is still getting South Australian gas much cheaper than we are paying for the same gas—our gas! I refer, fourthly, to a decision on the site and fuel for our next power station, which was originally promised by the middle of this year, but it has now been postponed until next year.

A final decision on the use of handguns by the police has been on the Government's agenda for more than a year. The delay is causing continuing uncertainty within the force when there was no need to review the matter in the first place—it was forced into it by Caucus and by a policy decision of non-elected members of Parliament.

The Government failed to ensure adequate consultation with the city council on the ASER redevelopment, and now we have a backdown at the eleventh hour. Also, nothing has been done about the loitering laws which allow the mob and the misfits to harass police and people at Roxby Downs with impunity—even though the problem has been apparent for more than a year.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** They backed off shopping hours today.

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, that is another area. I noted in the press that the Government had backed off shopping hours. Also, the Government has failed to act on the desperate land shortage in Adelaide which is forcing home ownership out of the reach of many young South Australians. Whilst the Federal Government is trying to bridge the gap to finance young people into homes, this Government by its inaction is creating the difficulties by soaking up the benefit that the Federal home ownership scheme is providing to young couples in this State.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed. The Government has failed to remove the impasse which has developed over access to the north-western area of South Australia for petroleum exploration which could be vital to our future. The O-Bahn project has been set back two years after yet another review.

The north-south corridor has been scrapped because the Government is more interested in selling off the property to raise cash to alleviate a desperate financial position of its own making than in planning for Adelaide's long-term transport needs. An important attribute of Adelaide's quality of life is the ability to get around the city and suburbs with ease and convenience. The failure of this Government to proceed with the north-south corridor is putting that benefit in jeopardy in the southern suburbs.

I might add that it is imposing a considerable burden for future generations of young South Australians, not in this decade but in the decade to come. It is the young South Australians who will pick up the tab for that shortsighted decision of this Government. Governments of all political persuasions in the past—both Liberal and Labor Administrations—have accepted the principle of the north-south corridor, yet this Administration, because of its short-term needs, is prepared to mortgage the future of young South Australians: it is prepared to pass the buck to them—pass the cost on to future generations.

**Mr Mathwin:** An honest decision!

**Mr OLSEN:** An honest decision? Indeed, we have already attempted to demonstrate in relation to taxes and charges that this Government has not been honest with the people of South Australia. It has no intention of being honest. I suggest that we are in for yet another round of tax slugs during 1985.

The people of the South-East face the indefinite prospect of one of the most attractive areas of their coastline being polluted because there is no commitment to starting work on the Finger Point sewage treatment plant. The Government has run away from the shop trading hours issue as fast as it can. That was referred to a moment ago by way of interjection. It is not prepared to grasp the nettle. It puts union pressures before the interests of shoppers and consumers. All these policies and actions are symptomatic of a Government in full retreat.

There is example after example. The Government seeks any escape path to avoid hard decisions. This Government is drifting along on a hope and a prayer of economic recovery while its own policies are doing a great deal to jeopardise that recovery. We only have to look at the unemployment figures for South Australia to see that. For the third month in a row there has been an increase in unemployment. On the last occasion it was .5 per cent, taking it to 10 per cent. That is higher than any other State in mainland Australia and, what is more, the number of our long-term unemployed (people who have been unemployed for more than nine months) is higher than any other State in Australia. In addition, we have more people unemployed today than when this Government came to office.

So much for the record, so much for the policies, so much for the direction, so much for making the best of economic recovery! The fact is that the Government's policies are simply not working. The Government is devoid of positive ideas. We have lost our voice in Canberra, and that is witnessed by the wine tax and the decision on the rail link. We are being taken for granted and we are ignored. In the longer term, the Government has no strategy for the future economic development of South Australia to the end of the century. We hear a lot from the Premier about car races and birthday celebrations, but we hear nothing—

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** We hear about Boy George.

**Mr OLSEN:** He had plenty of time to see Boy George, but he has no time to see business leaders in this State who have significant problems. The message I get from Treasury and State Development is that access to the Premier for policy formulation and direction is not available to them because access is not given to heads of departments. We hear nothing about what this State will be like 20 years from now and what we have to do to get there.

Where is the vision for South Australia, and where is the long term direction for South Australia? It is not there. The Government is doing nothing about South Australia's potential for increased exports to Asia except ensuring that South Australian companies are priced out of those markets by the Government's own imposts and its failure to remove some of the other obstacles to market diversification. The Government is doing nothing about a solution to the Murray River problem and our other water supply needs. It has ignored that basic and fundamental need of South Australia. In fact that is a total abdication of responsibility by the Government of this State. It cannot make decisions about the use of our natural resources—our coal, gas, uranium, and the need to explore for oil and gas in the North-West.

Increasingly, the decisions which affect South Australia's long-term future are going to be made at State Government level in the next few years. This Government has demonstrated that it has no answers, no policies and no plans. It has lost its way. We have the highest unemployment on the mainland. We are now creating fewer jobs than the other States. We are no better off than we were two years ago despite the economic recovery throughout Australia. This Government has failed South Australia.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I will confine my remarks to the Estimates Committees of which I was a

member, that is, the Deputy Premier's Estimates and those of the Minister of Mines and Energy. If I were to give marks out of 10 for the performance of those Ministers, I would give the Deputy Premier five out of 10, because at least he was trying, he co-operated with the Committee, and he did answer the questions. However, I would have to give him nought in relation to the Government's programme, and I will explain why in a moment.

I think the member for Todd and the member for Eyre were with me on the Estimates Committee examining the Minister of Mines and Energy's lines. We would have to give the Minister of Mines and Energy nought in relation to the Government's programme, and we would have to give him nought in relation to his performance, because he did not try. We also heard disturbing reports about the performance of the Health Minister during the Estimates Committee. In fact, I came in at one stage and was told that the Minister of Health had been answering a question for an hour and then handed over to his officers to continue, thus making a complete farce of the Estimates Committee.

At least the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy answered questions. I pay a tribute to the Deputy Premier for his attempt to give the Committee straightforward replies, but I was disturbed about his comments in relation to the Government's programme. First, I refer to the employment scene in South Australia. This Government came to office on a pledge to do something about creating jobs in South Australia. We heard nothing (as I have said before in this House) but doom and gloom from the now Premier and his Deputy when they occupied the Opposition benches. They came to office on two major planks in their platform. One was that they would not increase taxes, there would be no new taxes and they would not use increased charges as a means of backdoor taxation. The other major plank in their platform was that they would do something about the dreadful plight of the unemployed. The fact is that we would have to give the Government a negative score on both of those pledges.

How do you score a Government which has blatantly broken every promise it made in relation to taxation? Far from improving the lot of the unemployed, the situation has deteriorated drastically. In support of the Budget document, the Leader of the Opposition dealt with the question of taxation in relation to this Government at some length. I refer to the employment theory of the present Government. The document accompanying the Budget papers purported to be the Government's programme and its record in relation to employment. It was a new document, and to my mind it was probably as damning as anything the Government has put out in relation to what it has done in relation to its election promises. In effect, all the Government has done is to put another 3 100 employees on the public pay-roll (about half of them as permanents) and preside over a decline in real employment in this State. The document makes the amazing claim that by putting more people on the public pay-roll the Government is stimulating employment in the private sector. That is an absurd proposition. I think former Under Treasurer Stone has said some things—

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** You certainly don't agree with him, do you?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I certainly do, and I believe that most thinking people in the nation—from those who run a household budget, to those who have to balance a budget, and those in the highest office in the nation—would agree with some of the fundamental propositions that Stone is putting: that is, one cannot live on someone else's money; and with an enormous overdraft, whether one is running a household budget or whether one is running a nation, one must look further down the track. If the Minister has not grasped that fundamental fact of life, Lord help

him in his private affairs and Lord help this State and this nation! I certainly do agree with Mr Stone and his fundamental premises in relation to budgeting, deficits, and interest rates and their interrelationship. The document which accompanied the Budget papers suggests that, by putting extra people on the Government pay-roll, the Government is stimulating employment in the private sector. It is absurd, ridiculous and stupid to suggest that the ability of the private sector to provide employment is enhanced by the highest tax regime. To suggest that somehow or other that is enhancing employment in the private sector, as claimed in this document, is absolute arrant nonsense of the first order.

That is their employment policy. What has been the result? It is dramatic escalation in taxes and a diminished opportunity for the private sector in this economy—the major employers, to whom even the Hawke Government, including Mr Keating (the present Treasurer), are saying, 'We must encourage private sector investment if we are going to improve job opportunities.' They are doing precious little to bring that about but they keep making this plaintive cry. The present Government in this State is quite incapable of grasping that simple fact, and the employment figures verify that. The Premier of this State is proud of the fact that \$93 million has been spent here on employment schemes.

How many kids leaving school of the 27 per cent unemployed have a permanent job out of that lot? I would like to know those figures. Unfortunately, they did not emerge in the Estimates Committee, but I bet that one could count on the fingers of one hand the number of youngsters leaving school who have found permanent employment of those 7 000 people who have been given temporary jobs. The employment figures in South Australia this month have deteriorated and are the worst in Australia, despite the fact that we have had this enormous infusion of funds which has created 7 000 temporary jobs. So, they have padded the figures, and the position is really worse than these figures indicate. We have the highest unemployment now in the mainland, and we have had the smallest growth in employment.

In fact, in real terms there are now by far more people out of work and fewer people in employment than when this Government was elected, despite the fact that it has put more than an additional 3 000 on the Government pay-roll. Can anyone claim that this Government's employment strategies are working? I believe that it is an absolutely disgraceful record. The Government has to rethink its approach to what will be done to assist the long-term unemployed and what will be done to assist the 27 per cent—no less—of young school leavers who are unemployed.

Does spending enormous sums of taxpayers' funds on temporary jobs solve the problem? I think not. It does provide some short-term padding, but in terms of looking down the track and thinking where this State is going in regard to economic planning, this Government is completely devoid of any programme at all. We just wait for something to turn up, but unfortunately with the lack of leadership that is being shown in this State at present it will not turn up. In the areas where we did have a future (and let me refer now to the Minister of Mines and Energy and his lines) they have banged the door shut. The one area of the economy (I have said it before and I will say it again) where this State had a future and where there was a prospect of real expansion was in the development of our primary mineral resources. What has the Government done there? It has dithered around and done precious little, and in fact it has closed down some industries, making the excuse on the altar of its so-called uranium policy.

Before I refer in more detail to the Minister of Mines and Energy, let me mention again one other matter canvassed

with the Deputy Premier during the Estimates Committee. As I say, we appreciated the way in which he was prepared to answer questions in a forthright fashion, although we must part company with him in relation to his programme. I mention briefly workers compensation. Like Labor Governments with which I have been familiar in this State, the Labor Party dives in, seeks to make radical changes, throws everything out, brings something else in and claims that it will solve the problems. In the early 1970s, when the now Deputy Premier was Minister of Labour, a Workers Compensation Act was brought into the Parliament. It was claimed that this was wonderful legislation that was the panacea to all the problems relating to the injured at work, and so on.

It is that very legislation that the Deputy Premier is now loud in condemning: it is his own legislation. At the time, there were some queries from the Opposition. We thought that there were areas where the Bill went too far, but no: throw all caution to the winds; this is it; this is wonderful legislation. Now we will throw the whole lot out and start from square one with a scheme, despite warnings from other places around the world where some of the basic premises of the new scheme are in place but where the scale of benefits is nothing like that being promoted in South Australia, that will solve all the problems in relation to workers compensation.

Let me say that, while we have this wonderful consensus in the country, the view of the present Government is not shared around Australia. Despite the fact that consensus was reached on the Byrne Committee (and one of the members opposite served on that committee), that consensus is not shared around this nation by some fairly significant people who have something to contribute to this marvellous consensus. If I have time I will say something about consensus; if not today, I will certainly do so when I have an opportunity to speak again on some other occasion.

A report has just been commissioned by the Victorian Government headed by Mr Cooney, who I think is a QC, although I am not certain what his qualifications are, but I think that he is a legal man. I am also told, although I have not verified this, that he is a Senate candidate for the Australian Labor Party in Victoria, so no-one could claim that he is anti the Victorian Government. They would not have made him Chairman if he were anti, anyway, but he was the Chairman of the committee that has just reported in Victoria, more recently than the operation of the Byrne Committee. It is interesting to me to note that the major recommendations of the Cooney Committee line up very closely with the major thrust of the Liberal policy that we announced in this State some months ago.

This is an independent inquiry that has just reported in Victoria. It wants to retain the multi-insurer system. It believes that a competitive system, fairly strictly regulated (and the industry here is asking for that; it is quite happy to be regulated; it does not want the fly-by-night companies operating)—the multi-insurer system—is the most appropriate way to deliver workers compensation cover. The South Australian Government will not wear that in a fit. This is the report of the Victorian Government which came down about a fortnight or three weeks ago. I refer briefly to some recommendations of the Cooney Committee, as follows:

**Accident prevention:**

The workers compensation system should promote the goal of accident prevention by:

- (a) in the area of its own financing mechanism and operations by adopting and providing procedures and resources to encourage safe working practices—

and we agree with that—

**Rehabilitation:**

The workers compensation system should actively promote the rehabilitation of the injured worker.

We agree with that—it is in our policy. They say that there should be some degree of compulsion in relation to medium term rehabilitation, and we say that in our policy. It also refers to compensation. The report states:

Within the economic constraints accepted by the community workers compensation systems should provide maximum assistance to victims of industrial injury and their dependants by the prompt payment of compensation.

That is also contained in our policy. It refers to:

providing payment for all medical rehabilitation and other services incurred or involved in the injury.

That is also in our policy. It refers also to:

ensuring that the greatest possible percentage of the premium dollar is directed to the accident victim.

That is encompassed in the Liberal Party policy announced in this State. The report goes on to talk about accident prevention, and all that lines up with what the Liberal Party has been saying. Chapter 4 on rehabilitation lines up with what we have been saying. The recommendation brief on occupational health and safety runs counter to what the Deputy Premier is saying in relation to health centres—union controlled but publicly taxpayer financed health centres are being promoted here. The Cooney Report runs counter to that. I will be surprised if the Liberal Party will wear that in a fit. Employer groups certainly will not wear it, but the Cooney Report talks about support for properly accredited private rehabilitation facilities. There is nothing about trade union controlled health centres. So, my point is that the Cooney Report lines up almost identically, and certainly identically in all of its major recommendations, with the policy enunciated by the Liberal Party.

In regard to the central fund and pay as you go, they will not be in that. Some decisions are split, but the majority decision was that self-insurers should continue. The Liberal Party endorses that concept. The Cooney Report talks about structured payments rather than lump sums, as the Liberal Party policy announced. One of the major reforms in relation to common law would be that these enormous lump sums would be structured to replace lost earnings. That is what workers compensation should be about. If a worker is permanently incapacitated or permanently partially incapacitated, he has really lost his ability to earn. That should be replaced for him, and any equitable system should do that.

That was one of the recommendations of the Cooney Report. It was most encouraging that at least the most recent independent committee of inquiry into workers compensation that has reported lines up in its major recommendations almost identically with what the Liberal Party is proposing in South Australia. We are not simply proposing cosmetic changes: the changes we propose are radical, particularly in relation to the speeding up and settlement of claims which is the major complaint from workers and their representatives. Complaints are made on the time taken and the messing about to get claims settled. We believe that we have addressed that matter in a realistic way.

I conclude my remarks on workers compensation by saying that this view is supported strongly by the Confederation of Australian Industry. I am unsure of what local employer groups and the Chamber of Commerce are saying, but the most prestigious body around Australia also agrees with what the Liberal Party has said here. The Confederation of Australian Industry, in its comments in relation to workers compensation, agrees almost entirely in the points it makes in relation to workers compensation, with the stance adopted by the Liberal Party. Under the heading 'Objectives', the Confederation states:

CAI believes the present competitive structure of workers compensation insurance, which provides the widest range of choices,

in both cost and approach, is to the ultimate benefit of the Australian community.

It wants multi-insurance to continue. It also states:

Further, CAI believes that, with appropriate safeguards, self insurance should be available.

So do we! It supports a review and, where appropriate, a rationalisation of available benefits and delivery costs. So do we, and that is independent of anything they have done. It believes that greater emphasis should be given to rehabilitation, and so do we. The CIA has major reservations about the development of lump sum settlements as against the equity of structured settlements, and so do we—we said it in our policy. A worker has lost his ability to earn, and that is what we must replace for him. The CIA believes that legislation should make adequate provision against the abuse of this system, and so do we.

**Mr Gregory:** What's the CIA?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I meant the CAI—the Confederation of Australian Industry. I saw the would-be member for Makin walk in; he probably made me think of it. I know that the member for Elizabeth is hung up on Special Branch and on the CIA, and that probably led to my slip of the tongue. The CAI believes that legislation should make adequate provision against abuse of the system. If anyone suggests that there is no abuse now, they close their eyes to reality. So do we!

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Close your eyes to reality?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No. If members do not think that there is any abuse of the present system, they are in dreamland. The CAI supports an examination of procedures for initial certification and re-examination of compensable injuries. If we are to have any real policy for employing the disabled, some recognition must be given to existing disabilities or these people will never get a job. That is the problem at the present time. The existing disability is thrown on the shoulders of the present employer. Under those circumstances, if the worker further deteriorates, the employer carries the whole burden. Of course he will not employ handicapped people under those circumstances. The CAI expresses disquiet about medical charges and the two-scale system. We mention that in our policy. The CAI believes that greater attention needs to be given to the availability of data on compensable injuries. We mentioned that in our policy. A dearth of statistics exists.

In concluding my remarks on workers compensation, I am encouraged by what leaders around this nation, who are not blinkered, are saying on the subject. Sir Arvi Parbo made pertinent comments when he was reported, in the *Executive Journal* earlier this year, in an article stating:

Typical was the argument voiced recently by the President of the Business Council of Australia—

that prestigious body set up by Prime Minister Hawke—and leading industrialist, Sir Arvi Parbo. Sir Arvi said that high workers compensation costs had helped erode Australia's international competitiveness. He argued that protection had to be provided for workers, but changes were needed to cut the cost of insurance.

Workers' compensation claims as percentages of wages doubled from 1971-72 to 1981-82. 'This rapid increase in workers' compensation premiums is an added cost burden to employers and a further erosion of our international competitive position, with its consequent effect on economic growth and employment opportunities', Sir Arvi said.

But at the same time Sir Arvi would not back the move for State monopolies on this form of insurance. He said employers should have the choice of State insurance offices, private insurers and self-insurance, because he did not believe State monopolies were cost-effective.

The poor old Minister of Mines and Energy would score nought out of 10. All day during the questioning in the Estimates Committee he did not say anything. His idea was not to provoke the Opposition and therefore to say nothing. I think he had had a good dose of tranquillisers before the

Committee, as we got precious little out of him. We questioned him again about the Government's policy on land rights and opening up Pitjantjatjara lands for exploration, as we had sought to do, and we got, in effect, a nil answer.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** What did you get on a two week gas action promise?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We got nothing on that. We got nothing on anything. We asked whether the Government was looking at Honeymoon and Beverley and about whether he had changed his views in relation to *in situ* leaching, but we got nowhere. We asked the Minister about uranium enrichment. The member for Eyre had been overseas and made some inquiries about the nuclear fuel cycle, as had the member for Todd and I. I recounted to the Committee the fact that I had been to Marlowe and talked to Dr Kehoe, whom the Minister ought to know; he has been to South Australia often enough. These people do not come now because of the present Government's policy. He told us that we had lost the uranium enrichment facility, certainly in the immediate future—a billion dollar project. We got nowhere with the Minister on that matter. He had no answers.

We asked the Minister about uranium conversion to help the unemployed people at Port Pirie. We pointed out to him that the council and members of the Labor Party backed the move because of the unemployment at Port Pirie, and where did we get? We got nowhere. So the sorry story went on. We asked the Minister about the options for electricity generation and about electricity tariffs and what the Government's plans were in relation to electricity generation. We asked the Government about the option of nuclear energy, and we got nowhere with that. We quoted some figures in relation to that option at least being kept open, but it was interesting to note that in the Stewart Report that that option was not even available because of Government policy.

In the *Advertiser* I read from time to time these sort of reports which come from overseas about how people are not interested in nuclear energy anymore; that is the impression that the *Advertiser* seems to give. In fairly recent days it quoted the American experience. I hope the Minister has read the latest report because he claims to be an avid reader and gatherer of information—he will not go and talk to people, but he reads. I hope that he read what came from the Atomic Energy Commission in the July/October volume this year because he will find a very good summation of the world nuclear scene as seen by these experts. The markets, and so on, are quoted in this useful publication. The Minister has quoted NUEXCO in relation to markets. It gets a berth in this publication, as do all the other people who predict what is happening in the uranium scene around the world. If the Minister reads this report dispassionately, he will find that the policies of this Government and of the Federal Government have cost this State and this nation hundreds of millions of dollars. It will probably run into billions of dollars over time, depending on how long the Government's present uranium policy persists around the nation.

Looking at the prediction of world uranium consumption and what we could supply, I notice there is an asterisk which means 'depending on Government policy'. One sees that in one of the major areas where the nation and the State could develop and where South Australia could get a place in the sun has been denied to us by these Governments. If the Minister looks at this publication he will find that it is time that this Government in South Australia got off its backside and gave a lead in these matters.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten):** Order! The Deputy Leader's time has expired.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Mr Acting Speaker, I certainly support the motion that we note the reports of the two Committees. Following along the lines that were undertaken by my colleague, the member for Kavel, I would say that in my three experiences one Minister would not rate, one Minister (the Premier) would rate somewhere in the middle, and the other Minister (the Minister of Local Government) would rate quite well. I do not want to sabotage his efforts for promotion, but I do believe that he honestly sought to provide information for the members of the Committee as is the requirement of Ministers.

Certainly, there was a great deal of prepared material and it was trotted out from time to time. But, in providing that prepared material, the Minister sought to update it from his own knowledge and gave the opportunity to his officers to do likewise. Indeed, where a question was raised that required some additional information it was readily offered and in some instances has been delivered, or the information is now available.

The Premier, as the Leader indicated earlier on, was evasive, which is typical of his question answering activity. Some information came out, particularly when it was forthcoming from the officers, and in many cases, because a matter was politically sensitive, the Premier would not even defend his own position or that of his Government and he gave so, so answers. There was no real joy in a lot of the information that was forthcoming from the Premier and, because of the length of answers that he gave to simple questions and the evasiveness of his answers to direct questions, the total area covered during the course of the day was diminished accordingly.

I am not suggesting that there was not some worthwhile information, and that is why I place him in the middle of having at least provided some information. However, the Premier could certainly have improved the stance of his Government and himself in the eyes of members of the Opposition and indeed of the public if he had been more direct and open in his answers to legitimate questions asked of his Budget—asked of a Budget which involves the expenditure of money of the people of this State and information that the people who provide those funds ought to be able to receive through the questioning of their representatives in this place.

I did not nominate the Minister who was disastrous. He identified himself earlier this afternoon in what he suggested was an answer to a question that I posed to him in relation to the Builders Labourers Federation and a claim that it has made against the small and large builders—the building industry of South Australia. He tried to fob it off by saying, 'Did not the honourable member, who is knowledgeable in these matters, realise that it was an ambit claim?' Certainly, the member for Light realised that it was an ambit claim, and I will refer to that ambit in a minute.

However, the same qualities indicated in that foolish answer this afternoon were exhibited practically the whole time during the examination of the Housing Minister in Committee A when he came before the Committee. The Minister showed us one thing and one thing only—that he could read painfully slowly and that he could read from reams and reams of information that had been made available to him. He threw out on many occasions the opportunity for his officers to give pertinent and succinct answers. I take my hat off to the officers that, when they did get the chance, they gave those answers in a succinct and practical way, and there was no claim by the Minister that they were overstepping their mark. He invited them to give answers, and they gave them without a political twist. They did not seek to read into the record statistical material which the Minister had been invited by the Chair to lay on for the purpose of inclusion in *Hansard*. Rather than take the

simple way out, the Minister proceeded to read painfully slowly, to the disadvantage of the Committee and the number of questions which could be asked, information which was of a statistical nature.

What else do we find, and why do I raise this matter and refer to the information provided by the Minister of Housing and Construction? The Minister for Environment and Planning (who fortunately is in the House at present) and the Minister of Education were asked questions which had relevance to the housing area. The member for Chaffey, as shadow Minister of Lands, asked questions in relation to the creation of blocks and referred to the sorts of problems that the Government has in providing adequate services and in getting titles through. The member for Torrens asked the Minister of Education questions about such things as the Government's intention in relation to the Teacher Housing Authority. By taking the information provided by the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Education, who were so ably supported by their officers, and comparing that with the twaddle given to the Committee by the Minister of Housing and Construction, the reality of what I am saying becomes ever more apparent.

The Minister of Housing and Construction was in constant defence of himself and his office. In the first instance he was prepared again to seek to defend the irresponsibility of the Treasurer and the Minister in seeking to put to the people of South Australia that in 1983-84 the South Australian Housing Trust had been successful in a programme to provide 3 100 homes in a 12-month period. That was the aim: it was a goal that members of the Opposition lauded and sought to help to achieve. But it did not happen. In fact, fewer than 2 900 homes were added to the Housing Trust stock during the period from 1 July 1983 to 30 June 1984. In documents presented to this House almost two months after the end of that financial year (and certainly after the Auditor-General had become aware that the number of houses taken into stock during the 1983-84 financial year was less than 3 100), the Treasurer commenced this false approach of laying claim to a successful programme that had not been achieved, by saying that 3 100 homes had been added to the stock. Under close questioning (the Auditor-General having identified the facts in his report), the Minister acknowledged that fewer than 2 900 houses had been added to the stock. The Minister then sought to defend the position by saying that within a matter of two weeks into the 1984-85 financial year the target of 3 100 had been achieved, and that after six weeks another 700 homes had been added: he therefore asked why the Government should be criticised.

I simply make the point that the under-achievement represented a 6 per cent error factor. If we were to presume that, in regard to the 1984-85 figures the Government would not have sought to discount those figures in relation to the 200 homes that had not been provided in 1983-84 (although that achievement was claimed) and had left counted those 200 homes that had come on-stream immediately afterwards, the percentage error in housing achievement in a two-year period would have been about 12 per cent. That is the way in which members of the Government seek to fool the people of South Australia. The Minister of Housing and Construction was in an indefensible position, yet he sought to continue to defend his position when he was caught out during questioning about matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report (which was subsequently acknowledged by officers accompanying the Minister) and when the position was quickly identified. That is why the Minister rated so poorly. It is only one example of the distorted claims that were made.

In regard to information provided by the Minister for Environment and Planning (I refer to the *Hansard* record of the Committee proceedings of 27 September 1984, page

209) and by the Registrar-General of the Lands Titles Office, Mr Maher, it was acknowledged that the Government had tried to do better. It was stated that the demands on the Office were becoming greater and that, notwithstanding that staff numbers had been increased by 50 per cent in vital areas, the Office was no further advanced today than it had been in September 1983. No attempt was made to defend a position that was so patently and publicly obvious. No attempt was made to hide the unfortunate reality of the situation, although it was acknowledged (and it is accepted by the Opposition) that some attempt had been made to improve the situation by increasing the number of staff working in that area. However, what did the Minister of Housing and Construction do? The record indicates that he told the Committee that problems associated with ETSA, the E & WS Department and the Lands Titles Office had been identified and corrected and that there was now no longer anything but a minimum problem. The Minister pointed out that he and his colleagues had corrected the situation. However, the Minister for Environment and Planning quite clearly illustrated the falsity of that statement.

The Minister of Education was questioned in relation to the Government's intention with respect to the Teacher Housing Authority. The Minister of Housing and Construction was also questioned by the Opposition about that matter, although, because the Minister prattled on with some of his answers and read so slowly, we very nearly did not get the opportunity to do so. It was only by the good grace of the Committee—which was somewhat reluctant, I must admit—that the time for the asking of questions was extended beyond 6 o'clock. It was then that I was finally able to ask the Minister of Housing and Construction a question about the Government's intention in relation to the Teacher Housing Authority, as he is the Minister primarily responsible for housing matters and housing associated with Government activity.

We got a series of comments that did not bear any relationship to the factual information that was given by the Minister of Education. The Minister of Housing and Construction tried to side track the activities of the House. He sought to suggest, 'Oh, yes. We are looking at these matters, but we have not made any decisions.' However, the Minister of Education was quite unequivocal: 'Yes. We have looked at that. We have made a decision. We are going to get rid of it.' He did not seek to go on and say how it was to be handled. I refer to the Teacher Housing Authority and the responsibility for that Authority being withdrawn from the Education Department's activities. At least the Minister of Education was unequivocal and factual. He sought to provide genuine information to the Committee, but that was not forthcoming from the Minister of Housing and Construction.

We could pick up a number of other points of some importance relevant to housing. For example, the Minister of Housing and Construction has arranged for a special committee of the Industries Committee to look at dual occupancy. We knew that 12 months ago, because it was on the board then. However, nothing more was forthcoming. The Minister indicated that the report directed that the issue be looked at by the Department of Environment and Planning. I hope that in due course we obtain some details of those decisions from the Minister for Environment and Planning.

However, the Minister of Housing and Construction was not prepared to indicate more than just a brief comment relative to that quite vital matter. The Minister was asked quite deliberately whether he, through his Department, had the figures analysed for housing in South Australia. Increases in costing have been talked about in the press almost daily. In the 'State of the State' supplement to the *Advertiser* today, there is a great deal of information relative to the housing

boom, the cost of housing and the effect of a number of problems on planning.

Also, in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 4 October 1984, Malcolm Newell (economics writer) gives a very full and complete overview of Adelaide house prices and of the major increase which has taken place. I identified to the Minister a number of similar statements by Malcolm Newell, the real estate industry and other authorities that have researched the housing industry over some three or four years. Clearly, they have been able to identify the land component increase, on a general basis the cost of materials increase, the cost of labour increase and the greater length of time taken needed to complete a home and the associated costs.

Twelve months ago young people could contract to have a home built, and a number of builders would contract for completion from 11 to 13 weeks; homes were being delivered on or ahead of schedule. Now, except for one type of home, one cannot obtain a contract to build a home in under 26 weeks. It is most unusual for homes to be delivered on schedule. In a number of instances contractors will not write in a completion date. They will give an approximation, indicating that they would like to believe that they could finish it within 26 to 30 weeks but that they cannot be held to that position because of the 'heated' circumstances existing in the housing industry associated with the boom that we are experiencing and the lack of qualified and skilled artisans.

The fact that two organisations were prepared to go interstate to bring skilled workers here is to their glory. It has helped somewhat. However, when the Minister was questioned on this matter during the past 12 months and even when the Deputy Premier was questioned about it in the past six months, they failed to grasp the nettle and answer honestly the reality of the situation in respect of artisans in the building industry. Any member who has in their district a CEP project in which an element of building industry labour is involved would know that it is unlikely to be completed on time. I congratulate the Government, because in many cases it has acknowledged the need to get away from the use of traditional labour associated with CEP projects and has allowed funds to be expended on people who are employed in the building industry to do these vital building operations associated with CEP funding. A series of events is causing these problems.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They have missed the target area.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes. The other problem is that by increasing the period in which the money is outstanding, and during which materials are being turned into a house, the cost of servicing the debt increases, as does the cost of the house because of the additional cost of interest associated with the difference between 11 to 12 weeks and 26 to 30 weeks construction time. That adds a cost factor into the housing industry.

Benefits were given to young people by the previous Fraser Government for their first home, and indeed this has happened under the present Hawke Government in slightly different formats. Nonetheless, funds are made available on savings in the first instance. Although the first home owners arrangement exists, the Hawke Government regrettably has not really assisted many people entering a new home because funds available by way of subsidy have gone into the bottom end of the housing project and jacked up the price of the eventual house.

Wherever one subsidises rental in the private sphere or wherever one makes money available to entice people to come into a goal area so that they can achieve ahead of their own time with their own funds, one gets a greater demand than would normally be created. The increased subsidy money put in at the bottom end pushes up the cost of the product. The cost of housing today reflects an element of the subsidy which is available from Government sources, but which younger people or people who do not qualify



have to meet to get into the market. We could point out a number of similar aspects. We have the unfortunate reality that rental rebates to Housing Trust tenants increased from \$22.646 million in 1982-83 to \$32.013 million in 1983-84. We now have to take into account that 64 per cent of the total population of the Housing Trust, including aged accommodation, receives some form of rent rebate.

A real problem is reflected in the document handed down to this House by the Minister of Community Welfare which was a report on an overview of all the concessions available to people in the community whether for council rates, E & WS charges, rental benefits for Housing Trust accommodation, and so on.

It would be remiss of me, in the brief time that I have left, not to make one or two comments about the Builders Labourers Federation's attack upon the building industry to which I adverted during Question Time. A letter of demand was forwarded to most, if not all, building organisations, small and large, in South Australia last week over the signature of N.L. Gallagher, General Secretary of the Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation, head office, Trades Hall, Melbourne. Dated 11 October 1984, the letter of demand states:

By direction of the Australian Building Construction Employees' and Builders' Labourers' Federation ('the Federation') and on behalf of its members, I forward to you herewith a log of claims and require that you grant to all your employees who are members or eligible to be members of the Federation the rates and conditions as set out herein. You are required to grant the said rates and conditions within two (2) days from the date hereof.

It was dated 11 October so it was certainly not received on 11 October, so in less than two days from the receipt of the document members of the building fraternity were expected to respond to the claims. The letter, signed for and on behalf of the Federation, contained 39 claims, the first nine of which are these:

1. A wage of \$600 per week.
2. An ordinary working week of 30 hours.
3. An industry payment of \$100 per week.
4. A special payment of \$100 per week.
5. A travel mobility payment of \$150 per week.
6. Reimbursement of all expenses incurred in the course of the employment.
7. A special project payment of \$300 per week.
8. A construction disability of \$200 per week.
9. A height payment of \$200 per week per each 10 metres of the height of the structure being built.

These people are involved in constructing not only business premises but Housing Trust and private houses. Why should the Opposition be denied the opportunity to question the Minister of Housing and Construction in this State, who had sat on this document to the exclusion of the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer and had not sought to have it analysed?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman's time, having expired, I call the honourable member for Mount Gambier.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I share the extreme concern of literally tens of thousands in South Australia and hundreds of thousands across Australia that the State and Federal Budget papers for 1984-85 have done little to relieve the plight of the poor and needy, the low income earners, the pensioners and those on the basic wage and above in our State and elsewhere. The Federal pension concessions already have been totally absorbed by rental increases announced by the South Australian Housing Trust and also by the fact that the removal of Medicare charges from the consumer price indexation figures has literally robbed pensioners of a legitimately much larger rise in pensions this year. Pensioners and the poor people on basic

wages and above are already further behind now in income purchasing power than they were at this time last year.

My electorate office (and I am sure those of many other members) is inundated with people coming in complaining about the steady increases in State charges which more than outweigh the meagre increases in Federal pensions. In the last 20 months or so the Federal pensions have risen by \$10.50 a week, in three increases of \$4.50, \$3.50 and \$2.50 respectively. From what I understand, the Federal Government has already decided that Public Service superannuation pensions in November of this year will not be increased because of a negative CPI and that indicates to me that social security beneficiaries generally in Australia—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the debate because at the moment he is dealing with Federal issues and clearly the debate must deal with the State Budget.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** My remarks are leading directly on to the South Australian review of State Government concession, the final report, and the remarks are directly linked because the recommendations contained in that concession report refer directly to the Federal Government and, of course, this document was released by the Premier on Budget day.

**The SPEAKER:** I accept the honourable member's assurance.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As I was saying, this document was released on Budget day by the Treasurer and by the Minister of Community Welfare. I was a little disturbed that although this was ostensibly to be available to all members of Parliament, in fact, I had to solicit a couple of copies, one for the Leader and one for me, later on Budget day because there had been a printing problem and the rest of the members were unable to check this document.

One of the leading comments which is made in this important document is that the Federal Government pensions are quite inadequate for today's needs among the poor and the needy. One of the strong recommendations is that the State Government should lobby the Federal Government as a matter of urgency to try to win for this State two pretty large sums. One recommendation was to make a submission to the Commonwealth on income support for an amount of \$77.6 million and the other was a submission to the Housing Trust on rent rebates of \$25 million. As members will see, by linking the State and the Federal Budget Papers I am simply doing what the Premier had already done in releasing his document on Budget day. He had tied in both the State and Federal Governments firmly by the release of his own document, the review of State Government concessions.

The fact is that those Federal Government pension increases have been totally absorbed by increases in State charges, not the least of which is the 46 per cent increase in electricity charges in the last 20 months and water and sewerage charges which have increased. That document contained many interesting recommendations which I will debate in a few moments. However, I must confess that I was very surprised when I raised the issue during the Estimates Committee on the community welfare lines to hear the Minister of Community Welfare defend the Premier's inability to win for South Australia a better deal at the Premiers Conference earlier this year and then to say that he would not be making any special recommendations or approaches to the Federal Government because he inferred that it was very difficult to change Federal Government policy once it had been made. I did point out that under the Tonkin Government a few very important representations had been made to the Federal Government to change policy: one was to get a discount price on the Monarto land loan and to pay off that loan at a much lower rate than would otherwise



have been the case, and another was to obtain for South Australia \$25 million for the Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education which certainly was not in the Budget of the Federal Government, but it changed its mind following representations.

I also refer to the South-East college of rural studies, to which another \$2.5 million was allocated. The Federal Government decided to give it that additional amount of money. How does that compare with the great reduction in funding for South Australia's technical and further education colleges this year? Out of \$39 million available to Australia for recurrent grants in TAFE, South Australia wins only \$1 million because the Federal TAFE Commission says that South Australia has been undersubscribing over the past two or three years to TAFE colleges and has not in fact been providing sufficient money even to fire up new colleges but has been taking from existing colleges. Therefore, South Australia is now paying the penalty by having lost a very substantial amount of recurrent funding and being allowed only \$1 million out of \$39 million. The other States have won out at our expense.

I still believe that the Minister of Community Welfare must make strong and immediate representation to the Federal Government, as recommended in this report and as is obviously needed for South Australia, because the South Australian community has the highest number of social security beneficiaries of any State in Australia in proportion to population. There are some eight different categories of social security beneficiary and in each category South Australia is leading the rest of Australia. So, surely the Premier would have had a first rate case to present to the Federal Government for South Australia to receive some special consideration, instead of which we see that the various Grants Commissions recommend that next year South Australia should receive less than it has this year: it should receive a smaller proportion of funding because the Grants Commissions recommend that the Eastern States with the higher populations will receive grants on a per capita basis. Therefore, once again South Australia loses out. We are rapidly approaching the situation where South Australia must be looking to become a mendicant State once again and we would probably obtain a better deal then. Meanwhile the Federal Government is looking to take funds from the smaller States and give them to the larger and more populous Eastern States. Some strong representation has to be made to the Federal Government.

The State Budget gave South Australian voluntary agencies an increase of about \$355 000 for welfare service provisions and the South Australian Council of Social Services sought an extra \$1 million in quite a substantial submission to the Premier in March this year in order to meet the needs of the poor in South Australia. Instead of seeking further public comment, which is what the Minister of Community Welfare and the Premier have decided to do on the review of State Government concessions, the Government should be releasing funds immediately to assist those extremely needy people in the community such as the single male unemployed and others who are at present neglected.

In that respect, the Government might well ignore some of the recommendations contained in this report, because I notice that one of the groups already seriously disadvantaged (low income males over 60 years) is recommended to retain rates concessions but to lose STA, electricity, motor registration, rail travel outside of Adelaide, and St John Ambulance assistance. Of course, that would be another severe blow for that category of people. Low income males over 60 years are already in a desperate plight, because even 50 year olds and over are finding it almost impossible to obtain work of any kind. Of course, whereas the rest of Australia's unemployment problem has eased a few percentage points

in the last few months, South Australia's has increased to 10 per cent and is higher than it was under the Tonkin Administration, in spite of unequivocal promises made at election time to buy votes that the unemployment situation would be redressed, given a socialist Government in South Australia.

It is very clear that the Government's policy of 'user pays' will result in considerably greater increases over a whole range of State charges with the result that pensioners and the poor will have to commit an ever increasing proportion of their very meagre incomes just in order to survive. A press release from the Minister of Community Welfare which accompanied the concessions report admitted that Commonwealth benefits such as unemployment, supporting parent and pension benefits were not enough to provide families and individuals with adequate income. What an indictment for a South Australian Government publication to slate the Federal Government in those terms. This is an official Government publication and there is a clear admission that both at State and Federal levels the poor have been let down very badly. In fact, it is an admission of the total failure of Federal and State Labor Governments to meet the needs of that section of the community which it, more than any other Party, claims to support.

I remind members of the House that a Federal Liberal Government first introduced unemployment benefits in Australia. Socialist policies are rapidly becoming a social disgrace and I believe that they have already necessitated one Government back-bencher's attempting to provide bulk stores for the needy in his not impoverished electorate and possibly with soup kitchens to follow. He went public on that matter. I heard him broadcasting on one of the talk shows only a few weeks ago. It highlights the dire problems facing the impoverished in South Australia.

We have another strange anomaly that the Labor Party's management policies are just a total nonsense. It can commit \$2 million to policing the Roxby Downs fiasco, encouraging people to go and demonstrate in that desert region. Even a magistrate supported the demonstrators (odddity of oddities), while tens of thousands of South Australians are subsisting on a mere pittance. They are unable to help themselves, and if ever \$2 million could have been better spent by giving that money to the 4 000 voluntary agencies in South Australia for which SACOSS was soliciting assistance, then I have yet to meet that needy case. The report on State Government concessions to which I referred earlier was looking to save an amount of \$4.7 million while committing another \$3.4 million. In other words, this report is looking to save for the Government \$1.3 million, which the writers of the report say could be available for an extension of concessions or for other welfare purposes.

This report seems to have been a waste of time because, after tabling it, the Premier announced within a matter of hours that two of the recommendations would not be abided by. One of them was a recommendation to save \$2 million by reducing pensioner concessions on State transport, particularly in the metropolitan area, of course, where most State transport is concentrated. That \$2 million will not be saved, virtually meaning that the entire report is invalidated because it states that until money is saved money will not be spent on those very needy people about whom I have been talking for the past 10 or 15 minutes. Yet the Government will put out this report again for further public review, comment and consideration, rather than acting immediately to help the people in South Australia who all of us know are desperately in need of help. SACOSS, the Premier and members of the Opposition who have been asked to help in making representations are all aware of the magnitude of this problem in South Australia for improv-

erished people. They are going backwards and South Australia is very quickly becoming a divided society.

I turn now to the problems emerging at Yalata. It is a great pity that only a few years ago the last of the Lutheran lay administrators was removed from Yalata. Prior to that time there had been a strong Christian influence—a caring humanitarian approach to looking after the Aborigines at Yalata—which dated back to 1933 when Miss Short looked after Aborigines at Ooldea Soak in the Maralinga territory. Only four or five years after the final removal of the Lutheran influence at Yalata problems have emerged aplenty, including alcoholism, glue sniffing and violence. I recall having to threaten to remove educationalists from Yalata when windows were broken, cars interfered with and personal threats made. Since then the problem has become more acute with alcohol being cited as the main cause of the problems, and I have no doubt that it is a very significant cause.

I was somewhat concerned to hear the South Australian Minister of Aboriginal Affairs saying that it was not his problem, that it was largely a Commonwealth problem and that there was very little he could do. I find that quite astounding when State-employed people are under threat. In fact, they are resigning and leaving Yalata because they cannot take any more, and they have said as much. We have seen the resignations of the Administrator, the adviser on alcohol problems, the health sister several months ago, the social security adviser, and another community welfare adviser. That is five people within the past few months. They were leaders in the Yalata community, which is why their resignations received publicity. Their resignations are only the tip of the iceberg: many more responsible members of the Yalata community have been unable to cope with the problems there and have decided to move away where they can live more peaceably. It is not that they prefer to live away from the rest of their colleagues, but they believe that they can no longer exist happily and safely at Yalata. It is a leadership lost problem.

Two or three weeks ago we passed a Bill enabling Aboriginal people at Yalata to put in a request to the Minister, 'provided the community was in agreement', to ban alcohol. With the consent of the Aboriginal Lands Trust the Minister and the Governor together can outlaw alcohol on any native reserve in South Australia. It is highly unlikely, with the leadership losses such as we have had at Yalata over the past few months, that the remaining people will come together with a united approach to ask for alcohol to be completely banned. However, I sincerely hope they do that, because that will begin to resolve the problem on the Yalata Reserve, which is a huge area of 1 million acres. It will be a positive step towards regaining some common sense on the reserve. However, it will not be the total answer, because I suggest that people who are decidedly alcoholic will be inclined to leave the reserve and head off to create problems elsewhere in the Far West of the State.

We have had long-term problems in the Ceduna area with Aborigines being transferred from one township to another and back to Yalata with almost a yo-yo movement of people under the influence of alcohol. However the problems are tackled, the solutions are not going to be easy. I believe that the State Minister should be taking firmer measures and should listen to requests for some police presence at Yalata. I know that requests have been made in the past. I believe that in the near future the Minister should negotiate with the Aborigines at Yalata to provide some police presence, which will at least give a much more secure atmosphere on the reserve. Without some security, some guarantee of safety of life and limb and property, it is highly unlikely that those people who have resigned will be attracted back there. It is

highly unlikely that people of high calibre and quality will go back to Yalata or apply for the position of community co-ordinator there. Unless there is some extremely firm, sound, humanitarian, compassionate, and caring leadership there in the very near future, the situation can only deteriorate even further. It is a sad situation.

To those people who see the removal of Aborigines from Yalata back to the Maralinga lands, to Ooldea, as another solution to the problems, I remind them that there has been a gross misunderstanding perpetrated by members of the anti-nuclear group in Australia. They say that the Ooldea Aborigines were taken from that area and sent down to Yalata purely because of the atom bomb tests commenced by the British Government in 1952. That is nonsense.

I refer to a document detailing the history of the Yalata Lutheran Mission from 1952 to 1977, compiled by Pastor Neil A. Hampel. The document points out that when the Mission began at Ooldea in 1933 there was a steady succession of problems. The work of Miss Annie Lock was soon followed in 1936 by that of Mr Harrie Green, a Lutheran Missioner. He said that his work was difficult because of the sandhills around Ooldea Soak. As Aboriginal people cut down the trees around the Soak for their fires, the sand began to move. By the time the Mission closed at Ooldea on 30 June 1952, there were 100 dust storms a year—an average of two a week. Native game had become very scarce in the sandhills and the surrounding land. There was very little to hunt. Aboriginal people were already wanting a better life style as a result of what they had seen and experienced during the filming of *Bitter Springs* in the Warren Gorge, near Port Augusta, in 1949 and the film *Kangaroo* in the same area in 1950. In other words, their appetites for better things had already been whetted.

The Federal Government obviously wanted to establish an atomic testing area north of Maralinga, and for reasons of personal safety and national security the Government wanted Aboriginal people removed from that area. Pastor Hampel's document states that the Aboriginal people themselves were on the move. As early as 1938 the Koonibba Mission Board was concerned about the drift of Aboriginal people from Ooldea to Koonibba. In 1973, Pastor Green, in a personal letter to Pastor Hampel, said that there were only 300 Aborigines at Ooldea when the final move was made and that he was already experiencing a great number of sociological problems because there was no work. He said young men were drifting in and out of the area with literally nothing at all to do; therefore, boredom would have set in years before 1952.

In 1947 the Chairman of the Koonibba Mission Board told his convention that the problem of incoming natives from Ooldea would have to be dealt with at an early date. Pastor Hampel's document states:

The Mission compound at Ooldea Soak is being gradually covered by moving sandhills. Conditions are primitive and appalling. There are about 300 natives there. There is a general exodus to the coast.

A little further on he refers to a meeting and says:

This meeting with the protector of Aborigines regarding the welfare of Ooldea Aborigines was the first of many meetings over the next seven years before all questions regarding their resettlement were completed. Basically, these meetings concerned the location of the new Aboriginal settlement and the control of this settlement... Plans were made by the United Aboriginal Mission—

it was the Lutheran Mission—

to purchase Colona Station, owned by Yalata Pastoral Company, and they wished to establish their mission there. It is reported that they expected the Government to contribute about 50 per cent of the purchase price of £3 500 to £4 000. The Aboriginal Protection Board seemed to favour this plan.

The special meeting was called on 12 July 1950 to consider these developments and over the next 18 months to two years various meetings were held. The history states that on 2 August 1950 a deputation from Koonibba Mission Board met with the Aborigines Protection Board and it became clear that the Government thought that the Ooldea natives would have to be moved to the Yalata station area. So, the moves were already under way long before atomic testing began. It was some time later, by about the end of March 1951, that the South Australian Government had purchased the leasehold of the Yalata Pastoral Company for £64 000.

So, arrangements had been under way for many years before atomic testing was commenced at Maralinga. Attempts have been under way and arrangements were made for the natives to be moved out because of the problems of lack of water, drifting sand, lack of game, lack of vegetation for fires and the manufacture of curios and artifacts and, because of a whole range of sociological problems, including the underprivilege of Aborigines and the appalling conditions. I suppose if it had been a western community it would have been described as one of the worst slums. Indeed, the natives themselves were anxious to better their lot, so that movements were already under way and planned before the Maralinga bomb tests were envisaged. That comes from the history of the district compiled by the Lutheran people, who were most involved from 1933 until 1952, when the move was made.

I suggest that it would be folly to think that 800 Aborigines could be moved back from Yalata to the region of Ooldea Soak and Maralinga whence only 300 people came—and they came in conditions of abject poverty—without massive logistical support being provided at great expense in order to ensure that they were properly settled with hospitals for medical care, schools, pre-school, stores, water and communications. I do not imagine that any Aboriginal community anywhere in Australia would view a movement back to a homeland situation and at the same time contemplate that it would be forfeiting the benefits of Western civilisation.

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

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I took part in the education, recreation and sport and marine Estimates Committees, and I take this opportunity of congratulating the two Chairmen under whom I sat. I found that the member for Whyalla and the member for Price were most considerate in their chairing of those Committees. I would be the first to admit that in some cases provocation was instilled into the Committee hearings, but I found that the respective Chairmen were very tolerant in the circumstances.

With a tolerant Chairman, one gets a better Estimates Committee. I begin my remarks by discussing some of the issues that arose in the education Estimates hearing. I have some concern for the amount of time that is allocated to such a massive subject as education. I am sure that the Minister, who has just come into the Chamber, will agree with me. The time given for the debate on the Education Department line itself, which is of the order of \$600 million, was exceeded by the time given to debate on the recreation and sport Estimates, where, if one takes Loan into account, we have a budget of some \$15 million all up. Of course, I am not taking Loan into account in the education Estimates.

Government members may say that how much time is allocated to each department is very much in the hands of the Opposition, but in the education Estimates we are also dealing with the Minister of Education's miscellaneous line, which in itself has a budget exceeding that of most other departments in the Government. That miscellaneous line

contains some very important areas of concern, including the Kindergarten Union and funding for non-Government schools. We also have the very important TAFE sector, the budget for which also exceeds the budget for most other departments in Government. There we have again an allocation of time to fit into the available hours that is far less than is deserved by such an important sector of education, on which the focus is moving more and more because of the unemployment situation in this country, and which deserves a great deal more attention than it has been given. I do not have to mention the importance of the other parts of the education budget, such as works (I have mentioned miscellaneous), the Teacher Housing Authority, etc.

It is impossible, when we have to allocate the evening session of that day to the technology area of the Minister's responsibility, to cover the important issues that are extant in the education portfolio as a whole. I do not know what the answer is, but, at the very least, education itself, including TAFE and miscellaneous, should be granted the whole day until 10 p.m., and perhaps the Minister's technology line, which is very important but which certainly would not take the time needed for education, could be held on another day. I ask the Minister whether he can consider that in next year's Estimates if we do not have a State election before then. (If we do, I will be very pleased to consider that request.) If there is not a State election before the next Budget, I ask the Minister to consider whether he can prevail on his Cabinet colleagues to make a more appropriate allocation of time for the debate on these subjects.

I am not blaming the Government for the fact that I also hold the marine shadow portfolio and that I had to attend that debate on the same day, but it would not have mattered because we would have had to deal with technology in the evening, anyway; otherwise, the whole of the Minister's portfolio would not have been covered. If a portfolio is not covered, we get back to the old system that we had in this place when the Budget Estimates were conducted in the Committee of the whole House and when some departments were not even considered because we ran out of time.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** They say that in New South Wales transport was not covered for 12 years under that system.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am shocked to hear that because, of all the departments in Government, transport is one of the most important—not as important as education, but one of the most important and one that requires a great deal of work to administer. I am getting off the point; I now wish to deal with one or two of the things in the education Estimates that were of importance.

First, I want to deal with information provided by the Minister in response to questions. I compliment the Minister on making this information available so soon, and I understand that more information on various aspects will be forthcoming. I refer particularly to the question of enrolments in the school system between now and the 1990s and to the problems that will occur. From the figures that the Minister provided it can be seen that the projected reduction in primary school enrolments is about to bottom and that we are going to get a gradual increase in those enrolments. We are also faced with the situation of an increased retention rate of students in secondary schools, a retention rate that this Party supports very strongly, I might add. However, that has meant that the Minister will be unable to honour one of his pre-election promises, namely, that over 900 teachers would be retained over a three-year Labor Administration period and that some 80 per cent—or certainly the great bulk of those retained teachers—would be placed in the primary system.

When questioned about this matter, the Minister said that at the time of making those promises he could not have predicted the increased retention rate of secondary schools, and I accept that. I am not denying that the Minister could not predict that, but I am pointing out the dangers of making promises without sufficient statistical information on which to base them. The Minister, of course, is in trouble because he has not been and will not be able to honour that election promise. I might add that he has honoured his promises to the extent that so far he has retained the teachers who are in the system. I do not deny that. However, he will not be able to maintain the promise that most of those teachers will be placed back in the primary system. Matters involving the primary system if not attended to now will remain unattended in the future, because of the problems that will occur in the secondary school area.

We have some very severe differences between primary and secondary schools in regard to terms and conditions for the staff: the lack of teacher-librarians, comparable ancillary staff formulae, the lack of special education teachers, and the like, all of which are very serious problems that must be addressed. They should be addressed now, because it will not be possible to address them in the future. The reason for that is that the hollow in primary school enrolments is about to hit secondary schools. According to figures that the Minister provided to the Estimates Committee, by 1990 there will be some 14 000 fewer students in schools in this State.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Ten high schools.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Yes. What will some 14 000 fewer students mean? It will mean that severe problems will occur in providing students with a guarantee that they will be able to continue their chosen courses of study from year 1 of secondary school to completion, because there will be classes of perhaps one or two students only. Each class requires a teacher. If students in our State high schools are to be given a curriculum guarantee (which are the words used in relation to this problem), the Minister will have to provide teachers. That means he will not be able to reduce the number of teachers in secondary schools and move them to primary schools as primary school enrolments go up. This is a very serious problem.

The other problem in the secondary system is that many high schools are completely over-enrolled. For example, Christies Beach High School has an enrolment of 1 550 students—an enormous number of students for any high school; neighbouring Morphett Vale High School has an enrolment of over 1 000 students, and so it goes on. However, other high schools, such as Dover High School and Seacombe High School, have enrolments of 300 to 400 students. A solution to this problem must be found, and the solution is not necessarily to build a new high school at a cost of \$8 million, plus the additional commissioning costs that flow from such an activity. It may well be, with the latest publicity we have had concerning the development of the south, that a new high school will eventually be needed at Seaford, but the answer is not necessarily to build a new high school every time this sort of situation occurs.

The answer must be to investigate other methods, and of course there are other methods such as the clustering of high schools or the teaching of certain subjects at one high school so that students are transported from school to school, buses being required. Some high schools could be turned into what were called matriculation colleges—they would now be called year 11 and year 12 colleges. The Minister stated that his officers are addressing the problem. I remind the Minister that he gave an undertaking in the Estimates

Committee to report to this House on future moves that the Department intends to make in this very important area. This is one of the great problems facing education.

I refer now to a question posed to me by four groups of students over the past few months. I say 'four groups of students' because I believe that it is most unusual for groups of students from various areas of education to approach members of Parliament with problems relating to their courses of study. A group of students from the DeLissa Institute approached me, the member for Coles, other members and the Minister, too, I understand, about the threatened alterations to the early childhood education course at the Institute. This matter has been canvassed in the House, and I do not intend to deal with it at length now, save to say that the Minister has set up a working party to report to him on this very important subject.

The member for Coles and I had the pleasure of visiting the DeLissa Institute only last week. I thank the Acting Director of the College, Dr Mayling, and her officers for making this opportunity available. I thank even more those members of staff from the DeLissa Institute who attended a discussion with the member for Coles and me on the working party and the matters surrounding the proposed alterations to the early childhood services course. I must tell the Minister that there are still very grave concerns about what is expected of the working party. For instance, I believe that the working party is not necessarily addressing enough time for discussion with members of the staff or students.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** At a critical time of the year, when they are facing examinations.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** A point was made at the meeting that exam time is approaching, and it may be a very inopportune time for the working party to discuss these matters with students. Nevertheless, it has a job to do. However, I was a little disappointed when I heard the number of hours for these discussions allocated by the working party. I am not suggesting that the working party should go out there and spend the whole day, but rather perhaps have a series of half-day seminars with the students and the staff. I mention that to the Minister who might like to pass on my comments to Mr Gilding and the appropriate authorities.

The second group of students who approached me recently have been doing the developmental disabilities course at the Sturt college campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. It appears that that course, which is a very important one and an initiative that I support very strongly, was started some 18 months ago. It was thought then that it was so important that it should be started, as indeed it was. However, we find that it is projected that there will be no new students in 1985 enrolled into the first year of the course, because of the financial problems of the South Australian College.

I believe that it is intended that perhaps 10 mental deficiency nurses will be enrolled in the second year of the course, but at the moment it is proposed that there be no enrolments in the first year of the developmental disabilities course. I mention that to the Minister, because the students are extremely upset about what they believe is a downgrading of their course, which is only 18 months old. It is a very important subject and is to be compared with the other group of students who approached me on the question of speech pathology.

I know that these students have also approached the Minister and that the matter has been canvassed in this House before. The Minister is looking at it. I suggest that the Minister also take the opportunity to look at what is

proposed to happen with the developmental disabilities course.

The fourth group of students who approached me recently are from the School of Printing and Graphic Arts at the Croydon College of Technical and Further Education. They gave me a petition, which I read into *Hansard* during the Estimates Committee. I hope that the Minister and his officers have taken particular note of the wording of that petition because it appears that the conditions at that college under which these students have to do their course are really reprehensible, to say the least. I understand that the school is conducted in the old Simpson Pope factory at Kilkenny (as a branch of the college) and that the conditions are absolutely substandard.

**Mr Meier:** The rain pours in through the roof.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** My colleague from Goyder has also been approached by the students and knows the problems that they and the staff have to endure at that college.

**Mr Hamilton:** This has all happened within 18 months.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am on to a separate subject. The honourable member should sit back and relax, and all will be revealed. I mention those four groups of students because it is unusual for this to happen in such a short time. It proves up the problems that the Minister is having with Technical and Further Education because of lack of resources. I have canvassed that matter at some length and I understand that the Minister wants to make a statement in future in response to some of my comments.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** It will be incorporated in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am glad that the Minister has taken my remarks in relation to TAFE seriously. I am glad that he always does.

**Mr Becker:** The School of Music—

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Indeed, we are waiting with interest to see the reply we get from the Minister on the future of Miss Diana Weekes, from the TAFE College of Music in Flinders Street. I sent the Minister a telegram about that, but I have not yet had a reply from his office.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** You're getting one.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I thank the Minister. As I mentioned, it proves the problems in funding that the Minister is having with Technical and Further Education and, of course, funding for the South Australian College of Advanced Education. We need to know what success the Minister is having in negotiating with the Commonwealth Minister about getting additional funds for these very important areas of education.

I now leave education and move to recreation and sport and the Estimates relating to that Department. Two extraordinary things have happened in relation to the recreation and sport estimates, one being the admission by the Minister that he has prepared no cost projections regarding the operating costs of the new aquatic centre. This centre, to be built in North Adelaide on the site of the Adelaide Swimming Centre, is presently under construction. However, there are no estimates of its future operating costs. The Minister, in reply to my questioning on this point—questioning resulting from an implied criticism by the Auditor-General, which brought this matter to my attention—said that it was impossible to prepare a projection because he did not know how many people would use the pool during the winter and that the only figures presently available were summer figures.

It is an extraordinary situation that a Government about to spend \$7.2 million, and we are not sure whether that is the final amount of taxpayers' money to be spent (even though some Commonwealth money is included, it is still taxpayers' money), has not done a cost projection on what

will be the operating costs of that aquatic centre and what it will cost the taxpayers of this State. Under present arrangements the Adelaide City Council will maintain its contribution to the operating costs of the centre as it has in the past for the Adelaide Swimming Centre and the Government will provide taxpayers' money to meet increased operating costs—yet no cost projections have been done. When the former Government intended to build an aquatic centre in Hindley Street accurate cost projections were prepared.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They weren't that accurate.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Accurate cost projections were done. In fact, we altered the design in an attempt to make the proposed aquatic centre self-supporting. I find it absolutely extraordinary that the Minister can sit here and interject in an asinine manner when he has done nothing, not even used normal business and commercial practice, to find out what will be the operating costs of this centre. I think that it is an indictment of the Minister that the Auditor-General was forced to make that statement in his report. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Auditor-General on that report, because it is certainly the best Auditor-General's Report I have seen in many a long year.

The aquatic centre construction will be completed in March or April of the coming year. There have been delays, I understand, in construction of the project. I understand, also, that a tragic accident occurred a couple of weeks ago. I was very sorry to hear about that. Nevertheless, I am extremely concerned about the delays occurring with this project. The Minister said, in answer to a question, that these delays were caused by the weather 'and other things'. We would like to know what are those other things. Let the Minister tell us that when he provides his supplementary information to this House: what has caused these delays to the project? What is the actual estimated inflated cost of construction of these premises?

**Mr Becker:** Is it \$10 million?

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I understand that the sum will be in double figures. Let us wait for the Minister to tell us what that amount will be, because in answer to a question he said that he thought the amount was about \$7.2 million.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** During the Estimates Committees debates I had the opportunity of sitting on the committee in relation to the lines of the Minister of Water Resources, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Lands, and I agree that the committees were conducted in a very satisfactory manner. If I have any criticism it is that unfortunately time did not permit all the issues contained in the Estimates lines in the yellow books and the Auditor-General's Report to be canvassed. However, there are opportunities in this Parliament to continue to canvass some of the other issues from time to time.

However, I would like this evening to make one or two comments in relation to the responses that I received from Ministers in the various committees in which I was able to participate. First, in relation to the lines under the Minister of Water Resources I had the opportunity to probe at length the situation that exists particularly in relation to water filtration and the programme that the present Government is pursuing in that matter. While filtration of the metropolitan water supply is extremely important, it is not a life and death matter. However, when one considers the filtration of the northern towns water supply there is no doubt that it is a life and death matter; the longer the Government

delays in completing the filtration of that water supply, the longer the people of the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula will be at risk from the dreaded amoebic meningitis.

I do not have to remind members of this House of the performance put on by the Government, when in Opposition in 1980, when a case of amoebic meningitis occurred in Whyalla. Members of the present Government held the then Liberal Government fairly and squarely responsible for that case of amoebic meningitis, even though it had been in office for only some 12 weeks and, preceding that, the Labor Government had been in office for about 10 years. This problem cannot be resolved in the short term. The only answer to the amoebic meningitis problem is filtration to enable the proper treatment of the water supply of the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula so that the *Naegleria fowleri* can be effectively eliminated from the water supply.

The nature of the supply in the northern towns, and the distance the water must travel in trunk mains which are built above the ground and which during the height of summer build up considerable heat enable the *Naegleria fowleri* organism to become active, and thus cause amoebic meningitis.

During my questioning of the Minister of Water Resources the best answer I could get regarding filtration of the northern towns water supply was in the vicinity of 10 years. We proceeded post haste with the design and letting of contracts for the construction of the first of the two plants necessary to be built to filter the northern towns water.

The first plant being constructed at Morgan is proceeding satisfactorily. However, virtually no work has been done on the Swan Reach/Stockwell water filtration plant. Water for the northern towns comes from an integrated scheme from two points on the Murray River: Swan Reach and Morgan. The fact that it is an integrated system means that water from Swan Reach can transfer into the Morgan part of the system, and vice versa. The people of the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula can be assured that their water supply is perfectly safe only when both the Morgan and Stockwell filtration plants are operational.

The best that the Minister of Water Resources could do was inform the Estimates Committee that somewhere in the next 10 years the Swan Reach/Stockwell filtration plant would be built. When one considers the attitude adopted by the present Government back in 1980 in relation to amoebic meningitis and the attitude it has today in Government, there is absolutely no comparison. I claim, and I think the people of the northern towns will readily agree, that the attitude adopted by the Government clearly shows that it is gambling with human life by not placing the development of the Swan Reach/Stockwell water filtration plant on an extremely high priority.

Until that plant is built and both the Morgan and Stockwell filtration plants are operational there is no way that this Government, or any other Government, can guarantee that the people of the northern towns are safe from amoebic meningitis. It was a sad day for the people of those towns when they were told by the Minister of Water Resources that it could be up to another 10 years before this safety could be guaranteed. That is not good enough. If a further tragedy strikes the people of the northern towns, then the whole of South Australia will hold this Government responsible for whatever disaster occurs. The warning has been given, and given on numerous occasions, that this disease can attack at any time. If the Government is not prepared to get its priorities in order and is prepared to gamble with human life, then the public of South Australia should be aware of what it is doing.

I also raised with the Minister of Water Resources during the Estimates Committees the Government's lack of activity in salinity control measures for Murray River water. The Government has been in office for some two years and, to the best of my knowledge, little action has been taken by it to initiate meaningful discussions with this State, Victoria, New South Wales and the Federal Government concerning the major capital works programme that would be necessary to control the salinity problem. This is all part and parcel of what I was talking about in relation to water filtration. Water filtration may remove the turbidity from the water, but it certainly will not remove the chemicals. I have a couple of chemists sitting behind me who would readily agree with that statement: they would be well aware that all the filtration in the world will not remove chemicals, particularly salinity in the form of sodium chloride, from the Murray River.

Until we can tackle both the salinity and turbidity problems, the quality of water supplied in South Australia, particularly for domestic consumption, is a long way off being of a high standard. I come back to the question of what the Government has done during its two years in office. In fact, it has done nothing. I tried to highlight the fact that improved irrigation practices for salinity control provided some of the most effective known means of controlling salinity in the Murray River system. The fact that the Government has not been prepared to initiate and put into effect an 'on farm' improved irrigation practices scheme is a clear indication of the very low priority that the total salinity control measure has.

It has been widely recognised throughout the Western world that the most effective means of controlling salinity in most of the river systems is to treat the cause or base of the problem. The base of the problem is principally bad irrigation practices. If we can treat the cause of the problem on the farm, we will largely eliminate the problem of saline ground water moving back into the river. This is certainly the manner in which it has been tackled in other parts of the world but, unfortunately, the Federal Government on coming to office immediately dismantled the Bicentennial Water Resources Programme put into place by the previous Government—a programme that would have provided much needed funds for 'on farm' improved irrigation practices. Until the South Australian Government takes the initiative to do something about it, it is a clear indication that the whole business of water quality in South Australia is of an extremely low priority.

Some 12 months ago I suggested to the Premier that it would be a good idea if in 1986 South Australia was to host an international conference on irrigation, drainage and salinity as it affects the major water supplies of this State. In fact, it would involve other States also, particularly in relation to the Murray/Darling system. At that time the Premier gave an indication that he believed the proposal had merit.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are three conferences going on opposite the honourable member for Chaffey and I hope that they would cease. The honourable member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Unfortunately, I do not expect members opposite to understand what I am saying, so it does not matter greatly. The present Government has shown a lack of interest in this problem. Be that as it may, the problem will not go away even if members opposite intend to continue to ignore it. Some 12 months ago I raised the suggestion with the Premier that an international conference should be held. I raised the matter on two or three subsequent occasions in this House with little success. Many of the international figures involved in controlling the salinity



problem in various parts of the world were very eager to come to Australia principally because of the participation by Australians in international conferences overseas on this vital subject.

International engineers and scientists have become particularly interested in the problems of the Murray/Darling system because it is a major river network recognised as one of the significant river systems in the world. Also, the problems that we have are very similar to the problems that are encountered in other parts, and those engineers and scientists were very eager to come to Australia for a conference so that they could take the opportunity of looking first-hand at what we are doing in Australia and draw comparisons between our problems and the problems that they are encountering in their own countries.

It would have been a golden opportunity for the State Government to promote an international conference of this nature during the Jubilee 150 year in 1986. Unfortunately, the Government has failed to respond to that request. It is a great disappointment to many scientists from other parts of the world and, because the South Australian Government has failed to respond, a further international conference is currently being organised in the United States at a time when it should have been held here in 1986.

I refer to a letter that I received from the Executive Director of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum dated 14 September 1984; it indicates the particular interest in this whole subject. The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum is made up of representatives of the seven basin States of the Colorado River system. In some respects, it is a forum like the River Murray Commission, which has an overview of the total river system with all of its tributaries. The Executive Director wrote to me last month, and the letter states:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a report that was recently released by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey. We have experienced, in the past two years, record flows in the Colorado River, and the salinity levels have decreased significantly.

We have learned that in some of the major reservoirs there were salts in storage in stratified layers at depth. These record flows have served to purge the reservoirs of these stored salts and in the process, because of the volume of water, the salinity levels were not significantly increased by the releases of salts from the reservoirs. It has been an interesting period of time and I felt that the enclosed report might be of interest to you as you address the problems on the River Murray.

We are moving ahead with various other reviews. The enclosed publication of the Forum is an analysis that is required by Federal law for the States to make every three years. We are still struggling with the passage of legislation in the Congress. We are also actively engaged in a new evaluation of the number of projects that will need to be built in the Colorado River to reduce salt loading if we are to continue to stay below the numeric criteria in the years ahead.

Recently I had a discussion with Dr French of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. It appears that I will be serving on a committee that will be attempting to put together another international conference on salinity two or three years from now.

So, the conference, which should have been held here in Adelaide in 1986 and which would have brought key figures from all around the world during our sesquicentenary year, will now have to be held once again in the United States because of the lack of initiative or foresight by the Government of South Australia. What that letter and the reports forwarded to me from the United States clearly indicate is that, unless the major salinity control programmes (which have been clearly identified in past years) are continued in their order of priority and constructed to control salinity and to divert known inflows of salinity away from the river, then the battle ultimately will be lost.

It is an ongoing programme. Unfortunately, since the change of Government both in this State and federally the

whole salinity control programme in the Murray/Darling system has ground to a halt. The other day the River Murray Commission put out a proposal calling for ideas from the Australian public in regard to the salinity problem of the river system. Many studies have been undertaken by consultants. The River Murray Commission is well aware of the priority work that needs to be undertaken.

Whilst the River Murray Commission gives the public an opportunity to contribute (and there is certainly nothing wrong with that), much evidence is already available that will enable the Commission to get on with the job and get some of the major capital works started and operational as quickly as possible. However, that will only occur if the Federal and State Governments provide the funds. There is absolutely no need or reason for the delay to continue. Throwing the whole salinity control programme open for public debate is merely a delaying tactic by both State and Federal Governments, because they are unwilling to provide the necessary moneys in order to get on with the job.

There is absolutely no doubt that many projects have been investigated and eventually they will have to be built. I refer to the report 'A Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problems', developed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in 1981. The report clearly sets out priorities based on the evidence then available from a number of consultants engaged over recent years.

One of the most effective salinity control measures is improved on-farm irrigation practices. That measure does not need any further research. That programme could get underway tomorrow if both State and Federal Governments were willing to come to the party and provide the necessary funds. The only reason that that programme is not under way now is because the present State and Federal Governments regard the whole issue of water quality as a low priority. The people of South Australia will suffer more from that position than people in any other State.

The other matter that I refer to in the few minutes remaining to me is the effect of ever increasing electricity charges in South Australia and their effect on small business, irrigation, and on every South Australian householder. I will make one or two comparisons. According to ETSA, the average quarterly M tariff consumption for an all electric household (without an electric storage heater) is 1 300 kilowatt hours per quarter. The impact of the Bannan Government's increased tariff rates on the average M tariff consumer is illustrated by examination of the average quarterly account. I refer to the increases announced in December 1982. At that time the average quarterly account was \$94.59. The 12.1 increase at that time brought the account to \$106.28.

A further 12.4 per cent increase announced in November 1983 took it up to \$119.28. In November 1984 there will be a further 12.2 per cent increase. As of June 1982 the average M tariff account was \$84.40. The latest increase has lifted the quarterly bill by \$34.88, or 41.3 per cent, to \$119.28—a rise well in excess of the CPI movement for Adelaide between June 1982 and June 1984, which was only 19.7 per cent. In other words, the CPI movement was 19.7 per cent, but the ETSA increase amounts to 41.3 per cent.

What is the impact on small business? The cost of electricity is a major factor in the determination of retail prices in processing, manufacturing and point of sale. Already, industry leaders have warned of likely increases in the cost of food and other commodities. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* without my reading it a table which clearly indicates the increases between 1982 and 1984.

**The SPEAKER:** Do you undertake that it is within the guidelines?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Yes, Mr Speaker.  
Leave granted.



QUARTERLY ACCOUNT—GENERAL PURPOSE CONSUMERS  
(For other than Domestic, Industrial or Farm Consumption)

Approximate Usage*	Account June 1982	Increase announced 1.12.82	Increase announced 1.11.83	Increase announced 1.11.84	Annual Cost with new Tariffs	Per cent increase since June 1982	Per cent increase CPI Adelaide 1982-84
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		
Small shop with refrigeration (1 000 kWh per qtr).....	135.60	151.45	169.52	189.86	759.44	+40.0	
Suburban supermarket (12 500 kWh per qtr).....	1 149.26	1 287.03	1 440.24	1 613.10	6 452.40	+40.4	+19.7
Large shop (50 000 kWh per qtr)....	3 819.26	4 283.28	4 792.74	5 366.85	21 467.40	+40.5	
Very large shop (250 000 kWh per qtr).....	16 706.13	18 744.45	20 969.82	23 481.41	93 925.64	+40.6	

\* Approximate usage levels obtained from ETSA

\*\* Source ABS Cat. 6401.0 (underlying CPI increase for Adelaide)

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The table will make it easy for readers to determine the exact impact of the increases. Under the ETSA legislation, the Trust is required to pay the State Government a levy of 5 per cent on its annual revenue from sales of electricity. In 1981-82 the amount collected by the Government from this source was \$14.8 million. Following the recent tariff increase it is estimated that ETSA will pay the Government approximately \$26 million during 1984-85, an increase of 76 per cent under the Bannon Government. In addition, during 1983-84 the Government increased the interest rate on State Government loans to the Trust from 6.4 per cent to 12.2 per cent, and the rearrangement increased ETSA's debt-servicing costs to the Government during the year by some \$12 million.

Overall, when the royalties that the Government collects from ETSA's consumption of natural gas are taken into consideration, the Government receives around \$42 million from ETSA in its operations this year. That is a tax on consumers of some \$42 million, which the State Government is dragging out of the electricity undertaking in this State. It is a tax that the people of this State can no longer afford. It is hitting not only the home owner but particularly the small business undertakings in this State, whether they are shopkeepers, irrigators or any other form of small business undertaking that one likes to name.

An increase of some 40 per cent during the term of the Bannon Government, when there was a CPI increase of about only 19 per cent, is nothing short of scandalous. I am certain that when this really hits home to the people of South Australia—and many of them are becoming painfully aware of it right now—their attitude towards the present Government will change dramatically.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** It is not my intention to speak very long in this debate, but since I have been in this House I have never missed an opportunity to represent my district. I refer to the need for child care services in the Henley Beach area. I was a member of the Estimates Committee which examined the Community Welfare vote. Until the new Office of Children's Services is established, it is the responsibility of the Children's Services Research Team to negotiate with the Commonwealth regarding the location, siting and design of child care centres.

The Commonwealth-State agreement involves the State providing land and expertise, with the Department of Community Welfare being responsible for the location and siting of centres to Public Buildings Department design standards, and the Commonwealth being responsible for capital and recurrent funding. The State and Commonwealth Governments are committed to the concept that access to community child care is a right and are currently developing the preliminary stages of a universal system. To achieve this object, the allocation of resources to child care centres

is to be made on a planning model basis on needs rather than on the present submission-based model. Models for targeting our capital resources take into account the number of children in a target age group and the present supply of child care places. The development of a data base estimate of the number of children in a target age group is related to the expected demand for child care places within local government areas. I understand that because local government areas vary in size and population regional areas are being considered.

A long and complicated procedure is involved in the establishment of child care centres and includes the demand for child care places, geographic locations, taking into account the matter of access for children and parents, the availability of trained staff, the assumption that 40 places is the minimum requirement for the establishment of a child care centre, the placement to make the best use of very scarce funds, the need to find appropriate sites, bearing in mind whether or not the State owns the land, and the need for co-operation of local government, especially when seeking land and sites.

Unfortunately, the criteria involved with the placement of child care centres mitigates against the establishment of a child care centre in the coastal area around Henley and Grange. Henley and Grange has been identified as an area in need of a child care centre. Statistics reveal that of the local government areas with no facilities at present for children from a few months old to four years old, Henley and Grange ranks third. Munno Para heads the list with 2 937 children; Port Lincoln comes next with 781 children; Henley and Grange follows with 743 children; Payneham is next with 683 children, and so on. The primary difficulty that I envisage arises from the fact that child care needs in the Henley and Grange area are rather different from those in other areas.

The centre would need to provide occasional care for about 25 to 30 children. However, that number of children is below what is considered to be the optimum number for the provision of a funded child care centre, namely 40. A need exists for care facilities for young children for short periods of time, perhaps for no more than three hours a week or 12 hours a month. The need is slightly different from that applying to child care centres in other metropolitan areas. Fortunately, or unfortunately, depending on which way one looks at it, the number of working mothers in coastal areas is less than that in the inner metropolitan area. However, this does not reduce the need for a child care centre in the Henley and Grange area.

Many young mothers, for example, would like to continue their studies at the Port Adelaide community college annex at Jetty Street, Grange. Because of the lack of child care facilities, this objective is not available to them. It would seem to me to be highly desirable that a child care provision

be available for Henley and Grange in order to provide the opportunities for young mothers to continue with this activity.

It is my belief (and I have not had any opportunity to provide accurate studies on this subject) that the current downturn in the employment situation has led to unemployment for working mothers who under normal circumstances would in fact be working and that, therefore, the statistics in this area would be of greater benefit and more assistance in gaining finance for this operation.

I have stated on previous occasions that unfortunately we live in a world that is governed by statistics and, so far as community welfare services are concerned, the coastal area has a problem in that the sea is on one side: some of the nearby inner city areas have the advantage of being landlocked and therefore are able to provide for a better statistical base in order to gather these facilities. So, it is true to say that the criteria that determines the introduction of a child care service (that is, for children in the special needs group) that is determined from time to time and given priority does not necessarily apply to my area, because of this geographical situation, and I hope that the Department for Community Welfare gives due consideration to the special needs of the mothers of Henley and Grange in determining whether a child care service ought to be introduced into this area in the near future.

In summary, I point out that the number of children in the Henley and Grange area, according to the Australian statistical data for 1981, was 743 for the 0-4 year old age group and 891 for the 5-9 year old age group. The 1981 number of family heads with dependants equalled 287 families, which is 4.78 per cent of all families. This is an increase on the 1976 number of family heads with dependants, which represented 3.9 per cent of all families. Apart from informal care networks, family day care co-ordinated by the Department for Community Welfare is the only child care 'service' operating in Henley and Grange. At present there are 11 mothers caring for other women's children in their own homes under this scheme. This provides placement for only 35 children (as at August 1984). However, the scheme cannot meet the demand: additional mothers requiring care for their children in this scheme are at present refused because insufficient places are available.

In addition, there is little capacity for this scheme to expand as one co-ordinator is responsible not only for Henley and Grange but also for the Thebarton and West Torrens area. It has been reported to me that at the Grange CYSS office an average of six inquiries a week are made from participants who cannot do a course because no child care is available. So, we can see that the need for a child care centre in Henley and Grange is great. This is especially related to educational courses for mothers who cannot attend because of the lack of child care, and I would urge either the new office of children's services or the existing children's services research team to look very carefully at this situation.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles):** I would like to refer to the Estimates Committee investigation of the health and tourism budgets. Some publicity has been given to the health budget and to the manner in which the Minister of Health dealt—or I should say failed to deal—with the Opposition's questions about that budget. In seven years in the House of Assembly I have never encountered a situation such as the one with which the Opposition was confronted in dealing with the health budget. The Minister filibustered, he was prolix and insulting, and he continually poured self-praise upon himself and invective upon the Opposition.

**Mr Becker:** It was sick.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I believe that it was one of the most disgraceful performances ever witnessed by this House by a Minister dealing with a very important

matter indeed, namely, the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I have done a quick tally (and it is only a quick tally; I would not say it is precise by any means) of the number of questions that were put to the Ministers of Health and Tourism and, by way of comparison, of the number of questions that were put to the Attorney-General in the Estimates Committees.

The House may be interested in the substance of that survey, and I stress that it is not precise. Sometimes an honourable member can ask a question which may be a double or even a triple barrelled question, and I have simply counted each go as a single question. Sometimes an honourable member can put a question by way of interjection and a Minister will answer it.

However, in the space of 8½ hours the Minister of Health had only 40 questions put to him in that considerable length of time. He did not answer those 40 questions by any means, but only 40 questions were able to be put to him because of the extreme length of his answers. One answer took the greater part of an hour. By contrast, the Minister of Tourism was asked and answered 60 questions in the space of 4½ hours. That is by comparison with the Minister of Health—40 questions in the space of 8½ hours.

The Attorney-General (in dealing with that portfolio and with the portfolios of Consumer Affairs and Corporate Affairs, as well as electoral matters) answered more than 170 questions in 8½ hours. I put to it to members of the Government that their colleague who holds the portfolio of Minister of Health did no service to the Government, to the Parliament or to the taxpayer in the way he handled—or mishandled—the health Estimates Committee.

The Opposition has already given notice that the Minister of Health will not be allowed to get away with his conduct and misconduct in the Estimates Committee, and in another place he will be questioned on the health budget. It is an absolute disgrace, because it is a budget that affects the lives of South Australians from birth until death. It is a unique budget in that it includes a portfolio that has emotional overtones—we are dealing with life and death, with health and sickness, people's futures and personal happiness in a way that could possibly only be compared, in terms of human services, with the education budget, but even that does not involve the intensity of human feeling nor the cost to the taxpayer—I am referring not just to the State Government but to the South Australian and Australian taxpayers—and in the way that the health budget does.

That the Opposition was able to put only 40 questions to the Minister of Health, not all of which were answered and many of which just simply could not come near to dealing with critical matters to do with the health portfolio, is an absolute disgrace, and the Minister of Health should be condemned by his own colleagues for that. I believe that it would be fair to say that those of the Minister's colleagues who were in that Committee were embarrassed by his performance. I want to refer particularly to one aspect of the Minister's statement on that budget. The question of the budget of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was addressed by the Committee at some length.

The Minister's responses to the quite searching questions asked by several members of the Committee in relation to this matter appear at page 128 of *Hansard* of 26 September 1984, where he says:

I will comment when people play politics on political matters: I think that I have a right and a duty to comment. However, I refuse absolutely to meddle in administrative matters.

The Minister was there referring to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital budget. The State Budget is the prime instrument of a Government's policy. Any Budget, either State or Commonwealth, is the principal way in which a Government implements its policies. A Budget determines who gets what,

and why. It is nothing if it is not a matter of policy. No Minister can ever dismiss a Budget as being an administrative matter in which he will not meddle.

It makes an absolute farce of Ministerial responsibility for such a statement to be made, yet the Minister of Health continually passed matters to do with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital budget to his officers on the grounds that they were administrative matters and therefore matters in which he would not deign to meddle. That is not good enough: no Minister can be allowed to get away with a statement like that. It makes a complete mockery of the role of a Minister—the highest office that can be bestowed on a member of Parliament. One of the greatest responsibilities in the Cabinet is that of the Minister of Health, for the reasons I have outlined, and because of the immense amounts of taxpayers' funds that are spent under that portfolio.

There was no opportunity for the Opposition to question the Minister about the huge range and diversity of matters within the health services. The Minister did not see to it that the basic documentation, which has traditionally been provided to members before the House adjourns prior to the Budget Estimates Committees, was provided. That documentation did not get into my hands at all as lead questioner for the Opposition. It was provided to some members of the Committee on the eve of the Estimates debate. That is not good enough.

There were approximately 40 pages of detailed figures which needed careful study if questioning was to be effective. The fact that I did not receive a copy of that information, and that other members received it at the eleventh hour, shows that the Minister not only has failed to master policy matters in relation to the Budget but also has not mastered basic administrative procedures: he could not get his act together to ensure that House of Assembly members were provided with the basic information that they have traditionally received prior to their asking questions on the health estimates.

That is not good enough. It was a deplorable performance, and the Minister will be held responsible for that performance when questioning on the Budget takes place in another place. As I have said before, I contrast this with the Minister of Tourism's performance: he dealt with questions in a factual way, and there was a notable absence of invective and insult and no evidence of the lack of courtesy that characterised the conduct of the Minister of Health.

**Mr Becker:** The Minister of Tourism conducts his portfolio very well, doesn't he?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** He has a pleasant portfolio and is certainly doing his best with it. There are times when I can congratulate him; I commend him for the manner in which he conducted the Estimates Committee, and his colleagues for the manner in which they gave way to the Opposition to allow our questioning to be quite substantial. It was not a case of turn and turn about but of the Opposition having free rein in questioning the Minister. It is in relation to tourism matters that I will speak tonight. The more that one looks at the tourism portfolio the more one realises that South Australia will only succeed in terms of comparison with its competitors if it can develop its product to a point that its quality is competitive with the quality of interstate products. Our marketing can be the best in the country, and I believe that it is, but unless what we are selling is worthy of that marketing then repeat and continuous business will simply not come.

When one looks around the State at the things that need doing in order to make our product competitive, one is in the main looking at very basic facilities and services or standards of service as the case may be, and I want to refer particularly to regional airports. Because South Australia is a decentralised State in terms of its visitor attractions,

although it is a highly centralised State in terms of its population density, the greater part being in the Adelaide metropolitan area, it is obviously essential that we permit visitor access that is quick, easy and safe to those decentralised regions.

Whilst the majority of visitors will travel by private car to any of these destinations, a significant proportion, particularly of visitors from the international market who have at most a few days to spend in South Australia, will travel by intrastate aircraft. The question of regional airports has been raised with the Government on various occasions and I want to deal with it in some detail tonight because I think that it is reaching the critical stage. I think that it would be probably almost two years since I heard the Minister speak at Mount Gambier and refer in fairly positive terms to the upgrading that would take place at the Mount Gambier Airport as a result of co-operation between the State Government, local government, the local industry and community, and the Federal Government.

As far as I am aware, not a stick or a shingle has altered at the Mount Gambier Airport since that speech by the Minister. There has certainly been no redevelopment of the airport; the terminal is as shabby now as it was two years ago. The Minister's fine words do not appear to have borne any fruit. I stress that, because Mount Gambier is in the centre of very important visitor attractions in the South-East, notably relating to the wine industry in the Coonawarra district, the limestone caves and the softwood forests, it has the potential to be an important attraction for international visitors. There are certain facilities—Padthaway would be notable among them—that have the capacity to attract high spending international visitors, perhaps not in great numbers but the expenditure would be significant.

They will not be attracted and will not tell their friends to go there if their first impression is of a very shabby asbestos terminal. The Minister may have made representations to the Federal Government. If he has, they have been what one might call clandestine representations. There have been none of the promotional campaigns that I think are absolutely essential if South Australia is to convince the Federal Government of a well merited case for attention for its regional airports. We have to jump up and down far more effectively than we have done. I am happy to back the Minister in regard to this: it would certainly be a bipartisan approach.

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am about to deal with Coober Pedy. However, if the Queensland Government can achieve not one, not two, but three international airports and the upgrading of its regional airports, surely to goodness South Australia can manage to achieve basic facilities in its regional airports. The Coober Pedy Airport is another critically important regional airport as far as international visitors are concerned. I have a letter (and I know that the Minister has a copy of this letter) from Tom and Pat Campagna of Coober Pedy Tours who have written to the Federal Minister for Transport drawing his attention to the appalling state of the airstrip at Coober Pedy, despite the fact that it was resurfaced barely two years ago.

That airstrip is now classified as being in a dangerous condition and, as a result, East West Airlines from Sydney has cancelled its tour itinerary to Coober Pedy. This itinerary was to have commenced in March 1985 and was to consist of six large groups of approximately 40 passengers in each group. If we assume that each of those passengers would spend—and this is a conservative estimate—\$50 during a stay in Coober Pedy—

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** That would be half an opal.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Well, let us double it and say \$100 for accommodation. Let us not assume that

they would have bought a single opal, although that would be the purpose of the trip. So, 240 people at \$100 is \$24 000. If one applies the multiplier effect, about \$60 000 is lost to Coober Pedy as a result of the condition of the airstrip. There is no other reason. The East West Airlines tour itinerary was a pilot itinerary and, if it had been successful—and there is no reason to think that it would not have been—it would have undoubtedly been a regular monthly tour to Coober Pedy. One can see that Coober Pedy will now be losing hundreds of thousands of dollars of tourist income per annum as a result of the condition of that airstrip.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** And South Australia, too. It is quite often the gateway into South Australia.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** As the Minister points out, Coober Pedy can be the gateway to South Australia from the Eastern States and it is quite likely that people would fly from Sydney to Coober Pedy and down to Adelaide and possibly out to Perth or Melbourne. This is a critically serious situation and one that must be dealt with. The State Government must undertake a public campaign. It is no use sending polite letters to the Minister behind the scenes. There must be a public campaign to alert all South Australians to what is being lost as a result of the condition of the airstrip.

Although it is not always profitable to go back over mistakes that have been made—it sometimes is—there is a heavy responsibility resting on the Outback Areas Trust for accepting a tender and a job that was clearly inadequate at the time it was done. I believe that the contractor who carried out the work on the airstrip should have been sued for failing to complete the job properly. From what I have been told and from what appears in the letter, the Outback Areas Trust that commissioned the sealing of the airstrip would have had a very good case in court for suing the contractor. The Campagna letter states:

As most of our work comes from the airport, we spend a lot of time out there, and we could see the type of construction work that was being carried out, we did a lot of complaining to various departments to try to stop the work from being completed until someone that knew something could come and inspect before the seal went on. (Even a two-year old could see that it was a rip off job.) But who were we? We were told to mind our own business. That strip cost taxpayers \$380 000 and it is now of no use to anyone; there is no point in doing a patch up job, as that's been done three times already, even before it was opened. We know that the base is no good, so the only solution is to rip it up and start again from scratch properly this time.

That is an absolute disgrace—\$380 000 of taxpayers' money wasted; hundreds of thousands of dollars of tourism income foregone and all because the Outback Areas Trust did not see it got value for money when the airstrip was sealed. Coober Pedy is a very important airstrip. Mount Gambier, Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln are also very important regional airstrips. Although the terminal at Port Lincoln is not much, it is not too bad and at least there is now access for the disabled.

I refer to the Hawker airstrip. Right at the entrance to the Flinders Ranges we should have an airstrip that can accommodate executive aircraft, but the Hawker airstrip cannot. The only way that we are going to ensure that we capitalise on the Flinders Ranges as an attraction that fascinates and enchants the Japanese, the North Americans and the Germans is by giving them quick access to that airport.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** Last week was the first time an executive jet came to the Port Augusta airport and—

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Minister points out that Port Augusta airport is inadequate. I have had personal experience of trying to land at that airport with strong winds and high thermals.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** It is a little better now, but not the standard you are aspiring to.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, we must have the standard. These are bread and butter issues. We can spend a fortune on marketing, and attract hundreds of thousands of visitors to this State, but if we cannot provide basic facilities of a proper standard ensuring safe easy access to our regions by air, we cannot get to first base. These things do not fall immediately within the responsibility of the Minister of Tourism. Yet, they comprise the greatest responsibility of the Minister because they rely on his role as an advocate with his Cabinet colleagues, with his Federal Cabinet counterparts and as an advocate publicly. There must be much more of this in South Australia if we are going—

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** Criticise the Minister of Local Government, because he has a role as well!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, the Minister of Local Government should sit there and blush because he also has a role as an advocate, and one would expect the Minister on the front bench to be doubly eloquent and doubly energetic and to never rest until he has convinced the authorities that regional airports in South Australia are a matter of high priority if we are to develop tourism along the lines that we want to see it developed in South Australia.

I also refer to another matter related to tourism, to the product and product development. The basic product is there. I refer to the Victor Harbor railway. I want to deal with two aspects of it. That railway journey from Adelaide to Victor Harbor has been described by senior officers of Australian National as the most beautiful rail journey in the whole of Australia. That is a big claim to make when one thinks of the spectacular rail journeys we have in Australia. Because of the unique nature of that journey that embodies the beautiful scenery of the Adelaide Hills, the pastoral country of Strathalbyn and the lakes district, and the magnificent coastal district from Goolwa to Victor Harbor, one can see that the claim is well justified.

I do not underestimate the difficulties of a State Government confronted with a Commonwealth statutory authority that has a legislative requirement that it should operate on a commercial basis. That is well understood by people on both sides of the Parliament. However, when the Minister of Transport, the Hon. Roy Abbott, completely failed to raise any objection whatsoever when the Federal Government decided to close that passenger line, we lost a very strong moral bargaining advantage in the case now before arbitration. That was a sell out of the worst order. Whatever the Minister knew to be the realities and the difficulties, to sit there and not only not object but to agree to the closing, knowing that by so doing he was handing on a plate one of his strongest bargaining points before arbitration, was an absolute betrayal of the State Government's responsibilities in fighting to retain a very important asset, the nature of which is changing as the times change.

I do not think that anyone seriously suggests that a passenger railway to Victor Harbor, in the sense of a commuter railway, is a viable proposition, but let anyone in this House tell me that a tourism railway from Adelaide to Victor Harbor is not a viable proposition, and I will say that they have no imagination, no concept of either product development or marketing, and that they should get on that train and follow it from Adelaide to Victor just to see for themselves what a superb product it is.

The Minister has failed to raise any objection to an arbitrator who is not a South Australian and who, I understand, has an impressive record of closing down railways. If that happens, there will be most serious consequences. The tourist trains that have been running as a result of the efforts of Steamranger over the past few weeks have been

a brilliant success. The product in my opinion needs not only imaginative marketing, it needs development. I was very impressed with the South Coast Limited proposition which was put to me and which I know has been put to the Minister. I certainly would like to find out in due course what the Department's response to that proposition has been, what the recommendations have been and what the Government's action on the recommendations will be. It would be an absolute tragedy if South Australia lost that very precious resource. I think that, in changing times and with different attitudes, increasing levels of nostalgia for steam trains, for train journeys, for the peaceful possibility of getting from A to B without the rush and bustle of being behind a steering wheel or indeed, sitting on a bus, those things will develop very much in future and South Australia will be the poorer if we lose that.

Regarding the proposal for a walk from Adelaide to Victor along that trail, alongside the railway, I believe that the proposal put forward by Mr Robert Clyne is one that has great merit and one that could be developed. There has been some correspondence in the letters to the Editor column in the *Advertiser* on this subject, and I simply refer to a letter entitled 'Turn again, Williams' signed by Mr Robert Clyne, of Millswood, which refuted the arguments that the General Manager of Australian National had put in opposition to the suggestion.

I hope the Minister of Tourism feels, as I do, that this has a lot of potential. Again, it encapsulates the desire to be in the outdoors and at the same time to have access to some very charming hospitality and accommodation along the way: Mount Barker, Strathalbyn, Goolwa, exquisite old pubs. One could go around Australia and not find more impressive nineteenth century small country town pubs that can offer hospitality to the weary walker.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** The Adelaide Hills are marvellous for walking and cycling trips and tours.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** They are indeed. The Minister and I are of one mind on this. I hope to have his enthusiastic support for Mr Clyne's suggestions. In the *Advertiser* of 7 September, Mr Clyne states, referring to safety:

It should also be remembered that there is only one train service a week from Mount Barker Junction to Strathalbyn, and none from Strathalbyn to Victor Harbor. Apart from the Steamranger weekly tours, there is little risk of train/hiker accidents—particularly if there is a proper walking trail to follow.

That is what I am advocating: the blazing, if one likes—

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

**Mr RODDA (Victoria):** I have not made many speeches during this session, and I suppose it may be the last time that I am in this House when this Government presents a Budget. I would imagine that, good judges as I think they are, they would not want to have a short run. We have seen five Premiers fall as the result of having short runs and I am sure the Premier would not want to be the sixth one. So, perhaps, I will see another Budget.

For that reason I will make a short speech tonight on the Budget. General opinion (I think Mr Hawke will probably find this out) shows that people do not like short terms. Governments are elected for a term and are expected to serve that term out.

I have listened to the debate thus far. It is customary to belt the ears off the Government and the Treasurer, and that has gone on for the 20 years that I have been here. Indeed, I think the position has become worse as we have gone down the track. I remember what transpired as a member of the Hall Government in drawing up Budgets, and I had similar experience in the Tonkin Government:

there is never enough money to go around. I remember the first Budget with which I was associated in the Steele Hall days. The heads of my departments came to me and the departments indicated what they needed to carry out their responsibilities in the State; they indicated what was necessary to be raised in regard to recurrent expenditure and provide for expansion, as demanded by the populace. Along with all the requests from my colleagues, our request was eventually considered by the Budget boys and the next thing we knew was that we faced cuts of about 50 per cent. Such are the decisions that face the Government. That position has not been mentioned at all here. We all want to see more things done.

I refer to the source of funding from the Federal Government through reimbursements and various forms of taxation. Certainly, income tax is not in the province of the State Government; we saw that go overboard in 1927 in the financial agreement, and that was ratified during the Playford years. As Tom Playford said, 'We never really wanted it back.' That should be said, and perhaps I should be the one to say it after 20 years here. Treasurers, whoever they are, have that restraint upon them. The Premier is in no different a position in this year of grace 1984 than was the then Treasurer in 1969-70, which seems so long ago and which saw my being a member of Cabinet for the first time.

As much as members castigate the Treasurer (it happens on both sides), we should not lose sight of that. Three-quarters of the population have had the advantage of secondary or tertiary education. They are perceptive and know what is going on. The House should not lose sight of that. People are no longer beholden to the Liberal Party or the Labor Party as they were when I first came to this place. We see this emphasised more in the Federal sphere than in the State sphere. The Budget is most important; it is the State's pay packet about which we are talking. The State has to budget and spend wisely; development must be worked for, and those issues should not be lost sight of.

I shall refer to one or two things about the departmental budgets that we have had in the past two weeks. I was a Minister when Estimates Committees started and, along with one or two of my colleagues, had some of the roughest rides that have ever been had in this place, justifying the expenditure that my Government and Treasurer had brought down. We tended to get sidetracked.

The yellow books, for which this State has now become famous, are valuable documents. I had the pleasure of serving on several of the committees, with my colleagues the member for Torrens and the member for Mount Gambier. The questioning was without malice, and a lot of valuable information was forthcoming. I could not help but hark back to those days of some four or five years ago when we started out on this, and I remembered those motions of no confidence that I as Minister faced, along with the Commissioner of Police, Mr Laurie Draper, and on the second round on the issue of Correctional Services with the then Director, Mr Alex Stewart; we went through all those traumas. That is obviously not the function of the Estimates Committees, which are assisted by officers of the various departments. They are skilled and have all the expertise, and are able to tell the Parliament what is intended in the Budget.

Having read through the pulls of those two weeks, I can say that there has been a vast improvement. A reference to what has transpired will be valuable to this Parliament in the ensuing year and as an example in the years that follow. Looking back over the two decades in which I have been here, I have heard of all the horrible things that would happen to the State. They have not; the State has made a lot of progress over those past 20 years, despite all the chiding that has gone on. I am not saying that the Opposition

should not criticise—that is its function—but we have to be a little conscious of the consequences of our utterances.

In my district of Victoria there is a matter of great concern. I was not able to be present when the Minister of Agriculture was discussing his lines. I have written to the Minister and will have further discussions with him about the Kybybolite Research Centre, which is one of the most historic and valuable research centres not only in this State but in Australasia. It has been responsible for the discovery of the use of clover, the legume that has been the main source of nitrogen in the high rainfall areas, particularly at Kybybolite in the red gum country—a vast area.

I know that the matter is now the subject of review by the Minister. Kybybolite was the Centre that triggered the use of superphosphate in conjunction with the Mount Barker strain of subterranean clover, which was the plus that converted the Lower South-East in the red gum areas from a marshy morass that was carrying very few sheep to a highly productive area. It set the scene for heavy carrying pasture management.

In recent times the centre has been responsible for the redevelopment of Trikala—an advanced type of legume which does extremely well in the red gum country in the wet areas. At present the centre is developing a newer strain called Balansa. These two areas of pasture improvement and heavy carrying pastures have sheeted home the importance of the Kybybolite district. On animal husbandry, long-standing research has been conducted into worms and sheep, and on twinning. The productivity and genetic research conducted in the area has ensured that that piece of country has a very marked place in the study of high rainfall agriculture. I hope that the Minister will pay due heed to that aspect of a very valuable location which truly typifies the red gum area.

The area of Struan, which is where I live, is different, although it is only some 30 miles to the south. Half of that area is on the black rendzina clay plains and the other half is on rocky outcrop range country with deep sand dunes, which area is nowhere near as agriculturally productive. The two areas engage in vastly different types of agriculture. To close the centre and locate the whole spectrum of research at one centre would be doing a very grave disservice to the vast red gum areas of this State.

During the Estimates Committee examination of the Minister of Marine's lines I was pleased to hear the Director of Marine and Harbors, Mr Jenkin, discussing the matter of warehousing. With the advent of containerisation, warehousing was very quickly moved to Melbourne because Port Adelaide did not provide sufficient warehousing for prospective entrepreneurs who might wish to set up business in South Australia. When this matter was raised in the Committee, Mr Jenkin said:

Warehousing follows shipping. If one loses shipping, automatically one loses warehousing. We have recovered some of the shipping; just as automatically, as we have recovered some of the warehousing. There is quite an expanse of warehouse activity around the port and in other areas such as Regency Park.

That is sure proof of a matter to which I referred earlier in my opening remarks: we have seen Budgets drawn and we have seen them castigated, but we have seen the State expand, despite the utterances that perhaps have been made in this place. I think it is a dynamic statement of the Director of Marine and Harbors in saying that warehousing is following shipping.

I remember an occasion in 1969 when I spoke to an entrepreneur who had planned to come to Adelaide. He was very pleased with the port and the real estate that was available, but his next question was about the availability of warehousing. When he was told that his warehouses would be in Melbourne he replied that he might as well go

to Melbourne, and that is exactly what he did. The deficiency of warehousing has borne against development in this State. The port of Adelaide has great potential for quickly increasing South Australian development. Of course, the Regency Park and Grand Junction Estates bear witness to that. I am pleased that the Minister of Tourism has come into the Chamber, and I am also pleased that my colleague, the member for Coles, is present, as I know of her great interest in tourism.

The member for Coles pointed out to the Minister the need for an expansion of tourism in this State, and in this light I asked the Minister of Transport about the condition of country roads. There is a very modern motel at Bordertown, the Chardonnay Motel at Coonawarra is of a high standard and the Coonawarra Hotel is of historical interest, being connected with Adam Lindsay Gordon.

Will the Minister use his good offices to ensure that people in far flung areas of the State have the use of good roads and that the Naracoorte to Bordertown and the Keith to Bordertown roads are upgraded? If those roads are improved, bus operators will take tourists to those areas, but if there is no upgrading that will not be the case. The Bordertown to Naracoorte road running to the Gap is in better condition than the Keith to Padthaway road. Some people ask what we are growling about, but I point out that the tourism industry is a million dollar industry, and improved roads are a necessary adjunct to an extremely successful tourism industry in that area. I hope that this Budget and all future Budgets bring good fortune to the State. If this is the last time I speak in a Budget debate, I wish all members well.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to refer to the workings of the Estimates Committees. By and large, I believe that the Committees worked quite successfully. However, as was pointed out by previous speakers, it was obvious that insufficient time was allocated in some instances. The Committees dealing with the health and fisheries portfolios ran out of time and I believe that more time could have been allocated to the education portfolio. Nevertheless, we had an opportunity to explore some of the financial aspects in finer detail. At the same time, it was very disappointing to note that some Ministers decided to sidestep issues and not give factual answers. More facts may be revealed when tables are inserted in *Hansard*—time will tell on that score. The Minister of Health and representatives of the Health Commission appeared before the Estimates Committee on health.

I was quite amazed to see how the Minister handled various aspects of his portfolio. A document, brought to the Minister's attention by the member for Coles, highlighted various problems at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Parts of that document were incorporated in an article in the *Weekly Times* (Messenger Press) of 26 September. Basically, it highlighted the difficult conditions under which nursing and other staff were working at that hospital. It certainly hit out in strong terms. The article states, in part:

Nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital allegedly are being 'dangerously' overloaded and there is also a lack of intensive care for seriously ill patients. The charge is made in a discussion paper being circulated at the QEH for staff comment.

It details other specific areas of disturbance. I should have thought that the Minister would be pleased to investigate the possible problems in order to analyse to what extent they were real or not. However, what was his comment to the member for Coles? The *Hansard* report of the proceedings of that Committee is as follows:

First, I am sure that anyone who has done his homework would have read the very lengthy reply that I gave to a question that was asked in the Legislative Council last Thursday in which I gave the background to this scurrilous campaign that is being



conducted by a small number of recklessly irresponsible, faceless men at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

What a way for the Minister to carry on in Parliament in front of his officers and on the public record which can be seen by people who are under his jurisdiction. Obviously, the Minister cannot take criticism, which a Minister must learn to do. He should recognise that certain areas are not up to scratch. However, this Minister simply blasts at the people who make accusations.

He is not interested to hear about certain matters. In the next page or two of the *Hansard* report the Minister made all sorts of excuses and said that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had as high a budget as anyone did. That was really rubbish, because we saw details of particular circumstances that applied to that hospital. However, he kept on with that line of attack. The newspaper reported a comment by the Western Sector Executive Director, as follows:

I totally reject any claim that The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is under-funded. The facts indicate exactly the opposite because the hospital has been properly and generously funded, having regard to the total needs of South Australian hospitals.

On that point, I asked a question of the Minister about the situation in relation to the Radiology Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—a section where not one medical specialist has an office and where those specialists have to make do with pooled secretaries. Some 250 radiology examination reports are prepared there each day. There is often a 36-hour delay, although it has been up to three weeks before those reports have been properly processed. What did the Minister suddenly say after hearing that? He acknowledged that perhaps there was a problem at that hospital and that the Radiology Department needed major upgrading.

**Mr Mayes:** You support unsigned statements that people are not encouraged to put their names to?

**Mr MEIER:** Does the honourable member think that people will sign statements when the Minister will probably personally abuse and ridicule them in front of the media and anyone else?

**Mr Mayes:** Do you support unsigned statements?

**Mr MEIER:** The honourable member can carry on in any way he wishes. I think that the Minister has a lot to answer for to the public of South Australia. The election is getting closer all the time, and we will see what the people of South Australia have to say about the Minister and the Government, which is a Government of broken promises from the word go.

The Minister acknowledged that the major problem at that hospital is one of physical overcrowding. He said that the staff is senior and competent, and that the standard of work is first class. It was marvellous of him to acknowledge that. He went on to say that upgrading would need to be done. The Minister said that he could not say that with any certainty about the minor capital works programme for 84-85 and that he would ask Mr Coombe to comment on that matter. However, if it was not previously in the minor capital works programme for 1984-85, by Ministerial direction it most certainly would be in as at now. The Minister there and then did an about-turn. Before that he had been saying that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had plenty of funds—yet when a specific instance was raised he performed that about-face and said that, if we did not have it in the minor capital works, it would be there from now on. What a damning statement, which showed the Minister for what he is: a person who cannot accept reality until he is confronted with overwhelming facts that he finally realises he cannot deny!

It was certainly an education for me to be a member of that health Estimates Committee and to find out how that Minister works. The Minister let fly at many Opposition

members when they were questioning him during that committee hearing, showing a complete disregard and disrespect for them—a fact that is shown in the *Hansard* record. It must be very disturbing for people outside this place to see how this Minister behaves. Time will tell how the people judge him and other members of this Government.

Another matter that I raised at the Committee hearing related to the incorporation of hospitals under the South Australian Health Commission Act. I asked whether it was South Australian Health Commission policy to promote the incorporation under the South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975 of recognised hospitals and other health units. The Minister gave a reasonably detailed answer to that question in which he put forward points such as important symbolic reasons and a requisition that there is a true spirit of partnership and co-operation with the South Australian Health Commission, which regards itself as part of a very big and co-operative family. The Minister also said that the South Australian Health Commission is an employer for industrial purposes which negotiates awards and negotiates with unions that have State wide coverage. The Minister went on to say that it would make staff swapping between hospitals easier.

I believe that the Minister managed to sidestep the real reason for the incorporation policy being introduced in the first place. The intention of the Health Commission Act was to provide for incorporation thereunder—not to make it virtually compulsory for all recognised hospitals or health units to become incorporated. The principal reason for the legislation was to provide for incorporation under that Act to enable hospitals such as the Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth and Flinders to operate under boards instead of being run by the Health Department, as they had been run previously. It was noticeable that the Minister did not acknowledge what was originally supposed to be the main reason for incorporation. I wonder how many other areas were sidestepped in a similar manner.

Another area that I will highlight relates to the Estimates Committee dealing with fisheries. Unfortunately, time did not allow a detailed examination of all aspects of certain matters. However, one matter that I brought to the Minister's attention was the tuna allocations for tuna fishermen in this State. These tuna allocations were made only about three weeks ago so that the resources of tuna throughout the coastal waters of this State and Australia are not overfished, and that was certainly recognised. However, the Minister, who clearly aligns himself with socialist policy and who therefore in theory clearly supports equality and wants to see the smaller man get on, seems to disregard this theory completely when it suits him.

I cited during the Estimates Committees debate the example of one tuna fisherman, who is residing on Yorke Peninsula and who operates with the Port Lincoln fleet. Bearing in mind that his boat is worth approximately \$1 million, his quota for tuna had been reduced to some 224.133 tonnes per annum, yet to remain viable he has to catch between 350 to 400 tonnes of fish per annum. The Minister's reply was simply to the effect that we cannot take account of each individual on this point and we have to think of the fishing stocks rather than specific individuals. As I see it, the disturbing fact is that the smaller man, even though he is up for \$1 million for his boat and has worked his way up, in this case I think over 30 years to get where he is will be sold down the drain to overseas investments. Even though they may be directed by Australians, it is apparent that overseas investments, particularly from the Japanese, are coming in a large way into the tuna industry and supply the base of the capital for expansion of certain fishermen so that it can become a monopoly enterprise.



Yet, when that was put to the Minister he disregarded it and was not prepared to go on. In fact, he kept saying that it was a Commonwealth matter and that the State could not do anything about it. I would have thought that this Government could do a lot about it. For a start, it can take the matter directly to the appropriate Federal Minister. We have Senators elected from this State, and surely some pressure could be put on them to ensure that South Australian fishermen get a fair go in the allocation of their tuna resources, but not so from the Minister of Fisheries. It is very disturbing to me that this Government does not seem to care about the smaller fishermen.

It seems quite happy for monopolies to come in and take over the whole tuna fishing industry. As I said to the Minister on that occasion, it is being taken further, and certainly I have already taken it to my Federal colleague. I also believe that there were some strange occurrences in the way the allocations went for certain fishermen, who have a smaller boat than has the person to whom I referred and who have received a considerably larger quota, and that needs to be looked at carefully. Another matter that I had hoped to bring up in the Estimates Committee debate but time prevented it deals with the situation of Mr C.J. Holder, of Windsor.

This man was fined over some crabs he caught. This first came to public attention when an article appearing in the *News* on 12 June this year, under the heading 'Colin "crabby" over fine', stated:

It seems people who go crabbing, like fishermen, have tall tales about the ones that got away. But such a story, interwoven with claims of discrimination, resulted in a night in gaol for Colin Holder. Mr Holder, 63, of Port Parham—

he has now shifted to Windsor—

spent Friday night behind bars at Port Pirie Police Station rather than pay a \$67 fine for catching, and trying to take home, undersized sea-water crabs. He says it was a matter of principle because five other people were found with undersized crabs on the same day—but escaped prosecution.

He made the catch at Port Arthur on September 22 last year. Mr Holder admits a Fisheries Department officer found 12 crabs under the legal limit of 11 cm among his catch of 36. 'If the others had got pinched I wouldn't have cared about the fine,' Mr Holder said. Mr Holder said the five people hid their crabs in nearby mangroves when the Fisheries officers arrived. Mr Holder claims he helped the officers find the crabs, some of which were undersized, and helped them find the five people who had left them there.

'The five people had their names taken and have since received a letter from the Fisheries Department outlining that what they did was wrong.' In a letter to Mr Holder, the Fisheries Minister, Mr Blevins, said because of 'legal technicalities' the department did not proceed on the other reports. Mr Holder believes they all should have been fined, although a Fisheries spokesman said they did not have enough evidence to bring about a successful prosecution against the other five people. Mr Blevins said: 'The decision to prosecute Mr Holder was on the advice of the Crown Solicitor, and I was satisfied the Department had taken the fullest action it could against all people suspected of taking undersize crabs at the same time.' Mr Holder thought the crabs he was taking home were over the legal size.

Mr Holder approached me about it in due course, following correspondence with the Minister. After all, he had spent a night in gaol simply because he had caught undersized crabs. Mr Holder wrote to the Minister of Agriculture seeking clarification of the term 'legal technicalities' and did not receive a satisfactory answer. He brought this matter to my attention, and I took the matter to the Minister, whose reply on 28 August states:

Dear Mr Meier,

Thank you for your letter dated 8 August 1984 in which you sought clarification on an inquiry regarding the term 'legal technicalities', raised by Mr C.J. Holder of Windsor, South Australia. I am advised that the 'other persons in the vicinity, who, although they had undersized crabs, were not prosecuted' were Vietnamese persons. The following circumstances existed at the time of the interviews with them:

(a) the persons could not understand English language;

(b) no official, qualified interpreter could be obtained to conduct the interviews;

(c) with great difficulty, interviews were conducted and a report submitted.

Following the submission of the reports to the Senior Fisheries Officer, Mr Kevin W. Glover, discussions were held with the interviewing officer(s). It was decided then that the reports of the offences were deficient, due to language difficulties and would not proceed to prosecution. The term 'legal technicalities' referred to in this instance relates to the interviews conducted at the time without a qualified Vietnamese interpreter. Conducting the interview in this manner led to legal technicalities occurring in the report by the interviewing fisheries officer.

I believe that Mr Holder has every right to be very upset that there seem to be two sets of laws in this State: one for people who have resided here for most, if not all, of their life, and another for people who are fairly new. When they were apprehended about the crabs, they dropped them under some mangroves and ran. Yet, Mr Holder helped the fisheries officer to locate the crabs and the officer apparently said to him, 'Thank you for helping; we will take this into account'. They apprehended the five others, who have been described in the letters as Vietnamese. They also apprehended Mr Holder. They had all the evidence. Mr Holder, who helped them find the others, got one night in gaol and the Vietnamese people got off without any fine and a reminder that they should not catch undersize crabs. It is a matter about which Mr Holder is still very upset, and he feels that the administration of the law should be fairer than it is.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Do you have any other examples of where the law in force is not applied?

**Mr MEIER:** There are many other examples of where the law in force is not applied properly. There were many other examples that came out of the Estimates Committee, one being in relation to speed limits within South Australia. What a performance we had in the House today with the Premier making apologies for his Minister of Transport and saying that what he said in the first place was wrong. He was also apologising for himself and trying to backtrack at an almighty rate of knots.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** How fast is that?

**Mr MEIER:** About 100 km/h to be certain. If we think back, it was the Premier and not the Minister of Transport who announced a road safety package which included the proposed reduction in the speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** That was the main part of the package.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, as the shadow Minister points out; it was to cut down the road toll. If we want to take that argument to its extreme we could cut the limit to 80 km/h, 60, 20 or even 10; I guarantee that the road toll will be decreased if we have to travel at 10 km/h. However, in a State as large as South Australia we need to recognise that many residents have to travel far greater distances than do residents in Victoria, and we need to use common sense when we reduce speed restrictions. The situation, as the Premier stated, was that the speed limit would be reduced. It is amazing that his Minister was not prepared to release it, but that is what he said.

I stated earlier that he was backtracking, but it is also interesting to note the reply to a Question on Notice asked by the member for Hanson on a possible lower speed limit in residential areas of Adelaide. Statements such as the following were made in reply:

Vehicle operating speeds are influenced more by physical conditions in the residential street situation.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** It's exactly the same on the open road.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes. It further states:

The majority of average drivers will respond to speed limits which are realistic and this factor must be taken into consideration

when determining speed limits if it is intended to reduce the proportion of vehicles travelling appreciably faster than prevailing conditions safely permit.

The reply also states:

It is likely that a lower speed limit would be poorly observed by many drivers and could then be a hazard to other road users and pedestrians who rely on its observation.

That is exactly the same as applies on the open road. So, what the Premier said was ridiculous. Today he got up and virtually apologised for it, and said, 'I am open to suggestions. If you want to bring deputations, you bring them.' That is not what he said first, when he thought he had all of the people on side. He then said, 'This will be the case.' However, when he sees that he is wrong, he then says, 'We had better have consultation,' and is happy to backtrack on this issue. What a way to act especially in relation to the Minister of Transport's answer on the possibility of lowering speed limits in residential areas. It is complete hypocrisy by the Government, and they are being discovered by the people of South Australia.

**Mr Hamilton:** Discovered?

**Mr MEIER:** Discovered for what they are—imposters, people who promise the world or make grand statements and do not back them up. In the case of promising no taxes, the Government now says, 'Sorry we have only broken the promise 154 times now,' I believe.

**An honourable member:** One hundred and fifty-five times.

**Mr MEIER:** Is there any advance on 155? There probably will be soon. What a promise! They will do anything to get into Government and then break a promise helter skelter. Remember that they said there would always be consultation when they were in Government, but we have seen example after example where this does not happen—the native vegetation clearance control issue is a classic case. Here there is a proposed reduction in the speed limit with no consultation at all. When they see that trouble is possibly brewing, the Premier, not the Minister of Transport, back tracks. I do not know whether there will now be a swap of positions, whether the Premier will become the Minister of Transport; there might be a reshuffle. However, the Minister of Transport is not speaking on transport matters relating to road safety. Here is a classic statement in answer to the member for Hanson:

If speed limits were lowered there would be a resultant increase in fuel costs and an increase in air pollution.

I wonder whether we can apply that to the open road limits as well. It is very disheartening and discouraging to see many of the policies being instituted by this Government.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I wish to take up a couple of points raised by the member for Goyder when he talked about the proposed decrease in the speed limit. I wish to make two points on this particular issue: one is I think all members have received correspondence from the City of the Corporation of Port Lincoln opposing the proposal to reduce the speed limit. That is based on the assumption that, should the new speed limit apply, persons travelling from Port Lincoln to Adelaide would incur at least one hour extra time on their journey. At the end of the day, the fatigue and the traffic hazards would be greater for an eight-hour trip than a seven-hour trip.

The second point I make is that more often than not, where speed is involved and fatalities and accidents occur, it is as a result of inexperienced drivers. I cannot give the exact dates but I can recall when, over a period of years, there were 13 fatalities on the Eyre Highway. Every one of those fatalities occurred where the drivers had come from the metropolitan area; they were not country drivers and

they had not had experience of country driving. Persons who perhaps spend the greater part of the year in the metropolitan area, at holiday time, get on the open road, plant their foot and away they go.

They lack experience in being able to handle a vehicle at speed and under trying conditions of heat fatigue and more often than not dusty and dirty roads. It is more a matter of driver experience than speed when it comes to open highway driving.

However, that is not the main point about which I wish to take up time in this debate. Earlier in the Budget debate I started to speak about a recent visit of Mr Richard Llewellyn, who visited the northern and western parts of the State as the newly appointed Disability Adviser to the Premier. This was the first time that I had had the opportunity of meeting Richard and his wife, and I was indeed impressed with the objectives that Richard has set out to achieve. I am impressed with his courage and his willingness to undertake this position. Richard is a quadraplegic and requires a specially fitted bus for travelling as well as a driver, and it is through his personal experience that he has such a great understanding and appreciation of the needs of the handicapped.

My first experience was when he visited the new aquatic and leisure centre which is now being built at Port Lincoln and which the Premier will open on 9 November. That aquatic centre comprises a heated swimming pool, a water slide and shallow wading pool areas and is designed to accommodate people throughout Lower Eyre Peninsula at various times and, in particular, to assist handicapped persons. Richard Llewellyn's visit highlighted some of the shortcomings in the planning of the centre's facilities, and it was indeed fortunate that he was able to visit the site before the facility was completed. Indeed, if he had visited three months later it might have been too late for any changes to be included.

**Mr Hamilton:** He is doing a good job.

**Mr BLACKER:** As the member for Albert Park says, the Disability Building Adviser is doing a good job in this area. While many of us believe that we have a fair and reasonable understanding of the needs of the handicapped, unless we are personally involved it is all too easy to overlook what is obvious to handicapped persons. I refer to my own experience about two years ago when I moved to a new electorate office. One of my first callers was a constituent who wanted to visit me and who was a quadraplegic. I found out that my constituent was unable to gain access to my electorate office. As a handicapped person myself I should have been able to pick that up straight away, and perhaps I should have refused to take that office for that very reason, but I did not.

That example just goes to show that even the best of intentions do not always come through when one is trying to plan and consider fully the needs of others. I believe that Richard Llewellyn's position will be of tremendous benefit to handicapped persons throughout South Australia, and I commend him to other honourable members if they have not already met him. They should at least make his acquaintance, because I am sure that not only will they benefit but handicapped constituents will also benefit through his visiting various districts.

One of the other issues which I wish to raise tonight (I am pleased that the Minister of Water Resources is present) is ongoing, because it is the question of Porter Bay sewerage. Whilst the Minister has given reasons—and I can readily understand and appreciate some of those reasons—I sympathise very strongly with the residents of that area, who are in a developed area of the city of Port Lincoln. Whilst that is not totally developed at this stage, they are in an area that has considerable limestone; the drainage is very

poor. Raw sewage runs into the streets. It requires of some of the residents to be able to pump their septic pits twice a week. Generally speaking, it is a condition that the average person in any metropolitan or town area would not tolerate. I do not believe that people in Porter Bay should tolerate that position.

Some time back, hope was given that, subject to a favourable report from the Public Works Standing Committee, it would be included in funding of subsequent years. Regrettably, there have been Governments and changes of Government, and the priority for that work has been put off and off. I do not know how long or how much longer the residents of that area are expected to suffer the inconveniences that they are suffering, but in any sort of standard of equality with other towns and the metropolitan area they justly deserve some assistance.

It has been stated now that there is insufficient capacity in the riser main that travels past that area. For persons who are familiar with the area, the Porter Bay sewage proposal is that part of Porter Bay to the west of the Porter Bay slip and on the southern face of the Kirton Point area south of the caravan park. So there is a natural fall back towards the riser main that runs across the swamp out to the Billy Light Point.

Because of that and because of the statement that has been made that there is insufficient capacity in the riser main, the locals are becoming increasingly concerned; they believe that the planning should have been and would have been done some years ago when the initial deep drainage was installed in Port Lincoln to at least have the capacity to take the whole Porter Bay area, which has obviously been developed in part for 50 years and which has gradually been filled up. Since the last departmental assessments were made, another 23 residents have been installed in that area, with more building to take place.

Obviously, with the development of the Porter Bay marina those sites will become prime residential sites, as they will overlook the marina complex. The demand for that area will increase. I add my full support to the residents of that area in their quest to have deep drainage or sewerage implemented. It is not fair that people living in a civilised community should have to go home twice a week to pump out a septic pit or, for those who do not do that, to allow the raw sewage to run down the gutters. Whilst it may be all right and one can get away with it to a degree in winter, one cannot get away with it in summer, and the health risk is there in ever increasing amounts. There is plenty of medical and local evidence of that. The local E & WS Department is very conversant with the problem, and the area has its sympathies. I am not asking to put it on the spot at the moment. It is not for it to make up its mind as to which way it should go.

Another issue about which I want to say a few words (and the Minister of Mines and Energy is present) and which has been an old chestnut in this Parliament for many years is the 10 per cent ETSA charge to certain parts of Eyre Peninsula. While the Minister might laugh, and I have his full reports here as to what it is all about—

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** How did you get on with the previous Minister for three years?

**Mr BLACKER:** Until fairly recently not very much of the area involved was in my district. The basic thrust for that came from the member for Eyre who held probably the best part of three-quarters or more of the area in question. However, although the member for Eyre has made many speeches on this subject, basically I think it is a matter of equality.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** How did he get on with the previous Minister?

**Mr BLACKER:** I think that is a fair comment. Let us be honest about it: the whole problem that we are now experiencing started back in Sir Thomas Playford's time. I am not ducking that issue. It does not behove any Government of any era to have certain sections of the community (in this case the bulk of the residents of Eyre Peninsula, but some people in other areas of the State are similarly affected) disproportionately obligated because of a series of circumstances that have occurred over a period of time. These subscribers are now obligated to pay a 10 per cent surcharge on the cost of their electricity. It makes second-class citizens of them.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** They can install their own diesel generators.

**Mr BLACKER:** Yes. It is equally true that all people in the metropolitan area could install their own free light or a diesel plant. Perhaps people should be encouraged to conserve electricity by generating their own electricity. I note that some plans are afoot to investigate wind generation of electricity. I understand that although that has some limitations, nevertheless, it could be used as a source of electricity supplementary to that provided within the electricity grid. It may not necessarily form part of the grid system but in isolated areas it could be used to supplement diesel generated power. That could be an answer to problems experienced by those in isolated communities. Whilst I appreciate the Minister's interjections, I think for the meagre amount that has been mentioned to me—

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** Meagre!

**Mr BLACKER:** I refer to a submission from the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association that was prepared for the Premier, and I believe that the Minister has a copy. Under the heading of 'The solution' it states:

It is understood that the 10 per cent surcharge levied from consumers on Eyre Peninsula provides an income to the Government a little in excess of one million dollars annually.

It is suggested that the surcharge be abolished, and the amount be recouped through an adjusting increase in electricity charges to all Trust consumers in the State.

Based on a Trust income of \$417 million, this would represent an increase of approximately 0.25 per cent to all Trust consumers. It would cost an average household, only some 3.5 cents per quarter account.

The increase proposed is insignificant when compared with the increases applied to all State consumers during 1983, totalling 20 per cent.

I realise that those figures are now out of date and that the cost of electricity has altered. However, I am talking not so much about the dollars and cents issue but about the fact that the present Government still maintains, as the previous Government did, that there are two classes of consumers within South Australia. In encouraging decentralisation and equality of all constituents throughout the State, surely it is not unreasonable to expect that all constituents be entitled to power at the same rate. After all, the Government has been most adamant that water charges be at the same rate per kilolitre anywhere throughout the State.

Many submissions have been made to the Minister of Water Resources about having that altered for specific purposes, but the Government has stood fast. I can understand the reasons for that, because if the Government sets a precedent that will cause a big problem. It was pointed out once that if consideration were given to one bowling club, for example, it would only be a matter of hours before the Minister knew how many bowling clubs there were throughout the State. The same situation applies to recreational grounds. Whilst very good submissions could be presented to the Government in relation to a subsidy or a reduction in the cost of water used for sport and recreation purposes, the Government has stood very fast on this issue.

If we are to follow that principle in regard to water supply, surely we should follow it in regard to power generation.

Another matter that the Government does not take into account, one continually raised by my local community, is the value of the area to the State. Agricultural production figures show that the contribution from that area to the general revenue of the State is considerable. If the Government was to recognise that fact, surely it would not be unfair or unrealistic to ensure that all citizens have access to power on an equal basis.

It was suggested that wind generation could augment power supplies. I do not believe that there is a universal answer: a combination of factors could supplement power generation. I note that the last report of Amdel refers to a power fan designed to stop frost, working on the reverse principle of wind generation. Plants are being tested. I realise that, although the big rotors for wind generation look good in theory, there are structural problems: because of their size, the wind velocity differs between the top and the bottom of the structure, and stresses that were at first not envisaged must be overcome. However, these schemes could be tried in a number of sites in South Australia. The Minister stated that five experimental wind power plants would be established south of Adelaide.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** There will be 23 others.

**Mr BLACKER:** The Minister has foreshadowed a number of other sites, and I remind him that some areas on the western coast of Eyre Peninsula adjoining the Bight might be considered to be very windy and therefore quite suitable. I understand that Winters Hill at Port Lincoln is one of the windiest spots in South Australia, based not necessarily on wind intensity but on the number of windy days. Wind generation could be considered for that site. A lot of work can be done. However, I do not see wind generation as a panacea or as the whole answer but simply as a means of supplementary power generation. If wind power is combined with diesel generation in some of the remote or isolated areas, there would be increased benefits.

Yesterday I visited an area that is midway between Cleve and Kimba. I could take this opportunity to talk about the condition of the road, but I will not do so. I refer to an area called Cockabidnie on the Kialpa Road between Cleve and Kimba, where the Department of Agriculture has been involved with a group of farmers in establishing a soil conservation programme. I understand that 8 000 to 9 000 acres and seven farmers are involved. There are hundreds of kilometres of contour banks and dozens (and I think I can use that figure advisedly) of dams designed to hold the water where it falls and not create gutters or widespread washing of the area.

The area around Cockabidnie is noted for washing, not only in gutter form but also for sheet erosion. Some of the banks I saw yesterday have been established for a number of years, while others are of recent construction. I believe that the dams are working effectively. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this problem with local Department of Agriculture advisers, but I am sure that they would be impressed with the scheme.

I raise this matter tonight because any Government assistance must be made available on a group basis. In other words, at least four farmers must become involved before the Government can consider any subsidy scheme. When the Department carries out survey work and sets out the banks, a subsidy becomes available for the construction of dams, contourbanks, fencing, and any filling of gullies deemed necessary in a soil conservation programme.

The division line for the Cockabidnie scheme ran through the centre of the farm property I visited yesterday, but the main wash problem was on the northern side. Because the water was not being held uphill, it was creating a massive salt problem in the gullies that was totally non-existent in 1974. It first became known to the landholder and local

residents when a contractor in the area (Mr Ed Kalms, harvesting contractor) became bogged in a wet slushy area in the middle of summer. The water was not draining and the land became waterlogged. As a result, the water table rose and brought salts with it.

Year by year it has grown from nothing, as it was in 1974, to a salt infested area one kilometre long by five or six chains wide. The farmer has made every endeavour to grow salt tolerant grasses. He has planted trees, sown puccinella, tall wheat grass, and any other plant that has some semblance of salt tolerance. I commend him for the amount of coverage on that salt pan, but he is concerned that the salt pan is growing by tens, if not hundreds of acres a year.

Although this farmer erected a fence to keep the stock off the salt tolerant grasses, the fence has now had to be moved because the salt area is extending further up the hill. To solve the problem the farmer must contain the water up the hill to prevent water logging of the gullies. That can only be done by contourbanking, dams in the gullies and inceptor banks. Unless that can be achieved, the salt problem will grow. In fact it already extends into his neighbour's property. Initially, the neighbour was not very interested in doing anything about retaining water on the property because he did not believe it was a problem. He now knows that it is a problem because the salt is encroaching well and truly onto his property. It is only a matter of two or three years before it moves through his property and into the next property.

However, the dilemma faces the farmer about whom I originally spoke. He was able to get assistance for part of his farm for a co-ordinated overall soil conservation programme, but on the northern part of his property (which is most affected) he cannot get any assistance at all because the water runs the other side of the peak of the range.

I am suggesting that the scheme of assistance in relation to soil conservation programmes should not be limited to groups of four farmers. I know of another instance where a family collectively bought five farms. If those five farms were owned by five individuals instead of a farmer and his four sons, they would have been eligible for a soil conservation programme involving a small subsidy. However, because the farms are held by one family that subsidy is not available. There is a slight anomaly in this system because an individual is not eligible for assistance, but he would be if three others were involved. People who have problems with soil conservation or water erosion should see the scheme at Cockabidnie, which has been of tremendous benefit to the area. I support the motion.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** In responding to the motion I say, first, that I appreciated the Minister of Transport's attitude when he appeared before the Estimates Committee. He was responsive, willing to give answers, and was free and quick with the answers that he gave. My compliments to him. I believe that that Estimates Committee was the most constructive I have yet sat through, and I know that other members of the Committee felt likewise. The Chairman later said to me that he was impressed by the way that Committee had proceeded. I believe that much of the credit for that success goes to the Minister as well as to its members.

I turn now to the Modbury corridor, which is a road to be constructed in the North-East of Adelaide. I am delighted that the member for Newland is present, because he has

been involved with matters relating to this road, which is partly in his district. For approximately an hour and a quarter this evening I spoke to a group of residents from the Crest View Estate subdivision at Para Hills. I am sure that the member for Newland knows what I am referring to. The first stage of the Modbury corridor runs from Bridge Road, Salisbury east to Milne Road, Modbury North. I understand that construction work on the road will start early next year.

This road will be a major connector between the North-East and northern suburbs—in other words, between Modbury, Para Hills, Salisbury and Elizabeth. Nearby residents approached the member for Newland last year, because the proposed route runs relatively close to their houses. In fact, if one looks at the specific location, of which I have seen several photographs, one sees that the road runs within 73 metres of the nearest house. However, because of its location across a small gully right in view of local houses, and because of the way it is to be constructed, the corridor will act as a sound shell across the valley directing most of the noise from the road at these houses.

Some points need to be raised here, the first being that several of these residents went to great pains before they had houses built there in 1979 to make sure that they knew exactly where any major road was being constructed. They were told by both the Tea Tree Gully council and the Highways Department that no road was proposed in the valley to which they were referring, in other words, the hill opposite Crest View Estate. I now refer to a more detailed letter dated 13 August 1984 from Mr R.T. Marshall, who is the resident involved and who highlights the matter. It might be appropriate that I read several paragraphs of it now, as follows:

At the time we began looking for a property to build again (or to purchase an existing home) we were living at 83 Smith Road, Salisbury East. When we moved into our first house on Smith Road, the estate was new and Smith Road was a narrow metal roadway. From October 1964 to June 1979 when we sold our house the area and traffic built up greatly and Smith Road vehicular noise had become very disturbing. Because of the noise, any time spent in the garden was extremely unpleasant, even though we had erected a high fence and planted many trees and shrubs.

Eventually we sold and moved. To ensure a repeat of the traffic and noise situation wouldn't occur again, we began looking for a potentially quiet area within our price bracket. The salesman who sold our house stated that if the property had been back one street away from Smith Road we may have got approximately \$7 000 more for the house. We checked this out with a couple of other land agents and found that it was true: a noisy busy road at one's front fence significantly reduces property value.

After looking at some blocks for sale in the Crest View Estate we decided to find out what future developments (if any) would reasonably be expected to occur within the area where the land sale was being held. As the blocks were in the Tea Tree Gully council area, I phoned their Engineering Department and the council engineer produced large hard bound maps and plans which we discussed and he outlined possible future developments. As it was critical to me (because of our Smith Road experience) we discussed the future highway known now as the 'Modbury Corridor', and his best estimation of its alignment was either Kelly Road continuing into Quarry Road down to Bridge Road and eventually Main North Road, or another major highway being constructed to continue much further north than Quarry Road and maybe even getting across the hills to eventually meet Smith Road and continue to the Main North Road that way.

As a result of this meeting and discussion the council officer and myself agreed that the closest any future main highway to come to the Crest View Estate would be an upgrading of Quarry Road. He did, however, say that to be sure I should visit the Highways Department and ask to discuss their plans for the area.

Within a few days I had made an appointment to speak to a Highways Department official on the fifth floor at the Walkerville headquarters. The person I spoke with was from the planning department, and he along with another officer discussed my questions with the aid of a wall mounted map of the area concerned. One of the Highways men pencilled over the map where they were planning a major highway. The alignment pencilled in was not in the vicinity of Kelly Road or Quarry Road and, in fact,

appeared to coincide with the more northern route spoken about by the Tea Tree Gully engineer earlier.

I specifically asked about the possibility of using Quarry Road, and the reply was that it was unlikely but most probably further north of Quarry Road. In fact, I remember at the time telling them my present residence was on Smith Road, Salisbury East, and they laughed and said that I had better get away from that road, implying that Smith Road was a distinct possibility. They continued by saying that if I was going to build on the Crest View Estate the closest any highway may go would be Quarry Road if the connector was built between Modbury and the Main North Road.

After meeting the people who should have knowledge of future road planning from both local council and Highways Department, I felt that we could build on the Crest View Estate without any future noise problems from busy roads or highways. Based on this belief, we have since built and lived at Severn Court for five years and now we find we are about to have a major highway built barely 100 or so metres from our fence.

My family feels completely destroyed by the whole affair; we have been misled and a road is now about to be built as though no residents existed at all within miles of the project. Our hope is that the highway is never built where presently planned, but, if past record is a guide, large businesses and Government rarely listen to people, such is our society today.

That is just one of the stories from these residents. They are very disturbed that this major road is to be built across a very small gully immediately adjacent to all these houses.

First, they went and saw the Highways Department, got the facts and asked that Department to look at other alternatives. Eventually, they received a negative response from the Highways Department which, I might add, had looked at three other alternatives. Then they went to see their local member of Parliament, the present member for Newland, who is in the House this evening. Their recollection is that they saw him in about November 1983 and that he said he would take up the matter with the Minister of Transport and come back with a response early in 1984, implying January or at least February 1984.

They eventually received a negative response from the Minister in July this year—some eight to nine months after they went to see the member for Newland. Their description of him is not particularly favourable and he would not want it fed around his electorate. They accused him of deliberately delaying any response so that the project would get to the stage where it would have to be built and they would be effectively crushed out. They accused him of deliberately deferring any response back from the Minister. In fact, they accused him of knowing what the response was likely to be and said that they had to continually chase the member for Newland to even get a response from him.

Their assessment of the Minister of Transport was not much more favourable, but, seeing that I am going to ask the Minister to reassess the problem tonight, at this stage I will not be too harsh on him, except to say that I hope he will look at what could be a genuine compromise to assist the parties involved. The Highways Department appears to have acted with its usual total inflexibility. I know exactly what the Highways Department is like. I have already dealt with a similar road problem at Reservoir Drive in the southern suburbs. In that case the Highways Department was about to put a major four-lane road within something like 30 metres of residential houses. The local residents went to see the member for Mawson, I think—

**Ms Lenehan:** No, they did not.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am sorry; it was the member for Brighton. However, they got no response. They also saw the Minister for Environment and Planning and got no response from him. They were highly critical. They went to their Federal member, who happened to be a Liberal, Steele Hall. He asked me to look at the site, and we took up the issue publicly. We pointed out what was a logical solution and, lo and behold, the Highways Department and the Minister for Environment and Planning finally agreed that

the road could be moved farther west, closer to the reservoir. All the humbug they put up for months was suddenly brushed aside when the inflexibility of the bureaucracy was brought to the surface. I suspect, from what I have seen of the facts, that it is exactly the same.

**Mr Klunder:** Under which Government do you think the planning for this road was taking place?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It would appear that it was probably started back in 1979 and that some of the planning took place under the Liberal Government. I do not mind admitting that the Liberal Party started the Modbury corridor. The previous member for Newland started the push for it, but I stress that the final route has been selected by the Highways Department under this Labor Government. Do not let members opposite try to shelve that blame on to anyone else. For eight to nine months the initial planning stage has been going on, and the Department has been trying to get this Government to reassess the route.

*Mr Klunder interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I have the facts, the reports, the maps and everything else. As it turns out, the ideal route asked for by the residents would put the road the other side of the hill where there are no houses whatsoever and where there is vacant land, albeit land zoned residential and owned by the Urban Lands Trust. The Government could defer the housing development or put it elsewhere away from the highway. What we are talking about tonight is good sound residential planning, separating major transport corridors from existing housing if we possibly can. The housing is there, the corridor is not there and nothing is stopping that road being moved farther east over the hill away from the houses.

**Ms Lenehan:** What's the cost?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I will read out, Madam, the cost of this project, so do not get excited. The cost of the route requested by the residents would be an extra \$580 000.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I point out that \$50 000 of that figure was put down as an expense involved in buying additional land. However, no allowance was made for the sale of land currently owned which could then be used for residential development, so we can take at least another \$50 000 off that, plus the fact that they are arbitrary figures.

**Mr Klunder:** So, you would spend half a million dollars, would you?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No. The residents would like the road on the other side of the hill out of sight and out of sound. The Highways Department, the member for Newland and the Minister for Transport want to put it immediately adjacent to and slightly below those houses so that it would cause a significant noise problem. Those noise levels are known—approximately 68 to 70 decibels during peak traffic in the area of those houses. I believe that a compromise exists—an alternative route—namely, to put the road about midway between the two proposed routes. I am told that the additional cost of putting it midway would be significantly less than the additional cost of taking up what the residents have asked for—the extra \$580 000.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** How much?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I cannot say how much, because the Highways Department has not done a detailed costing. However, when the residents appeared before the Highways Department they were told that the cost would escalate, as they went farther east, on an almost proportional basis. If we go about midway we could reasonably assume that, for an additional cost of about \$250 000, we could put in the extra road. We have on the Government benches this evening the Minister and the members for Mawson and Newland who are basically arguing that major arterial roads should go adjacent to housing—and damn the residents.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** That is exactly what members opposite have been proposing. They have been over there interjecting this evening, supporting the case of the highways bureaucrats, supporting the inflexibility that exists and highlighting the fact that their Government, the Labor Government of this State, supports a proposal which completely ignores the effect of such a major road on the residents involved.

**Mr Klunder:** That statement ignores logic.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Well, that is what the honourable member has argued throughout the night. He has argued in favour of the Highways Department case, otherwise why interject supporting their case? I point out to the Minister of Transport—I hope that he is listening—that there is a compromise, and I ask the Minister to make sure that he looks at it and takes up that option. There is no doubt that that option, although it may involve a slight increase in expenditure, will significantly reduce the noise level. It will put the road on top of the hill, well above the residents and largely out of sight, because only the barest silhouette will be seen of the side of the road instead of the huge scar running right past their houses, with the noise coming up from an echo chamber right into the back of their houses.

**Mr Klunder:** You don't know what you're talking about. You've been briefed once by one side.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The residents have given me all the details. I will go out and look at the site as well; I promised them that.

**Mr Klunder:** You haven't been there?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No, I have not been there, but I will stand in this place and ask the Minister of Transport to make sure that he looks at these other options and adopts them.

**Mr Klunder:** You're standing here as an expert on the matter and you haven't been out to have a look?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The honourable member need not worry about that—I will go out next week and look at the situation. I have looked at all the maps, and there is no doubt that the land is vacant and the road could be moved. I will highlight to the honourable member's electorate the extent to which his Government and he have kow-towed to the Highways Department with no regard to the effect of the noise on the residents. I guarantee that the member for Newland would not be prepared to have a four-lane divided highway built within 73 metres of his own house. I guarantee that he would not be willing to put up with that, yet he is willing to impose that on other residents. Why? Let us look at the reasons. It is because that part of Newland will not be in his new electorate—that is how cynical we have to become. He could not care a damn, because it will not be in his district at the next election.

**Mr Klunder:** That is disgusting on your part.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The residents are disgusted at the total inactivity of the member for Newland, the extent to which they believe he has deliberately delayed his answer in coming back to them and the fact that they have constantly had to get in touch with the honourable member to even get a response, having taken the matter up. They are totally dissatisfied also, frankly, with the deputation that went to see the Minister. I will read to the House the letter that the Minister sent after the deputation went to see him.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms Lenehan:** No, the member for Newland took them.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The honourable member went along, too, but let us face it: the honourable member, according to these people who were all there, sat there like a puppet, as did the Minister, and hence there is the following response from the Minister. The facts show that he sat there



like a puppet. The Minister sent the following letter to the member for Newland on 2 October:

Dear John,

I refer to the Crest View Residents Action Group deputation, led by yourself, which waited upon me on 21 August 1984 to discuss the proposed Quarry Road/Modbury Corridor arterial road.

The Commissioner of Highways has advised me that his Department has investigated the feasibility of installing 'New Jersey' concrete barriers to attenuate the traffic noise level and of shifting the alignment of the proposed road further away from the Crest View Estate. As a result of this investigation, it is intended to install the 'New Jersey' type concrete barrier over a length of 900 m on the western side of both carriageways adjacent to the estate. This will have the effect of reducing the level of traffic noise.

He does not say, I might add, by how much.

**Mr Klunder:** That was clearly discussed at the meeting, but you would not know: you weren't there.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I understand that those barriers will reduce the noise level by three dba. I have seen those barriers in the USA and I have listened to the extent to which they cut down on noise and I can say to those residents that the most noisy vehicles of all—buses and trucks—are virtually unaffected in having their noise reduced by those barriers. So much for barriers! The letter states:

Various alternative alignments for the corridor were examined, taking into consideration the concern of the Residents Action Group.

The Government did not take them into consideration, it ignored them. The letter concludes:

However, it was found that any variation to the alignment originally recommended would incur substantial cost increases and have an adverse design aspect. Taking all the factors into account, it is intended to construct the corridor along the alignment that has been proposed by the Department.

The letter highlights that despite the logical case put to the member for Newland, the Minister of Transport and the Highways Department in respect of the realignment of this road to reduce the noise level to these houses, residents have been shunned and shoved aside, they have been delayed and ignored. I assure the member for Newland that, whilst the Minister is not presently in the Chamber—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! Honourable members should stop the interjections across the Chamber and let the honorable member on his feet be heard.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I assure the member for Newland that I will continue to take a close interest in this matter and fight for the cause of those residents so that, when a major arterial road is planned and when there are genuine options that can be taken so that a major arterial road does not have to go through the backyard of houses, those alternatives will be looked at. The situation has gone back to the position of the 1940s and 1950s and the idea that one can build major arterial roads regardless of where they are and to hell with the impact that they might have on residents. I can assure those residents that the Liberal Party will look after their interests and will take up their case even though the member for Newland has the comfort of knowing that he will not be representing that area after the election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the House to come to order.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, I certainly appreciate that. I am delighted that the member for Albert Park is present this evening, because on 21 August he asked a serious question.

**Mr Hamilton:** Doesn't he always?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No. However, this is an important subject and I ask the honourable member to listen. His question concerned co-operative supermarkets and was

directed to the Minister of Community Welfare. The member for Albert Park asked:

Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware of the latest type of supermarket in operation in Western Australia that has been established to help ease the burden faced by low income earners, and what similarities are there to the co-operatives that operate in this State?

The honourable member then went on to explain his idea. I have heard the member for Albert Park on radio. I think his idea has a great deal of merit and I would support it. In replying to the question the Minister of Community Welfare said that he thanked the member for his question and stated:

It is a most interesting exercise that he has explained to the House, and I am impressed that it is a self help organisation that is providing an important service to those most in need.

After saying a few other things, he went on to say:

I will certainly have officers of my Department follow up this matter. Indeed, many programmes have been established under CEP funding that will, in turn, see the establishment of organisations which will not require ongoing funding . . . but which are providing very worthwhile services to various sections of the community.

I was delighted with the Minister's positive response, but I would like to draw attention to the response that I received from the same Minister when I wrote to him on 1 December 1983 with exactly the same idea. The idea was not mine, but belonged to a Mr L.J. Youngman of Toorak Gardens, who wrote to me with it. He came and saw me and put the proposal in some detail. I suggested that he write to a number of people; he took it up with a number of people. I also took it up with a number of people, including the same Minister of Community Welfare.

However, when the Minister of Community Welfare responded to me on 9 February 1984 he said—and I will not quote his whole letter—that it sounded like a good idea. He said:

Whilst the proposal has some merit, I do not believe that it would be possible for my Department to provide material assistance to achieve its implementation.

I highlight the very political nature with which the Minister of Community Welfare apparently deals with requests to him. If a member of his own Party asks a question in the House he responds favourably to it and asks his Department to follow it up. If a member of the Opposition writes to him on behalf of someone else with exactly the same suggestion the Minister slaps that member in the face and turns it down. It disturbs me because I think that the idea has some merit.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I place on record my appreciation of the opportunity to examine the Budget through the Estimates Committees, and particularly through the programme performance Budget papers that were presented to us. On this occasion I deliberately kept away from the Minister of Health because I realised that it was a fruitless exercise. I served on committees that dealt with Labour, the E.&W.S., Recreation and Sport and Community Welfare. In those areas I found that, provided the member was prepared to do his research and follow the reasoning in the Budget papers, the information was available.

On some occasions the information was not available. In particular, during the examination of the Minister of Recreation and Sport I was amazed when the General Manager of the TAB and the Minister were unable to advise the Committee of any details in relation to the projected income, the expenditure and net profit that the new radio station 5AA would make and whether there would be any profit benefits to the TAB. Probably the most disturbing feature of that question was that the General Manager of the TAB

could not tell me what the interest rate would be on the amount that the TAB borrowed to purchase the radio station.

I do not believe that anybody, whether the General Manager of the TAB or the Minister, could sit before a Parliamentary committee and say that they did not have any idea how much they would be required to pay. The arrangements were for a \$4 million-odd loan, and they had no idea of what they would pay when they made the quarterly payments of the interest only. Surely, the General Manager of the TAB must have had some approximate idea. If he had said that it would be approximately 12 per cent, 13 per cent or 14 per cent, I do not think that anything further would have developed.

The Minister tried to fob off the whole issue by saying that it had nothing to do with the Estimate Committee's proceedings. I think it was very poorly handled. It is in the interests of this Parliament and it is the right of taxpayers of this State who are the guarantors of such a financial transaction to know exactly where they stand in regard to any Government transaction, in particular in regard to a transaction to purchase a radio station solely for the promotion of horse-racing in South Australia. It was an unusual move; it is a step that I cannot justify, and in my opinion the TAB has not come up with any logical reason why it should own outright a radio station which will broadcast the details of the activities of the racing codes and provide a pre-race betting service. In Melbourne the TAB owns a radio station, but that has not been a successful venture.

Further, if the Government is genuine in wanting to stamp out SP betting and in wanting to provide a first-class broadcasting and betting service for the whole State, why did it purchase a radio station that does not have that full coverage? I have been informed that it will be necessary for 5AA to establish transmitter stations in certain areas of the State to boost its output. I believe that parts of the West Coast cannot receive 5AA, let alone the Far North, the Riverland or the South-East. I am not sure about Kangaroo Island—I will have to check with the member for Alexandra. That being the case either the TAB or the new management of the station will find that considerable additional capital costs will be involved in reaching the whole of the State.

I think the decision to purchase the radio station was poorly advised and that it will have an impact on the broadcasting network operations in South Australia. All radio stations, whether commercial or part of the Australian broadcasting service have served South Australia well. Station 5DN, on its sixtieth anniversary, can be very proud of its record of service and pioneering spirit in this State. I think it is a great shame that we are to lose the identity of a radio station for this venture associated with the TAB.

It annoyed me immensely to find during the Estimates Committee that certain information could not be made available. I hope that it was a genuine oversight on the part of the management of the TAB in not having those documents available for the Estimates Committee. I sincerely hope that they will be available in future. I will continue to pursue the issue on subsequent occasions. In regard to the Minister of Water Resource's lines I was quite happy with the responses that I received, as I was in relation to the Minister of Community Welfare's lines. The Minister was quite patient with the Committee.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Have you—

**Mr BECKER:** No, I have not. The Minister endeavoured to support the Budget papers. The community welfare area is difficult, particularly in relation to the institutionalisation of young offenders. The hard, cold financial statistics indicate that it costs over \$2 000 a week to keep young offenders in some of our institutions.

Something must be done to try to contain or reduce costs, if that is possible. It is a tremendous price to pay for

disciplining and rehabilitating offenders. Surely there must be alternative methods in the rehabilitation area that are far more satisfactory than incarceration. We must consider this matter, because incarceration is a cost burden and, more importantly, damage is being done to young people, and that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

It is high time we considered rehabilitation services, because any improvement in the behaviour of young people benefits them and the community in the future. This is indicative of the times: young people are frustrated and annoyed because they are not being assisted, because promises of a good and sound education and the opportunity of employment when they leave school are shattered. There are broken promises, one after the other. Nothing has been done in the past two years at a State or Federal level to improve the situation to any great degree. Young people are annoyed, frustrated and cross with society: they are not happy at all with the way in which they are being treated.

I was annoyed at the almost paranoid attitude of the Premier and his criticism of the Opposition for pointing out the Government's errors. When speaking to the Australian Business Economists luncheon, the Premier said that sections of the media had set out deliberately to exaggerate the impact of the Government's taxation measures: he was very critical that the Opposition was peddling falsehoods and that this information was flowing to other States, causing confusion and undermining the strategies of recovery. I can feel for the Premier in his attempt to promote South Australia and to encourage businesses to establish here, because our lifestyle is first class. Business executives must be encouraged to establish new technologies in South Australia. We have always had advantages, but they are disappearing rapidly, and it is up to the Opposition to point out the Government's mistakes.

The Premier said that he would not increase taxes or charges and that he would not use charges as backdoor taxation. That promise was made on many occasions before the last State election, but the Government has broken promises on 155 occasions since being elected to office. It would be wrong and totally false to encourage overseas companies to come to South Australia on the basis that costs are cheaper here. It is wrong to say that electricity tariffs, land prices, the cost of services and taxes are cheaper. In the past businesses have been encouraged to establish in South Australia, but we have seen them leave.

I only have to mention a few companies that were induced to come to South Australia: Raytheon; Eglo Engineering; Malleys (who then took over Kelvinator and transferred the operation interstate); Breville at Elizabeth is no longer with us; and Rover Mowers came to South Australia from Queensland, returned to Queensland, was induced to come back to South Australia and is now back in Queensland. Those five companies have left the State with tremendous loss of employment opportunities and capital investment. They must be disappointed with what happened.

We do not have to go much further to see that Chryslers eventually had to sell up and leave. Of course, that company was taken over by Mitsubishi. There were wholesale changes; hundreds and hundreds of jobs were lost at Chryslers. Mitsubishi has been just as ruthless in its retrenchment programmes, but nothing has been said; there has been no campaign against Mitsubishi. That is different; it is a Japanese company whereas Chryslers was an American company. Mitsubishi has had to cut down considerably to try to make its operation viable. It is having difficulties as well.

We do not have to mention the future of General Motors-Holdens. We know that unfortunately there is a huge black cloud hanging over the GMH operation at Woodville. I hope that it does not come to be, but it could well happen. The whole of the GMH operation in this State is under

threat. So, it would be wrong if the Opposition did not point out to the Government that what it has done is foolish, what it is doing is foolish and what it is continuing to do is totally irresponsible.

If we want to hold and maintain the level of employment opportunities in South Australia and increase those employment opportunities, the Government must realise that it has to become far more efficient and effective. It has to do more for small business, for large business and for all levels of commercial undertakings to ensure that there will be continued progress and development in South Australia.

If the Government does not do that, it has failed. The Opposition realises that it will have to take up the gauntlet at the first opportunity of its being re-elected to Government and that there is a chance that the opportunities will not be easy. It will be a difficult process, but for South Australia's sake it has to be done. We want to warn this Government that increasing 155 State taxes and charges is enough; we do not want any more.

That brings me to probably the worst of all the increases that we have suffered. It has affected over 500 000 people in South Australia, and it is probably the worst example of lack of consumer protection—electricity tariffs. The recent increase in electricity charges in this State was probably another example of what a statutory authority can do, what it can get away with and what it will continue to do unless somebody puts the brake on its operation and unless somebody now takes time to examine the operations and efficiency of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The State Treasury has benefited for many years from its operations, yet nobody has ever examined its accounts.

In the past few years the Trust has undertaken development costing somewhere in the vicinity of \$700 million, yet not one cent of that money has been examined by the Parliamentary Public Works Committee; not one cent of the capital expenditure of the Electricity Trust has ever been checked for effectiveness and efficiency. I was disturbed when examining some Auditor-General's Reports that I have maintained in my office to see that the Auditor-General in 1977 had this to say:

The Leigh Creek township, headquarters of the Trust's open cut mining operation, is to be relocated to enable mining operations to continue over an increased area. A consultant was retained by the Trust to advise on the selection of an alternative town site and to prepare a town plan, cost estimates and a development programme for the project. Consultancy fees and other Trust expenditure on this project during 1976-77 amounted to \$56 000.

The Auditor-General then went on to say that the township site had been selected and that further planning and development of community policies and services would be undertaken in 1977-78. In 1978 the Auditor-General reported that consultancy fees and other Trust expenditure on the project during 1977-78 amounted to \$265 000 and that all-up expenditure to that stage amounted to \$310 844. The project was estimated to cost \$33 million and was due for completion in 1981. In 1979 the Auditor-General advised that the project was continuing, that the township was being relocated 13 kms south of the existing township and that it would be completed in 1981 at an estimated cost of \$36 million. Therefore, the cost had increased by \$3 million in 12 months.

In 1980 the Auditor-General advised that the cost of re-establishing the township of Leigh Creek, which was still due for completion in 1981, was estimated at \$42.535 million, an increase of \$6.5 million in 12 months. In 1981 the Auditor-General advised that the completion date of the new township was early 1982 and the estimated cost was \$44 million. We suddenly found that the cost of the new township was escalating. In 1982 the Auditor-General said that the estimated cost of the township was \$64 million and that it was due for completion in 1983. The last we heard

of the whole matter from the Auditor-General was in 1983 when he said that the cost of the town was \$64 million.

There were 716 Trust personnel employed at the field and transferring and establishing the new township involved a capital cost of \$88 000 for each employee. Not one cent of that expenditure has ever been investigated by a Parliamentary Committee. In other words, the Electricity Trust of South Australia has done what it has wanted to do when it has wanted to do it and nobody has taken any interest in its accountability. In 1978 the Auditor-General reported that the northern power station was to be completed by the mid 1980s at an estimated cost of \$268 million. In 1983-84 that power station was estimated to cost over \$400 million and was to come on stream in 1984-85.

There are other disturbing features of the Electricity Trust's annual report, particularly in relation to financing charges. One sees that during the past few years its borrowings have jumped dramatically. It is very disturbing to note the huge increase in financial charges of \$34 million, mainly due to higher interest rates, reduced income from funds invested and a guarantee fee paid to the State Treasury. This is all to do with the State Government's new Financial Assistance Authority. Stock market advisers in America have been telling people to buy shares in energy resources such as electricity commissions because they are the organisations which have huge capital borrowings and which, when interest rates fall, benefit from that fall—but not the Electricity Trust.

I want to know why at a time when interest rates have fallen considerably over the past 12 months or so the Electricity Trust is still saddled with such a high interest bill. In his report for the year ending 30 June 1982, the Chairman of the Electricity Trust gave a fair sort of warning to the Government of the day and, of course, this should be picked up by all Governments and all political Parties. He said:

Sales of electricity increased by 3.5 per cent over the previous year and demand reached a record level. At the same time costs in all areas of operations continued to increase substantially, mainly as a result of wage and salary determinations, increases in the price of natural gas, and higher interest rates on borrowings. Because of this, tariff increases were necessary to maintain the undertaking in a sound financial position. Despite these increases the Trust's tariffs still remain among the lowest in Australia . . . electricity tariffs are now increasing in real terms, i.e. at a rate faster than inflation. This trend can be expected to continue for at least the next few years.

Under the heading, 'Natural gas', he states:

The generation of electricity in South Australia continues to depend heavily on natural gas, 80 per cent of the Trust's total generation in 1981-82 being from this fuel. Under existing contracts with the Cooper Basin Producers, present proven and probable reserves of gas in the South Australian portion of the Cooper Basin are fully committed . . . Recent re-evaluations of the gas fields in the Cooper Basin have tended to reduce the estimates of proven and probable reserves.

The Chairman was expressing concern in that regard. However, I think the key to the report relates to natural gas and its role and impact on the Electricity Trust. The Chairman said:

This is of particular concern in view of the fact that in 1974, when the Cooper Basin Producers were in serious financial difficulties to the extent that their ability to continue operations was in doubt, the Trust and other South Australian gas users, except Peterborough Corporation, agreed to a request from the Government to pay a higher price for gas, including a component for exploration, and to forgo existing contracts and accept supply under new arrangements much more favourable to the Producers.

There was the crunch in 1982. In 1974 the Electricity Trust of South Australia was committed to pay higher than normal prices for natural gas and I believe that that has caused the rot in some respects for the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I believe that, because no capital expenditure has ever been vetted by any committee of Parliament, it is time the Parliamentary Accounts Committee examined the oper-

ations of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, even if it is only to assure the people of South Australia that it is a well managed operation.

Another matter that concerns me is the use of Government motor vehicles. In the Services and Supply section of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ending 30 June 1984, the Auditor-General draws the attention of Parliament to some alarming statistics. Page 181 of the report refers to parking and home-to-office usage, as follows:

A long term commitment was entered into with the State Government Insurance Commission as the owner for the provision of 390 parking bays for vehicles used on Government business at the Gawler Place car park at a cost of \$27 300 per month.

Surveys conducted at varying times of the day and week during July 1984 showed that occupation by authorised pool vehicles varied between 78 and 207 bays.

That meant that, of the 390 bays for vehicles, 78 or 20 per cent were being used only on some occasions, and on other occasions 207 parking bays or about 53 per cent were being used. This comes out to an average of 142 parking bays used per month. The Government was paying \$27 300 per month for 390 parking bays. If only 20 per cent are being used, it is worth \$5 460 per month; and if 53 per cent are being used, it is worth \$14 469 per month.

The Government is paying out \$27 300, but it is only using about \$9 964 worth of parking space. Clearly, it is wasting \$17 336 a month or, according to the Auditor-General's Report, in eight months it has wasted \$138 688 on unutilised car park spaces at the Gawler Place car park. In other words, the Government has paid out \$138 000 for nothing—because a few public servants want to have a spot to park their cars. Page 182 of the Auditor-General's Report states:

The low number of vehicles housed in the car park, particularly at night and on weekend, together with the high proportion of vehicles on permanent hire, indicated that the under-utilisation of parking resulted from more home to office travel than anticipated as well as delays by some agencies in participating in the pool.

Few savings are being made. When the Government established that car parking pool, it was estimated that it would save \$200 000 per annum. Because Government departments have not co-operated with the Government in the arrangements, there is a huge under-utilisation of the car parking pool. In eight months the Government unnecessarily paid out \$138 000 when in actual fact it should have saved \$200 000. That \$138 000 could have created a lot of jobs for young people; it could have provided superb medical technology to save some lives in this State; and it could have helped to enrich other lives. There is no excuse for Government departments not participating in the car pool system.

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

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** I support the motion. I raise a number of issues arising from the Estimates Committees, albeit very briefly. The issue has that caused me a great deal of concern in recent times has been the funding of TAFE colleges. Members will know that I have put Questions on Notice about this matter. I have written to the Minister concerning the funding crisis facing TAFE colleges and, indeed, colleges of advanced education. We have seen a great deal of publicity about declining funds for adult literacy. We have had various representations to the Minister on speech pathology.

It is amazing that at a time when the education system—and I am talking about the higher order education system, namely, the tertiary sector—should be gearing up our young people to take on the technological challenges before us the Minister's response is to provide budgets to colleges that

are quite inadequate in historical terms, provide them with no guidance as to their priorities, and have a complete lack of understanding about the role of tertiary institutions in the education field.

A friend of mine came back from overseas a few days ago after visiting various manufacturing plants in India, England, Germany and Spain. He said that the technology in some of the under-developed countries he visited was well advanced compared to what we had to offer in South Australia and Australia. He said that Australia had a lot to learn. I agree with those comments: they are very pertinent.

By 'a lot to learn', he means that we are well behind the rest of the world. In fact, we are well behind some of the countries that are lower on the OECD list than we are. There are, in some of these countries, a number of multi-national firms providing the latest order machinery and the highest level of expertise. They are using their key personnel and their extraordinary funds to create new manufacturing processes in countries that have traditionally been very backward. This is quite a frightening problem for Australia, because traditionally we have had a market that lends itself to Australian manufactured parts. We know that there are various segments to the world market on which we have been able to get a toe hold but which have evaporated over time. This has happened because we have lacked the competitiveness, which comes from two fronts. I refer, first, to the high wage structure in Australia compared with that in some of the lesser developed Western nations, and, secondly, the inability of Australian industry to adapt to the latest techniques.

Education plays a fundamental role in this process. It makes available expertise to those people and firms that wish to be able to compete in the domestic market. More importantly, we must look overseas, because the domestic market is very limited. I remember reading some 25 years ago a book which predicted that, by the year 1990, the whole of England's demand for domestic products could be satisfied by the employment of 10 per cent of the workforce in the manufacturing and primary sector. If one extends this a little further, one will understand that, with 10 per cent involved in manufacturing and primary industries as against 30 per cent in Australia today, we have somehow to create enough jobs for the other 90 per cent of the workforce. We in Australia have the ability, if we become competitive, to do just that. We are a small nation in world terms and have a vast amount of natural resources. There are various world markets in which we can find niches that will not be subject to the competition of multi-nationals or home grown products where those goods are not available at the moment. Extensive markets exist within the South-East Asian region and in highly developed countries, because we have natural advantages over everyone else.

Central to taking our position in the world and returning to that sixth position on the OECD listing must be a requirement that Australia's workforce becomes far more technologically advanced than it is today. We must also do something quite drastic about our cost of production which will come with technology. Essentially, we must do two things: lower our wage structure and take on new technologies and new means of production to enable us to provide the goods concerned.

I mentioned at the outset of my speech that I was very disappointed with the funding of TAFE. I am not here to tell the Minister how he should administer his portfolio, but it seems to me that something is drastically wrong when the only contribution that the Minister can make to tertiary education is to say that it has to limit its budget because of economic circumstances.

The Minister says, 'You must limit your budgets because I did not do very well in Canberra. You have to limit your

budgets because I could not persuade the Federal Government to give South Australia an adequate share of the tertiary education cake. You have to limit your budgets because I really do not know what to do otherwise; we have a limitation on funding.'

The Minister did not bite the bullet and say, 'Can we do with fewer colleges?' or 'Let us do a review of the services provided at the TAFE level and determine those things that are essential for our future wellbeing.' The Minister did not say, 'We want South Australia to provide the best employment training' in terms of trade and other related fields. He did not say, 'We know what resources are available and we will use them in the most efficient manner.' Nor did he say, 'We want the colleges to deliver a service second to none in Australia.' Rather the Minister said, 'You will have to survive the best way you can, irrespective of whether the impacts of the Budget constraints limit your ability to provide proper education in those fields where we need it.'

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Did you know that there are 9 000 kids in this State who can't get access to TAFE?

**Mr BAKER:** I would not be surprised. In fact, that may well be an under-estimate of the situation if the community college of which I am a councillor is any guide. I know that the demand for computing courses and business study courses far outstrips the supply. The demand for a number of other courses developed by TAFE far outstrips the supply. I know, too of other courses which may be meaningful for some people but which struggle to survive in terms of their student numbers.

The Minister has said that we will have a cleansing process. He says, 'We will make you all be economically efficient.' How pathetic of the Minister to say that that control will be implemented totally through financial means. He has abdicated his responsibility, which is clear: he has to guide and provide some idea of priorities. His responsibility, if the Budget is to be limited, or even at any other time, is to give direction to those colleges.

I want to share tonight with the House some of the directions that I believe TAFE colleges, universities, and colleges of advanced education have to take. Somehow we must bridge the gap that is widening between ourselves and those countries which have an extraordinary amount of funds. Because of their size and their attitudes they can create new products and develop new techniques. They have businesses that are attuned to research and development. It never ceases to amaze me, for example, that the research and development effort in Australia is about 1 per cent to 2 per cent of total budgets in the business sector. In the case of the United States, and even in Japan, the funds available for this development are in excess of 5 per cent and as high as 8 per cent.

We have to change the direction of the thinking of our managers in Australia and also that of our educationists. I was amused to read that Barry Jones has been touring Australia talking about the technology gap. He spent a great deal of time and effort telling us about the challenges in front of us. Surprise, surprise! When the Federal Budget was brought down it included mammoth cuts to the CSIRO. As a person acquainted with the CSIRO in respect of a number of development projects over the years, I found this decision to be fundamentally wrong and seriously defective. Indeed, if an examination was made of the CSIRO, one would see that its research effort and new discoveries have been well in advance of anything produced elsewhere in the world.

We need institutions such as the CSIRO to be provided with reasonable budgets and the necessary freedom and incentive to produce something new, different and useful. As I said, Mr Jones spent much time wandering around Australia, yet in the first major Budget produced by the

Hawke Government the very centre of public research activity in Australia was subject to a cut in funds. That decision defies description. I could have understood it if the Minister had said, 'We want you to be more accountable than you have been in the past.' I could have understood it if the Minister had said, 'I can identify areas where you are no longer relevant and where your efforts have been well surpassed by overseas institutions.' Indeed, I could understand it if the Minister for Science and Technology had claimed that there were certain sectors of the CSIRO that were redundant, but he did not. His position was akin to that of our State Minister of Education, who abdicated his responsibility. Somehow both Ministers expected that administrators would show the necessary wisdom and would determine who would miss out on the funds provided. The Minister left the decisions to those people. However, it is the Minister who should have the overview of where we are heading and what education facilities we should have.

The Minister should determine the best means that we can provide to educate our young people to be competitive on the domestic market, as well as making a contribution on the international market. For example, it was interesting to note that, in respect of computers, we have now come further down the track since the mid 1960s but in terms of computerisation we have gone relatively backwards. I contend that a basic minimum standard for any TAFE college should include linkage to a central system; that central system should be for accounting purposes, for students and for details in respect of the operations of the college. There should be an automatic transfer of information, and Telecom has even developed a system of letter transfer. However, what has happened in colleges and other institutions? Very little! Yet these are the same institutions that are trying to upgrade the understanding of students of the world around us. If people do not have vision and have not through their education achieved some vision they will never reach the heights to which they can aspire.

Psychologists have spent a great deal of time on child development. They have said that a number of techniques are available to parents if they want their children to be aware in an educational sense. They have talked about having bright colours in the bedroom of the child, about repetition and about widening the horizons of the child by continually explaining the things around them. They have taught parents how to sit down with and read to the child at a very early age.

Yet the principles that are embodied in that are not embodied in our educational system once we get out of the primary sector. When we get into the tertiary sector it is a sink or swim situation. The Minister has to make some very intelligent and incisive decisions for a change about the role of TAFE institutions and CAEs in the post-secondary development phase of our people. That means that some money will have to be spent on providing education for the lecturers and teachers at a higher standard than is available today and on equipment that at least is closer to world standards.

It also means that the Minister has to make some decisions, and the decisions are fundamentally trading off, perhaps, students with facilities. Again, psychologists will tell us that one can take one of two paths in development: if one tries to teach everything one may well teach nothing; if one concentrates one's efforts on those things at which one is good or has a specific expertise there is a fair chance that one will achieve excellence. So, the Minister will have to really consider what he wants out of those parts of the tertiary education sector that are under his direct control. Let us have no more of this buck passing down the line or of this abdication of responsibility. Let the Minister show

some direction and provide the colleges and TAFE institutions with the leadership that they deserve.

A number of other issues that have some interest came out of the Estimates Committees. I had the great displeasure to sit on Committee B, dealing with correctional services. I adjudge the Minister's performance on that Committee as disgraceful. He provided members on the Government side with typed sheets of paper on which the questions were clearly and concisely written, and he had reams of paper in answer to those questions.

We can determine here and now whether we want the system of review to work. Obviously, the Minister of Correctional Services decided that it was not going to work. I sat there for two and a half hours and did not have any chance to question the Minister on some of the Budget lines concerned. The Minister will rue the day that he decided to stack his Committee. I cannot understand why he did it; he is normally an adaptable, reasonably intelligent person. He could have competently answered any questions that we put to him. He may well have had some difficulties in certain areas, but that is no reason for him to use this technique to stifle debate on his section of the Estimates.

I wished to question the Minister on many issues. No doubt my colleagues and I will raise some of those issues in this House over the forthcoming months. The matter of the control of drugs in institutions was raised today. The Minister was at great pains to point out to the media that every effort is made to locate drugs within the prison system. I can assure honourable members that every effort has never been made to ensure that there are no drugs or alcohol within the system—they have always been part of the system. Occasionally someone will suffer because of an excess, as is the case in the wider community.

There are very effective means of controlling drugs within the prison system. If the Minister was serious about drug control he could identify those people who are at risk. The courts have well documented cases about people who have transgressed because of an addiction to drugs. Many of the people in the prison system today are there because of having committed a crime in order to fund a drug addiction. It would be a relatively simple matter to identify those people in the system. We should provide an alternative means of helping those people through the process of overcoming their addiction.

It is simply not good enough to say that we have addicts in the system and that they will have to survive as best they can. It is not good enough to say that they can shuffle between the various divisions of Yatala and the security hospital depending on their health at the time. Obviously, the Minister of Correctional Services is doing nothing about the situation at Yatala. There are some simple remedies that the Minister could take on board. However, he will not do so. He and the former Minister have spent a lot of time trading off the safety of the community with the demands of certain prisoners within the system.

We can be serious about many things in this place: we can stand up and talk about the issues which affect this State and Australia, yet how often do we overlook some of the very simple instruments that are available to fix up problems facing us at any given time. This gets back to a basic willingness to take the system apart, to reduce the deficiencies in the system and to build on its strengths. That principle extends across the board. It is a great pity that Governments throughout Australia have been very loath to take a good, hard look at themselves.

It is a great shame that Ministers of the Crown since the mid-1960s have failed to take their responsibilities in this area seriously. Ministers must spend time determining how the services delivered by Government can be improved. The system is loaded with excess and with poor services.

Many people who are paid by the public purse do not know the meaning of public service. Whether it be in respect of prisons or parole, the provision of water and sewerage facilities, the delivery of health care services, and so on, the system is fat and requires investigation.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I support the adoption of the report, and I wish to address my comments to the ASER project. When the Premier first announced the project he put the cost at \$120 million, which was to be made up by contributions from the South Australian Superannuation Trust and the Japanese investment company Kumagai Gumi. Shortly after that it was announced that the costing of the project had increased to \$140 million, and more recently a cost of \$160 million was cited.

I asked the Premier who would pay for any overrun—the South Australian Superannuation Investment Trust or Kumagai Gumi—and what formula would be used to fund the overrun. I asked those questions not because I am opposed to the project—as the Premier continually throws up at anyone who asks questions about the project—but purely and simply so that this Parliament knows the future costs of the project. Unfortunately, the Premier still has not answered the question satisfactorily. His Government has finally come forward with the plans, and hopefully we will soon have more idea of the costs. I continue to ask questions, because numerous rumours are floating around the town that the real cost of the project is already \$200 million. Will the Premier give a more realistic figure, and say how this extra funding will be met?

Every time I speak in this House I talk about small business, and I will continue to do that as long as this Government ignores it. A letter to the Editor in today's *News* from Mr Coventry, under the heading 'Small businessmen seek fair deal', states:

The article by Greg Reid (the *News* 11 October 1984) that the needs of small business will become a major issue in the election campaign is very true. The neglect of small business by the present and previous Governments, in their policies and actions is disgraceful.

This time, the rising clamor by small business people for a fair go will be an issue that the parties had better not ignore. As a small business man I have battled for years against unfair Government charges and controls, bureaucratic red tape and the problems with bad debtors. This time—

he makes a fairly veiled threat—

I and my colleagues in small business had better get a definite set of policies that are attractive and will not be broken or the mutilated giant of small business will roar like an uncaged lion.

That comment of Mr Coventry is similar to those coming from almost every small business man who is operating in this State. Even though this article is directed at the Federal Government, let us look at what the State Government has done in the past 12 months and at what it proposes to do in the next 12 months (as we see in the Budget) as far as raising receipts is concerned.

In the land tax area there is an increase of 13 per cent, or \$4.3 million, over last year. Many small business men have approached me about this matter, but I now quote three examples of the sort of thing that has happened. One business man paid \$150 for land tax in 1980-81; this year he is to pay \$951. A second business man paid \$85 in 1980-81; this year he is to pay \$430. A third business man paid \$1 100 in 1980-81 for a small factory; this year he is to pay \$4 100. That is a massive increase or push forward by this Government, because it has not recognised that, along with massive increases in property values, there is a call from business that Government should readjust the scale. It is not something that has suddenly been said: it is a call that has been put out by businesses, not only this year but last year.



Another revenue raiser, motor vehicle registration, this year has risen by 11.3 per cent or \$7.5 million, another direct cost to small business. Pay-roll tax is probably the only single thing about which this Government has done anything. It has recognised that some meagre little thing needs to be done and has raised the level of exemption of pay-roll tax, but although it has been raised there is still an increase of \$16 million collected by the Government.

A new duty—financial institutions duty—was introduced by this Government this year to bring in \$28.5 million—again another major impost on small business. The Government keeps on saying that small business is where more people will be employed, yet it is continually raping small business. All it is doing is putting up taxes and then saying, 'We will set up a small business corporation; we will take 18 months to get it going. It will take to six to eight months to set up the board,' and perhaps hopefully by the time it goes out of Government something will be done. What is this Government doing for small business? Absolutely nothing!

We have had a 29 per cent increase in stamp duty revenue, or \$55 million, to this Government. Not many small businesses are aware of the massive increases in revenue from stamp duty on workers compensation, which has taken some \$11 million extra out of the economy by this increase. Who pays? In this State 95 per cent of all business is small business. That \$11 million that this Government is ripping off in stamp duty on workers compensation is coming from the small business community.

I turn to another area that this Government supports, that of superannuation. The latest thing to happen to superannuation in this State is that, when one converts one's superannuation lump sum into an annuity, the State will take \$3 500 in stamp duty for every \$100 000 involved. This is the highest single taxed State in the Commonwealth in relation to superannuation: this from a Government that says that we need to convince people not to take a lump sum superannuation benefit. It is about time that the Premier did something to help small business. Again, this involves another group of small business people who retire—

**Mr Groom:** What would you do?

**Mr INGERSON:** I would reduce the stamp duty rate.

**Mr Groom:** How are you going to do that?

**Mr INGERSON:** The first thing we might do is get an efficient Government. Then we will not have to tax people as much as we do now because of the inefficient way this Government is running the State. I turn now to the massive increases in business franchises. Gas tax is up 17.5 per cent. The liquor collections business franchise is up 29 per cent, from \$22 million to \$31 million, an extra \$9 million is being taken out of the hotel industry. What is the hotel industry? It is a series of small businesses. This Government is raping the potential of the State to get ahead. In the petroleum industry, tax is up 14.5 per cent, or \$6.5 million. What is the petroleum industry? Again, it is small business. What is this Government doing to encourage employment? Nothing: it is purely and simply raping small business.

Finally, the tobacco tax is up 22 per cent, or an extra \$8 million. The last amount listed under taxes relates to electricity charges. What a farcical set up we have in this State with the Government saying that it is really not responsible for the increases in taxes, yet it takes of the order of \$40 million from the Electricity Trust in one year, either by way of duty or by reorganising the Trust's finances. How can this Government face the people of this State and say that it is not concerned about the massive increases in electricity charges when it is taking of the order of \$40 million in cash each year from the Electricity Trust of South Australia? This is the thing that the Premier and this Government

need to face up to. The Government is ripping \$40 million out of the Trust each year.

I have said as much as I can say about small business without getting too carried away. I intend, every time I rise in this House, to continue to point out to this Government that it must do something for small business and must stop merely talking about doing something, that it must cut costs and help with the massive redundancy payments thrown on it by the Federal Government, or at least stand up in the State arena and say that small businesses cannot afford to carry these redundancy payments. It should stand up in the Industrial Commission and say something about this matter, otherwise we will have a situation where businesses will go broke because of costs for which they have not been able to budget. I hope that this Government will stand in the Industrial Commission and raise this point when redundancy payments flow through to this State. I turn now to the financial institutions duty. This State has the highest level of this tax.

It is a pity to hear about the Premier running around the State, talking to the media or having a few cross words to the media. He blames the Opposition because we point out the Government's inadequacies. The Premier says that we must not do that sort of thing and that we must make the State competitive, when we have the highest level of FID and the highest increases in State taxation compared with other States. If one compares stamp duty in South Australia with that in Victoria, one sees that our figure is up 70 per cent since 1982 compared with only a 40 per cent increase in Victoria; land tax is up 67 per cent in this State, compared with only 25 per cent in Victoria; liquor licensing fees were up 94 per cent in this State, compared with only 42 per cent in Victoria; cigarette licensing fees were up 160 per cent, compared with 149 per cent in Victoria; and, as I said earlier, FID is the highest in Australia. Yet our Premier stands up and says that we have to be competitive.

What is wrong with the man? When will he realise that he must give this State and its businessmen the opportunity to compete by giving them a lower base level of costs? Why were we successful when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier? It was because everything in this State was at the low base cost level. But what do we have now? We have the highest base cost level. Until this Premier learns that very basic and simple fact, this State will not have the competitive edge that it deserves.

I now refer to the Estimates of Expenditure in regard to recreation and sport. During the Estimates Committee debate Opposition members questioned the Minister in relation to the aquatic centre at North Adelaide. The Minister stated that the estimated cost was of the order of \$7.2 million and that he believed that to be an accurate estimate. If the rumours that are floating around this city are correct (and I hope that the Minister in the next few days will come clean and help us with this matter), in fact it is closer to \$10 million, not \$7.2 million. What about the delays in this project? When will the project be finished? The Minister cannot tell us that. Perhaps we ought to ask why—because there are demarcation disputes at the centre.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** He said it was the weather.

**Mr INGERSON:** He said that it was the weather, as I have been prompted by the member for Torrens, but it is demarcation disputes. When will it be finished? Will it be finished in 1985 or will there be a Budget line in 1986? Will it be \$7.2 million or \$10 million? It started at \$4.2 million about six months ago, and now it is \$7.2 million. The rumours tell us that it is \$10 million. What is the cost? Then the Auditor-General states that the problem with this project is that no proper costing has been done on it.

What does the Minister say? He says, 'Look, it was too hard for us to do the costing. We could not understand.

There is nothing like it anywhere in Australia.' It is unbelievable that in regard to a major project like an aquatic centre a Minister can say to the Estimates Committee that it is too hard to work out the costing. Does he not have any cost accountants in any of his departments? Cannot he ask some of his other front bench colleagues whether cost accounting can properly be done? Every other major project in this city is properly cost accounted. Why cannot the aquatic centre be cost accounted?

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I thank members for coming back into the House and listening to me: it is a pity they are all going to leave again. I am glad to see that the Minister has come in. It staggers me that a Minister can comment in this place that his Department was finding it very difficult to work out the cost accounting exercise for a project of the order of \$4.2 million. Anyone would think that it is a major project! I can understand the Minister having difficulty in working out a project for \$4.2 million. He has had to cut out every other facility grant so that he can get one small project like the swimming pool constructed. It is quite staggering. The Minister says that he only had the base of \$120 000 from the council. If anyone else builds a pool or constructs a major project in this town they sit down and find out the information on how other projects work from other States. It is a simple, basic cost accounting exercise. But, it required the Auditor-General to point out to the Minister that the whole future accounting on this project was very poor.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** At least I know what the cost is, compared to the Minister's cost accounting methods. The Auditor-General made this interesting comment:

In addition, the State Government will meet any increased operating deficit in real terms over the existing level for a period of 10 years. There has been no attempt to quantify this cost.

That statement and the Minister's comments are unbelievable. During the Estimates Committees a question was asked of the Minister concerning the allocation of funds for sport in the Federal Budget. We all know that the Federal Budget was brought down in August and concerned some \$65.5 million for sport in this country. We got what, I believe, was an unusual statement, which is seemingly consistent with other statements—that the Minister was not familiar with the break-up to the States. However, he was very emphatic in saying that South Australia was not going to get its reasonable share.

How can the Minister stand up and say he does not know the break-up for the States and then say that South Australia is not going to get a reasonable share? One either knows or does not know: it really is that simple. Those sorts of comments are basic, straightforward quotes from the Minister's answers. The classic of all time came when we talked about the TAB. I know that it is going to be thrown up again that I am repeating what the member for Hanson said, but it is unbelievable that a Minister of the Crown, and the Chairman of a statutory authority, does not know the interest rate to the statutory authority on some \$4 million borrowed from the State Financing Authority.

For a Minister of the Crown, who has the responsibility for that statutory authority, to not know the interest rate really does show the incompetence of that Minister. I am concerned about the takeover of 5AA by the TAB because

it seems that many of the things that have been happening have been pushed under the rug.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Rubbish!

**Mr INGERSON:** I said 'It seems'. The Minister does not have to get toey about it—I will go on and explain. It concerns me and all codes on the receiving end of the transaction that \$350 000, as announced by the TAB, was involved in transferring 5AA to the TAB. What other costs will be picked up by the TAB? That money comes out of profits to the codes. If it does not come out of profits to the codes, from where does it come? It is only the bottom line that pays for things. The cost of the TAB cannot be increased without recognising that \$350 000 has gone somewhere.

We then have the extra costs involved in extending the ability of the station to broadcast right around the State because its current broadcasting ability and equipment cannot do that. There is also the overall question of what happens if the station does not shape up and who pays. Again, the codes pay. They are the sort of questions that need to be answered. The fact that the interest rates were not known tends to highlight how quickly this deal was put together. It is incumbent on members to ask these questions, and, hopefully, we will get some reasonable replies from the Minister later.

The other area of concern in recreation and sport is that all of the money in the capital area is for the aquatic centre, the cost of which is escalating massively on a daily basis. Sporting and recreational associations say that all their grants have been cut back on a daily basis and that almost no equipment grants have been made this year. Almost every association is putting in for equipment grants and getting nothing. What is happening to the running of the Department of Recreation and Sport? Sporting associations say that to get \$1 out of the Department they have to spend \$5 in time and \$10 in paper to get an application looked at. What is happening in the Minister's Department? We only hear about a reorganisation of the Department. Is the Minister reorganising paper so that sporting associations can fill out more bits of paper and get less money? That is what is happening.

Finally, I refer to something that this Government should be doing and should have said something about. I refer to the sponsorship of sport by cigarette or alcoholic beverage companies. In the past few days two major decisions have been taken that will significantly effect sponsorship of sport in Australia in the years to come. The first was a High Court decision that upheld the decision of the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal to reduce the level of cigarette sponsorship on television.

The second was a recommendation made on Monday that sporting events sponsored by companies manufacturing alcoholic beverages could not be shown on television, particularly on Saturday afternoons. All I can say is that I think this country has gone mad. It is about time that the majority of the people in this country were supported, instead of minority madcap groups—

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

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

## ADJOURNMENT

At 11.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 17 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 October 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SCHOOL FIRES

1. Hon. PETER DUNCAN (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: At which schools have fires occurred during

the past five years, on what date did each fire occur, in each case what was the amount of damage caused in financial terms and was the fire deliberately lit and, if so, have culprits been apprehended?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The following statistics are in relation to school fires which have occurred during the past five years: (Regarding apprehension of culprits, Education Department records have only been maintained in recent years and these show that four offenders have been apprehended since 1982. (Shown \*\*)).

FIRES

School	Date of Fire	\$		Arson
		Building	Contents	
1979-80				
Strathalbyn HS	16.7.79	1 292.00	—	
Scott Street PS	10.8.79	5 374.11	—	
Elizabeth Downs PS	12.9.79	1 364.55	50.00	X
St Morris PS	2.10.79	2 004.33	—	
Marion HS	6-7.10.79	41 455.23	19 215.82	X
Marden HS	17.10.79	2 200.00	—	
Paralowie School	23.10.79	—	17.00	X
Glenunga HS	10.11.79	—	370.40	X
Woodville HS	17.11.79	1 600.00	3 479.64	X
Paralowie School	24.11.79	837.53	—	X
Alberton PS	24.12.79	—	81.57	X
Lucindale AS	26.12.79	27 298.24	4 579.36	
Brighton PS	10.1.80	—	37.36	X
Parafield Gardens HS	12.1.80	5 000.00	2 902.63	X
Tarcoola AS	15.1.80	3 840.78	—	
Hendon PS	24.1.80	5 160.34	1 186.82	
Warradale PS	2.2.80	—	100.00	X
Salisbury East HS	16.2.80	530.00	5 279.57	X
Woomera HS	19.2.80	—	338.70	
Mylor PS	20.2.80	6 600.73	327.56	
Paralowie School	29.2.80	838.00	—	
Marion PS	16.3.80	6 589.43	5 562.31	X
Smithfield Plains PS	17.3.80	—	844.25	X
Para Hills PS	22.3.80	2 500.00	2 523.73	X
Port Pirie PS	11.4.80	285 305.58	16 271.54	X
Gilles Street PS	15.5.80	19 135.50	3 120.09	X
Reading and Development Centre	15.5.80	—	242.52	X
Thorndon HS	6.6.80	—	—	X
Fremont HS	7.6.80	—	—	X
Para Vista HS	11.6.80	—	1 600.00	
Mitchell Park HS	20.6.80	—	—	
1980-81				
Marion HS	4.8/80	—	—	X
Glengowrie HS	5.8.80	—	138.24	X
Gepps Cross PS	19.8.80	3 500.00	2 631.50	X
Marden HS	6.9.80	3 815.00	21.81	X
Thebarton HS	23.9.80	6 000.00	1 839.06	X
Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre	15.11.80	90 000.00	48 733.01	
Broadmeadows PS	9.12.80	—	1 199.04	X
Broadmeadows PS	10.1.80	—	—	X
Ridley Grove PS	3.3.81	19 000.00	6 859.14	X
Salisbury Park PS	8.3.81	1 458.28	2 114.80	X
Broadmeadows PS	20.3.81	—	—	X
Kadina Memorial HS	9.5.81	80 000.00	2 867.15	X
Daws Road Centre	10.5.81	20 000.00	5 989.00	X
Karrendi PS	13.5.81	—	—	X
Minlaton PS	27.5.81	493.00	—	
1981-82				
Smithfield Plains HS	1.7.81	—	258.00	
Elizabeth Downs PS	21.7.81	6 875.00	1 670.90	
Goodwood HS	25.7.81	4 310.00	—	
Scott Street PS	11.8.81	4 131.82	238.10	X
Minda Special School	3.9.81	11 744.16	10 837.97	X
Paralowie School	21.9.81	49 600.00	60 283.42	X
Athelstone JPS	24.9.81	4 000.00	4 851.28	
Morphettville Park PS	26.9.81	4 245.00	—	
Loxton North PS	28.10.81	992.26	100.00	
Mitchell Park Special Education Unit	15.11.81	1 601.18	2 562.65	X
Thebarton HS	26-27.11.81	—	—	X
Salisbury East HS	9-10.12.81	37 800.00	3 180.47	X
Challa Gardens PS	6.3.82	6 457.87	674.14	X
Hackham West PS	7.3.82	30 200.00	10 805.10	X
Rose Park PS	3.4.82	6 200.00	—	X
Mansfield Park JPS	6.4.82	—	325.00	X
Hillcrest PS	23.4.82	89 838.00	13 973.14	X
Ingle Heights PS	21.5.82	—	—	X
Ferryden Park PS	29.5.82	2 700.09	100.00	X

School	Date of Fire	\$		Arson
		Building	Contents	
Birdwood HS	7.6.82	2 290.00	3 173.23	X
Mansfield Park JPS	28.6.82	7 836.41	3 771.44	X
1982-83				
Mitchell Park HS	14.7.82	32 540.61	180.14	X
Para Hills JPS	22.7.82	802.00	53.00	X
Salisbury North West PS	25.7.82	7 192.53	—	X
Nuriootpa HS	9.8.82	3 184.59	1 004.41	X
Elizabeth West HS	23.8.82	65 000.00*	9 972.00	X
Cummins AS	25.8.82	700 000.00*	34 531.86	X **
Whyalla HS	21.9.82	400.00	—	X
Thebarton HS	22.9.82	—	70.00	X
Forbes PS	28.9.82	20.00	—	X
Whyalla R.E.O.	3.10.82	913.08	275.00	X
Smithfield Plains HS	19.10.82	5 000.00	—	X
Elizabeth Downs JPS	24.10.82	66 000.00*	38 224.00	X
Seaton HS	24.10.82	100 000.00*	13 828.00	X
Smithfield Plains HS	1.11.82	754.00	—	—
Elizabeth West PS	5.11.82	—	—	X
Craigmore HS	10.11.82	18 060.67	9 536.00	X
Marden HS	12-15.11.82	978.36	—	—
Broadmeadows PS	13.11.82	—	—	X
Klemzig PS	4.11.82	3 376.88	—	X
Henley Beach PS	25.11.82	34 060.67	10 598.00	X
Torrens ville PS	25.11.82	7 998.42	2 931.00	—
Christies East PS	27-28.11.82	—	—	X
Para Hills PS	3.2.83	—	197.00	X
Long Street PS	12.2.83	522.64	—	—
Challa Gardens PS	15.2.83	100.00	—	X
Millbrook PS	16.2.83	50 000.00*	34 122.00	—
Kalangadoo PS	16.2.83	2 000.00*	—	—
Kangaroo Inn AS	16.2.83	34 500.00*	44 579.00	—
Houghton PS	16.2.83	29 750.00*	—	—
Tarpeena PS	16.2.83	10 000.00*	1 827.99	—
Paracombe PS	16.2.83	750.00*	—	—
Northfield HS	22.2.83	2 500 000.00*	480 000.00	X **
Salisbury North PS	16.4.83	700 000.00*	51 266.00	X **
Elizabeth Vale PS	17.4.83	4 981.23	—	X **
Para Hills HS	29.4.83	800.00*	—	—
Millicent HS	3.6.83	1 500.00*	—	—
Ingle Heights PS	5.6.83	200.00*	—	—
Languages and Multicultural Centre	13.6.83	13 610.00*	7 663.00	X
Wudinna AS	14.6.83	3 243.00*	—	—
Gilles Plains HS	17.6.83	333 000.00*	29 863.10	X
Plympton HS	18.6.83	493 000.00*	30 858.00	X
Fremont HS	21.6.83	7 096.29	15 603.00	X
1983-84				
Christies Beach HS	5.7.83	500.00	—	—
Seaton North PS	10.7.83	900.00	573.00	X
Playford HS	15.7.83	200.00	—	—
Ingle Heights PS	17.7.83	200.00	—	X
Whyalla HS	26.7.83	3 275.76	111.25	X
Modbury HS	12.8.83	130 531.74	8 636.00	X
Munno Para PS	17.8.83	100 000.00*	21 618.21	X
Mawson HS	31.8.83	4 000.00*	20 840.21	X
Milang PS	24.9.83	25 000.00*	9 383.50	X
Kingscote AS	1.10.83	400 000.00*	25 925.00	X
Forbes PS	26.10.83	—	640.00	X
Port Augusta PS	4.11.83	60 000.00*	4 125.00	X
Broadmeadows PS	13.11.83	2 500.00*	—	X
Unley PS	26.11.83	85 000.00*	7 527.86	X
Stuart HS	5.12.83	10 000.00*	156.40	—
Karrendi PS	27.12.83	9 000.00*	3 172.00	X
Modbury West PS	7.1.84	2 280.00*	11 500.00	X
Stanvac PS	6.2.84	450.00*	19.68	X
Tailem Bend PS	22.2.84	150 000.00*	27 635.00	X
Salisbury North PS	24.2.84	200 000.00*	—	X
Hackham West PS	5.4.84	4 416.00*	25.00	X
Bevan Crescent PS	14.4.84	120 000.00*	9 785.60	X
Taperoo PS	14.4.84	3 000.00*	1 000.00*	X
Elizabeth Field JPS	24.4.84	10 000.00*	11 483.00	X
Le Fevre HS	24.4.84	150 000.00*	40 000.00*	X
Ferryden Park PS	17.5.84	2 000.00*	—	—
Mount Barker HS	24.5.84	3 300.00*	878.00	—
Smithfield PS	17.6.84	114 500.00*	42 363.00	X **

(\* Estimates Only—Claim Not Yet Finalised)

### EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE

5. Mr ASHENDEN (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Task Force on Education and Technology forwarded any reports to the Minister or Cabinet and, if so, when will those reports be made available and, if not, when is it expected that either an interim or final report will be made?

2. What resources have been made available to the Task Force?

3. What funding has been made available to the Task Force and in what areas has it budgeted for that funding to be spent?

4. What secretarial facilities have been made available to the Task Force?

5. What procedures is the Task Force following in its collection of data?

6. What were the criteria used to determine the selection of the present members of the Task Force?

7. What representation is there on the Task Force from:

(a) the University of Adelaide;

(b) Flinders University;

(c) the South Australian Institute of Technology; and

(d) any group representing industry?

8. What liaison has there been between the Task Force and the University of Adelaide, Flinders University, the South Australian Institute of Technology or groups representing industry?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The Task Force has reported periodically to the Minister and through him has reported once to Cabinet.

(b) The report to Cabinet advised Cabinet of the programme of information gathering, resources required in the financial year 1984-85 and invited Cabinet members to participate in the Task Force's activities as appropriate.

(c) A formal report will be submitted to the Minister in the first half of 1985. It is proposed that a discussion paper will be circulated for public comment in mid-1985 with subsequent comment on recommendations of the Australian Education Council Working Party on Education and Technology at the end of the year.

2. Continuing funds are yet to be resolved but it is anticipated that \$40 000 will be made available to the Task Force (this does not include secretarial assistance—see 4 below). At the present time \$4 000 has been secured from the Ministry of Technology for ongoing expenses. In addition there has not yet been a decision regarding a CEP application.

In the meantime the support services of the Ministry of Technology and other bodies have been available to the Task Force as well as assistance from and through the Public Service Board.

Added to the above, some members of the Task Force have been designated to work on Task Force matters for a specific part of their time. These persons amount to 1.6 equivalent full-time plus, a full-time Executive Secretary. This of course does not imply that other members do not also make considerable input.

4. Secretarial facilities have been provided by the Ministry of Technology, Department of Technical and Further Education, South Australian College of Advanced Education and the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia. Negotiations are presently proceeding to coalesce this help thereby making available a full-time stenographer.

5. Data is being collected in two ways, namely:

1. by search of the literature, including overseas sources;

2. by consultation with

- users and providers e.g. industry, business, professional associations and educational bodies;

- interested members of the community and general public;

- experts in relevant areas.

6. Criteria used for selection of members were interest in and commitment to the principles underlying the technology strategy for South Australia and availability.

Members have been nominated by the Department of TAFE, Education Department, Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, South Australian College of Advanced Education and the Department of Labour.

7. The Task Force is a working rather than a representative body. The Task Force has adopted a policy of full consultation planned as follows:

(a) University of Adelaide through the Vice-Chancellor and other relevant members of staff. Staff who have specific relevant interests will be invited to participate in specially convened meetings and/or contribute expert opinion;

(b) Flinders University: as for the University of Adelaide;

(c) South Australian Institute of Technology: as for the University of Adelaide.

Discussions are presently occurring with a view to adding one further member from one of the above institutions.

(d) *Industry* Mr J. Jordan, Principal of Regency Park Community College and member of the South Australian Council on Technological Change, has been released by the Director-General of TAFE for two days per week to consult with industry bodies.

Mr D. Harrison, a member of the Task Force is responsible for liaison with the National Training Council and the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission.

8. Liaison with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University with the Vice-Chancellor through the Task Force Chairperson (Mr K. R. Gilding). Some individual staff members have already been involved and the Task Force is shortly to have formal discussions with the vice-chancellors and appropriate staff of the universities. Liaison with the South Australian Institute of Technology has been initially through the previous Director and recently discussions have been arranged with Professor Mead, the newly appointed Director, and members of his staff.

### SCHOOL LIBRARIES BRANCH—MANPOWER AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

22. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What are the manpower and financial implications of the establishment of regional libraries and the abandonment of the School Libraries Branch?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Libraries have been established in regional education offices for several years and are now 10 in number. It is anticipated that a similar number will continue to exist following the reorganisation of the Education Department in area education offices and elsewhere. Reorganisation should result in no change to the staffing and financial requirements of these libraries.

The decision to split the functions of the School Libraries Branch between the Curriculum and Programmes Directorates and to cease publishing the quarterly journal *Review*, has the following implications:

six reviewers require relocation outside the two newly named units (Library Resource Branch and Library Resource Development Unit), the Assistant Principal of the School Libraries Branch has required relocation outside these units,

a saving of \$32 000 in production costs for *Review* and approximately \$100 000 in reviewers' salaries since they are being redeployed,  
 \$12 000 has been lost in income generated from the sale of *Review*,  
 a newsletter, to replace *Review*, at least in part, will be distributed to schools, its cost is estimated at between \$2 000 and \$3 000 per annum,  
 approximately \$25 000 may need to be spent to provide the SAERIS data base and the Branch Library with the up-to-date material previously supplied free of charge by publishers for *Review*.

#### NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

28. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: With respect to land earmarked for the north-south transport corridor:

- (a) how many vacant blocks and houses were owned by the Highways Department as at 31 December 1982;
- (b) since that time how many have been sold or transferred (by locality), to whom, and at what price; and
- (c) how many further blocks (by locality) will be sold or transferred during 1984-85?

The Hon R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

- (a) 291 vacant blocks and 430 residential properties.
- (b) See below—figures are up to 30.7.84:

	Address	Sold to	Amount
<b>Bowden</b>			\$
Residential Property	31 Port Road, Bowden	} Raptis Properties Pty Ltd	135 000
Vacant Land	31 Port Road, Bowden		
Vacant Land	Lot 14, Field Street, Bowden		
Vacant Land	25 Port Road, Bowden		
<b>Croydon Park</b>			
Residential Property	16 Reo Road, Croydon Park	SAHT	49 000
Vacant Land	Part Lot 845 Regency Road, Croydon Park	E. C. Alonge	21 000
<b>Devon Park</b>			
Residential Property	37 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	48 500
Residential Property	39 Harrison Road, Devon Park	D. I. Rutherford	48 000
Residential Property	41 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	51 000
Residential Property	45 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	49 000
Residential Property	51 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	49 500
Residential Property	1 Plymouth Avenue, Devon Park	SAHT	52 500
Vacant Land	Part Lot 61, Cavendish Avenue, Devon Park	SAHT	130 000
Vacant Land	Lot 172, Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	18 000
Vacant Land	63 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	17 500
Vacant Land	65 Harrison Road, Devon Park	SAHT	17 500
<b>Dudley Park</b>			
Residential Property	15 Cowley Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	49 000
Residential Property	17 Cowley Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	49 500
Residential Property	19 Cowley Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	49 500
Residential Property	2 Itala Avenue, Dudley Park	P. G. Campbell	50 000
Residential Property	4 Itala Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	51 000
Residential Property	8 Itala Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	51 000
Residential Property	3 Oldsmobile Terrace, Dudley Park	SAHT	51 500
Residential Property	13 Oldsmobile Terrace, Dudley Park	SAHT	49 000
Residential Property	12 Starr Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	51 000
Residential Property	14 Starr Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	51 000
Vacant Land	1 Oldsmobile Terrace, Dudley Park	SAHT	18 000
Vacant Land	Lot 934, Star Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	15 000
Vacant Land	Lot 935, Star Avenue, Dudley Park	SAHT	15 000
<b>Glandore</b>			
Residential Property	51 Albion Avenue, Glandore	SAHT	57 000
Residential Property	54 Albion Avenue, Glandore	SAHT	60 000
Residential Property	17 Beckman Street, Glandore	SAHT	62 000
Residential Property	23 Beckman Street, Glandore	SAHT	55 000
Residential Property	25 Beckman Street, Glandore	SAHT	58 000
Residential Property	33 Beckman Street, Glandore	SAHT	53 000
Residential Property	71 Glengyle Terrace, Glandore	I. L. and K. L. Charles	60 000
Residential Property	35 St Georges Avenue, Glandore	SAHT	54 000
Residential Property	47 Waymouth Avenue, Glandore	SAHT	50 000
Vacant Land	Nil		
<b>Kurralta Park</b>			
Residential Property	187A Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park	P. and D. T. Fouyaxis	71 000
Residential Property	40 Broughton Avenue, Kurralta Park	SAHT	48 000
Residential Property	1 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	65 000
Residential Property	21 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	55 000
Residential Property	27 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	48 000
Residential Property	42 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	50 000
Residential Property	46 Daly Street, Kurralta Park (includes vacant land overleaf)	SAHT	44 000*
Residential Property	74 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	50 000
Residential Property	82 Daly Street, Kurralta Park	SAHT	45 000
Vacant Land	Lot 80, Daly Street, Kurralta Park	L. A. and V. J. Nicholls and R. Rethus	40 000
Vacant Land	Lot 81, Daly Street, Kurralta Park	A. G. and G. Galeano	39 000
Vacant Land	46 Daly Street, Kurralta Park*	SAHT	44 000*
<b>Marleston</b>			
Residential Properties	Nil		
Vacant Land	Part Section 174, Ritchie Terrace, Marleston	SAHT	72 000



	Address	Sold to	Amount
			\$
Mile End			
Residential Property	5 Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	52 000
Residential Property	8 and 8A Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	57 000
Residential Property	10 Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	42 000
Residential Property	17 Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	52 000
Residential Property	28 Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	30 000
Residential Property	28A Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	28 000
Residential Property	30A Cuming Street, Mile End	SAHT	28 000
Residential Property	1 Daringa Street, Mile End	SAHT	40 000
Residential Property	2 Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	38 000
Residential Property	11 Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	47 000
Residential Property	13 Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	43 000
Residential Property	14A Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	44 000
Residential Property	15 Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	50 000
Residential Property	17 Gladstone Road, Mile End	SAHT	42 000
Residential Property	5 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	52 000
Residential Property	7 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	62 000
Residential Property	8 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	52 000
Residential Property	13 Hughes Street, Mile End	J. R. and V. Foubister	50 000
Residential Property	14 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	60 000
Residential Property	15 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	52 000
Residential Property	16 Hughes Street, Mile End	Basic Life Distributors Pty Ltd	90 000
Residential Property	18 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	56 000
Residential Property	21 and 21A Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	50 000
Residential Property	23 and 23A Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	54 000
Residential Property	26 Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	32 000
Residential Property	28 Hughes Street, Mile End	South Australian Health Commission	66 000
Residential Property	30 Hughes Street, Mile End	South Australian Health Commission	66 000
Residential Property	32A Hughes Street, Mile End	SAHT	32 000
Residential Property	6 King Street, Mile End	SAHT	30 000
Residential Property	12 King Street, Mile End	SAHT	48 000
Residential Property	14 King Street, Mile End	L. J. Bruza	30 000
Residential Property	14A King Street, Mile End	SAHT	30 000
Residential Property	15 King Street, Mile End	J. M. Bastin	55 000
Residential Property	16 King Street, Mile End	SAHT	30 000
Residential Property	16A King Street, Mile End	SAHT	30 000
Residential Property	4 Parker Street, Mile End	SAHT	35 000
Residential Property	28 Parker Street, Mile End	A. Cartensen and T. Loughry	43 000
Residential Property	19 Rose Street, Mile End	De Duong and Hung Nga Ngo	55 000
Vacant Land	24 Goodenough Street, Mile End	SAHT	50 000
Vacant Land	12 Parker Street, Mile End	SAHT	22 000
Vacant Land	14 Parker Street, Mile End	N. T. and T. K. T. Phung	40 000
Vacant Land	16 Parker Street, Mile End	SAHT	23 000
Old Noarlunga			
Residential Properties	Nil		
Vacant Land	Lot 229, Dungey Road, Old Noarlunga	N. E. and M. R. Cooper	3 500
Vacant Land	Lot 5, Main South Road, Old Noarlunga	K. M. and J. W. Miskin	3 500
Vacant Land	Lot 185, Victor Harbor Road, Old Noarlunga	D. J. and S. Murphy	3 500
Vacant Land	Lot 186, Victor Harbor Road, Old Noarlunga	J. A. and L. Outram	3 500
Vacant Land	Lot 187, Victor Harbor Road, Old Noarlunga	J. A. and L. Outram	3 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 242, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. E. and S. A. Gudyer	4 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 243, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. E. and S. A. Gudyer	4 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 244, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. E. and S. A. Gudyer	4 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 245, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. E. and S. A. Gudyer	4 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 246, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. E. and S. A. Gudyer	4 500
Zoned Commercial	Lot 247, Scenic Drive, Old Noarlunga	J. and K. Neailey	4 500
Renown Park			
Residential Property	90 Blight Street, Renown Park	SAHT	41 000
Residential Property	92 Blight Street, Renown Park	SAHT	46 000
Residential Property	6 Harrison Road, Renown Park	SAHT	48 000
Residential Property	8 Harrison Road, Renown Park	SAHT	56 000
Residential Property	75 Lamont Street, Renown Park	SAHT	48 000
Residential Property	8 Tait Street, Renown Park	SAHT	35 000
Residential Property	17 Tait Street, Renown Park	SAHT	70 000
Vacant Land	12 Harrison Road, Renown Park	SAHT	56 000
Thebarton			
Residential Property	28 and 28A Rose Street, Thebarton	SAHT	52 000
Vacant Land	Nil		

(c) The estimated number of allotments to be sold or transferred during 1984-85 is 84 plus four additional parcels of land to be sold as development sites.

	Allotments
Enfield Council Area	2
Hindmarsh Council Area	27
Thebarton Council Area	48
West Torrens Council Area	11
	88

**E & WS DEPARTMENT**

38. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What initiatives have been taken to reduce delays associated with provision of services and administrative

requirements with respect to land subdivision and housing development?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: To cope with the large increase in the workload resulting from the current boom in land

division and housing development the Engineering and Water Supply Department has increased its manpower within appropriate Branches by reallocating staff to assist with the preparation of information and the co-ordination of the necessary processes.

Also, the procedures involved in the extension of water supply and sewerage schemes to existing allotments and new allotments created by land division have been revised and changes to reduce processing times implemented. These changes have already reduced the processing time for major land divisions to a level satisfactory to the development industry. In addition, measures have been taken to reduce the backlog of inspection of house drains.

### LAND SUBDIVISION

39. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What initiatives have been taken to reduce delays associated with provisions of services and administrative requirements with respect to land subdivision and housing development?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The Electricity Trust of South Australian has taken the following action to reduce delays associated with the provision of electricity services in new land divisions:

- Administrative procedures have been changed to allow quotations to be based on average costs of recently completed land divisions so that quotations can now be given immediately the land division plan is available. (Previously, quotations were not given until all designs had been completed.)
- Thirty-four additional trainee linesmen have been employed and contract arrangements have been made for the provision of additional drafting services.
- Arrangements are in hand to employ an additional three technical officers.

40. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: What initiatives have been taken to reduce delays associated with provision of services and administrative requirements with respect to land subdivision and housing development?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:  
1. Planning Act Considerations:

In submissions to the Planning Act Review Committee, and at seminars and conferences sponsored by the Government together with development industry organisations, the land development industry expressed three main areas of concern with the planning approval process relating to land division:

- The requirement to lodge application at over 120 different councils causes delays and promotes inconsistency;
- the need to seek planning approval and two separate certificates of Approval under the Real Property Act creates excessive paperwork and delay;
- the sequential examination of planning issues and then servicing requirements creates delays, particularly for simple land division proposals.

As a result of these concerns, the Government considers a number of proposals for amendment to the Development control regulations under the Planning Act, and the Land division regulations under the Real Property Act. In August, 1984, all councils were sent draft proposals for amendment to the land division system, and the period for comment from councils closed at the end of September 1984. Final wording of the amendments is now being prepared. In summary the proposed amendments provide that:

- (i) Applications for planning approval for land division shall be lodged with the S.A. Planning Commission. The Commission will collect relevant fees

and plans and within seven days forward the application to the relevant council. At this stage the Commission will either advise council of the Commission's view, thereby allowing council to determine the matter, or the Commission may advise council that its report will be forwarded within eight weeks. The Commission will also forward details of the proposal to relevant Government agencies.

For major proposals (subdivisions) council will be required to determine the application within three months of receipt. For minor proposals (resubdivisions) council will be required to determine the proposal within six weeks of receipt of a report from the Commission. Where the Commission is the planning authority, the three months limit will apply, to ensure council has sufficient time to comment on the proposal.

- (ii) An application under the Planning Act shall be sufficient to constitute an application for certificates under the Real Property Act.
- (iii) The land division regulations will provide that where council is the planning authority its statement of requirements be issued concurrently with planning approval, and the Commission's requirements within three weeks. Where the Commission is the planning authority, then its requirements will issue concurrently with planning approval and the council's within six weeks.

Where certificates are applied for separately from planning approval, a time limit of two months will apply for issue of 'statement requirements'.

#### 2. Lands Department:

The delays being experienced at the Lands Titles Office have been addressed by the Government in the following manner:

#### (1) Document Examination Section

##### (a) Grade II Work

- Staff complement (one Senior Examiner and four Examining Officers Grade II), augmented by addition of two trained Technical Officers (TO-3 level). Staff number has been increased by 40 per cent, that is, from five to seven.

##### (b) Grade I Work

- Staff complement (eight Examining Officers Grade I) augmented by three trained officers, together with employment on contract of a retired officer. Complement of group has been increased by 50 per cent, that is, from eight to 12.
- Some Grade I Examining Officers are currently engaged in six hours overtime per week, the present session of overtime (of three months duration) having commenced on 10 July. Prior to that date, two other periods of overtime (in total, six weeks) have been worked by this group.
- Granting of long service leave and special leave without pay has been suspended (other than in cases of hardship or other pressing necessity) until December, 1984.

#### (2) Plan Examination Section

##### (a) Non-survey plans

Staffing in this Section has been increased by 23 per cent, that is, from 13 to 16.

##### (b) Survey Examination Section

- The addition of three Technical Officers (TO-1 Level) has allowed revised examining procedures to be used; this has reduced the average time taken for examination of a survey from 2.3 to 2.0 days.
- Three Technical Officers (TO-3 Level) have been seconded into the section from other departments;

- of these, two returned to their own departments on Monday, 20 August.
- A domestic rearrangement of staff has allowed four additional LTO personnel to be employed on examination of survey plans; some backlogs may be generated in the areas providing the additional staff for survey examination.
  - An advertisement appeared in the Public Service Board Notice dated 15 August 1984, inviting applications from Technical Officers for temporary appointment or transfer (for an initial period of 12 months). A number of positions (five) is entailed. As well, approval has been given for a similar temporary employment of three base grade Technical Officers as additional staff for the Registrar-General's Office. Effectively, the examining staff of this Section has already been increased by 21 per cent, that is from 14 to 17, with provision for a further eight officers.

### SPECIAL BRANCH

45. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What is the current status of the Special Branch within the Police Department and, if it has been disbanded, which area of the Department will be responsible for its intelligence functions?
2. What liaison arrangements have been made with the Federal Police for the transfer of appropriate information?
3. Under what guidelines will the Police Department be working in respect of activities which are regarded as subversive?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force was discontinued on 25 July 1984. The newly established unit known as the Operations Intelligence Section will be responsible for intelligence functions pending a review of guidelines or directives following publication of the paper of Mr Justice Hope on Australia's intelligence and security agencies.
2. Liaison between the South Australian Police and the Australian Federal Police is performed as a normal part of the policing function. The exchange of information takes place as the need arises.
3. The South Australian Police will operate according to directives contained in the Order in Council made by the Governor on 20 November 1980 until such time as it is revoked. For the purpose of the Order in Council, 'subversive' is understood to include 'acts of violence, civil disorder or the commission of other offences directed towards overthrowing, weakening or undermining, by unconstitutional means, the Governments of the States or the Commonwealth or any of the processes of democratic government.'

### EYRE PENINSULA CONSERVATION PARKS

64. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the Government any plans to create more national or conservation parks on Eyre Peninsula and, if so, why, in which hundreds and council areas are they to be established, and have detailed surveys been carried out to determine if the areas contain any minerals which could be exploited in the future.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes, specific proposals to constitute land on Eyre Peninsula as national parks or conservation parks or additions to existing parks are being examined in the District Council of Port Lincoln in the

Hundred of Lincoln, and in the District Council of Cleve in the Hundred of Verran. The land concerned is considered to be suitable for dedication because of its significance by reason of its wildlife or natural features and because there are few or no other examples of similar land already dedicated.

An interdepartmental committee has been investigating the feasibility of constituting areas of Crown land on the Peninsula as new parks, but no final decision has been made on the matter. The Department of Environment and Planning is not aware of detailed mineral surveys which may have been carried out in the areas mentioned.

### PANORAMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

71. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the Minister aware of the estimated \$94 000 shortfall in funds necessary to maintain existing programmes at Panorama Community College during 1984-85 and, if so, what direction will he provide as to the courses which have to be discontinued and lecturers to be sacked?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Following advice of the 1984-85 indicative budget, Department of Technical and Further Education colleges were provided with tentative allocations and were requested to consider the implications and strategies necessary to remain within the indicated figure. Panorama's indicative budget allocation for 1984-85 was given as \$424 000. This is \$10 160 higher than the indicative allocation for 1983-84 (\$413 840) but \$10 040 less than the final allocation made for that year (\$434 040).

Originally the Principal had calculated that to maintain the present activity level and meet the increased fuel and power cost, inflation and non-use of General Service Fee revenue in the conduct of educational programmes, the College would require a further \$94 040. In Panorama's case this would, in the opinion of the College, result in reduction of access type programmes and staff reductions in the area of temporary and PTI staff. However, the necessary effects of the 1984-85 budget allocation will be further examined by the Department and the College in consultation with each other. Actual allocations to individual colleges are still being finalised at the time of answering; so the final effect on college programmes is still to be determined.

### COMMUNITY WELFARE BRANCH

74. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: Will the Minister establish a Department for Community Welfare branch or office in the City of Henley and Grange and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Whilst no immediate action is planned to establish a branch office at Henley Beach, the need for this facility will be kept under review.

### MINNIPA POLICE STATION

80. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Does the Police Department have any plans to close the Minnipa Police Station and, if so, why?

2. Is the Government aware of the concern the local residents of Minnipa are showing in relation to rumours of closure?

3. Will the police consult with the district council before they make any decisions to close or reduce the police presence at Minnipa?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has been made by the Police Department to close the Minnipa Police Station.

2. The concern of local residents about rumours of the closure of the Minnipa Police Station had not been previously brought to the attention of the Police Department.

3. A statewide review of policing operations is currently in progress. The police services provided at Minnipa are being examined as part of that review. The review team will meet with representatives of the District Council of Le Hunte this month.

#### REGIONAL TOURISM ASSOCIATIONS

82. The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

##### REGIONAL TOURIST ASSOCIATION INCOME 1982-83

Region	Dept. of Tourism grant/subsidy	Local government	Region	Total income
Barossa Valley	12 000	9 465	25 129	46 594
Eyre Peninsula	15 000	7 800	14 607	37 407
Fleurieu Peninsula	16 000	13 450	36 222	65 672
Flinders Ranges	10 000	3 750	10 777	24 527
Kangaroo Island	11 000	7 500	15 431	33 931
			17 517	
Lower Murray	10 000	—	(including Local Government contribution)	27 517
Mid North	10 000	2 560	6 540	19 100
			13 187	
Riverland	15 000	—	(including Local Government contribution)	28 187
South-East	20 000	14 195	60 992	95 187
Yorke Peninsula	15 000	7 145	32 302	54 447
Total	134 000	65 865	232 704	432 569

##### REGIONAL TOURIST ASSOCIATION INCOME 1983-84

Region	Dept. of Tourism grant/subsidy	Local government	Region	Total income
Barossa Valley	15 000	10 900	27 565	53 465
Eyre Peninsula	17 000	7 600	7 978	32 578
Fleurieu Peninsula	18 000	14 850	19 168	52 018
Flinders Ranges	12 000	4 250	31 826	48 076
Kangaroo Island	17 000	6 000	14 259	37 259
Lower Murray	9 000	6 159	2 030	17 189
Mid North	11 000	6 000	15 065	32 065
Riverland	18 000	Nil	15 966	33 966
South-East	23 000	10 500	43 720	77 220
Yorke Peninsula	20 000	6 250	13 950	40 200
Total	160 000	72 509	191 527	424 036

#### CEP GRANTS

86. The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Is it the practice of the South Australian Consultative Committee, which approves CEP grants to consult with State departments, which normally approve funding for projects of the nature applied for under the CEP, before final approval is given for such grants?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Joint Commonwealth-State Community Employment Programme Secretariat consults with State departments whenever they feel it is appropriate before placing recommendations before the consultative committee.

#### FERGUSON PARK TOILETS

87. The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. How long have the toilets in Ferguson Park, Hallet Road, Stonyfell been out of order?

2. When will they be repaired?

1. In 1982-83 and 1983-84, what was the grant to each of the regional tourism associations?

2. What funds were contributed in each region by—

(a) the region; and

(b) local government?

3. To what purposes were the funds put in each of the regions in 1983-84?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. Attached are lists 1 and 2 which detail the information sought by the honourable member.

3. These funds were used to cover the costs of promotion, literature, training seminars and general administration.

3. What is the reason for the delay in repairing them?

4. What is the estimated cost of repair?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The toilets in Ferguson Park have been out of order for five months.

2, 3, and 4. Negotiations are currently in train with the Burnside Council, which wishes to operate and maintain the toilets as a public facility.

Although council has offered to meet the costs of operation and maintenance, the negotiations are dependant on the availability of funds to upgrade the toilets to appropriate health standards. As this facility, under council control, would service a community need beyond the management objectives of Ferguson Park, it has been suggested that council meet the costs of upgrading, estimated at \$3 000. Some additional costs to provide pathways may need to be met. Council has not yet had the opportunity to respond to this proposal.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT  
PLAN STRATEGIES**

88. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: What is the progress to date in implementing strategies 1.1 to 14.3 of the South Australian Tourism Development Plan and what action has been taken in respect of each strategy, in accordance with the time schedule laid down in appendix 2 of the Plan, by—

- (a) the State Government;
- (b) the Department of Tourism;
- (c) the South Australia Tourism Development Board;
- (d) SAARTO;
- (e) SATIC;
- (f) the South Australian Tourism and Hospitality Industry Committee;
- (g) the Premier; and
- (h) the Minister of Tourism?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I refer the honourable member to my speech in the House on 28 August, when I comprehensively detailed action under the strategies of the Tourism Development Plan.

**TOURISM CO-OPERATIVE ADVERTISING  
CAMPAIGN**

91. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What funds were allocated to the Co-operative Advertising Campaign run by the Department of Tourism in 1983-84?
2. What amount was originally sought from private operators for the campaign and what was the formula for sharing of costs?
3. What funds were forthcoming from private operators in 1983-84?
4. If funds from private operators were insufficient to comply with the formula, what was the value of advertising foregone as a result and what were the reasons for lack of response from private operators?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The replies are as follows:

1. \$54 996
2. An amount of \$50 000 was sought from private operators.  
The cost-sharing formula was intended to be approximately 60/40 with the Department of Tourism accepting the major share. The final cost-sharing varied slightly in each advertisement but averaged 62/38.
3. \$35 000
4. The value of advertising foregone in 1983-84 was \$41 000. The response from operators was considered very satisfactory but was affected by the timing of the launch of the campaign, and an apparent failure by operators to realise the full advantages of the scheme which in effect represented a significant subsidy by the Department of Tourism. Private operators contributions are now steadily increasing.

**NORTH ADELAIDE VILLAGE**

93. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Premier: How much land tax was paid by the South Australian Superannuation Investment Trust for the Village shopping centre, North Adelaide for 1980-81 and 1983-84?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust was not subject to land tax until the year 1982-83, and hence none was paid for the year 1980-81. \$40 943.40 was paid in land tax for the North Adelaide Village shopping centre for the year 1983-84.

**CALCA WATERHOLE PARK**

94. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Does the Government still intend to make land available from the Calca Waterhole Park to the Calca Tennis Club for tennis courts and also to the community to build a new oval?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Government still intends to make land available to the District Council of Streaky Bay for the establishment of an additional tennis court near the existing court in Calpatanna Waterhole Conservation Park. It is not however, the Government's intention to provide land from the Conservation Park for the establishment of an oval.

**DAY-CARE CENTRES**

95. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government provide funds to local community groups who endeavour to build community service centres which would incorporate pre-school day-care centres and various other community services and, if so, through which departments?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Funds are provided for capital costs for some selected pre-school day-care centres (child care) in areas of need. These funds are provided by the Department of Social Security. Some of these pre-school day-care centres have other community services related to them, and in this way they could be called 'community service centres'. The Department of Social Security would be the appropriate department to contact for further information.

**SCHOOL FURNITURE**

96. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the policy of the Education Department in relation to the replacement of furniture in schools and is the Department aware that some schools are experiencing difficulties of shortages, particularly when chairs have been damaged, in getting replacements?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The recurrent and capital spending on school furniture will amount to \$804 000 in 1984-85 Budget compared with \$747 000 in 1983-84. This is an increase of 7.6 per cent over the previous year (against a 3.6 per cent increase in the CPI over the same period). This follows last year's increase which was also approximately twice the rate of inflation and compares with consistent reductions in real terms that applied during each of the budgets of the previous Government. Funds for the provision of replacement furniture are dispersed by the Education Department to Area Officers for management at local level. The Education Department is aware, however, that some schools are facing difficulties in achieving adequate quantities of replacement furniture, particularly in areas where high enrolment levels have been maintained. Every effort is made by the Department to satisfy urgent needs as and when they arise.

**GRAPEVINE**

98. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: How many issues of *Grapevine* have been produced since November 1982, what was the date of each issue and when will the next issue be published?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The replies are as follows:

- (a) Four issues:  
November 1982

October 1983  
January 1984  
September 1984  
(b) November 1984.

### TOURISM SUBSIDIES

99. The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Of the projects listed in appendix 2 of the answer to Question on Notice No. 254 (*Hansard* page 2576, 1983-84), which have since been given a grant for the development of tourist resorts, what is the value of each grant and the date of funding approval?

2. From which sponsors have applications (facilities grants) been received since December 1983, what are the projects and what is the value of each project?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

Sponsor	Project	Estimated Cost	Value of Subsidy	Date of Approval
D.C. Beachport	Tourist Information Bay at Beachport	7 600	3 800	26.10.82
Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society	Restoration of Car 210	25 000	10 000	23.7.83
D.C. Berri	Two Tourist Information Bays, Berri	22 000	5 500	4.11.83
Christison Park Trust	Picnic Facilities at Christison Park, Clare	18 447	2 100	21.11.83
D.C. Cleve	Arno Bay Caravan Park—Roadways	32 000	16 000	28.11.83
D.C. Coonalpyn Downs	Public Toilets—Tintinara	30 000	15 000	16.3.83
C.T. Glenelg	Tourist Information Centre and Public Toilets	395 000	45 000	28.11.83
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn	Tourist Information Bay, Quorn	6 000	3 000	4.11.83
	Handicapped Public Toilets, Quorn	4 000	2 000	22.3.83
D.C. Karoonda-East Murray	Caravan Facilities—Karoonda	40 000	2 000	13.8.84
D.C. Mannum	Tourist Lookout—Coolcha	5 600	2 800	15.4.83
D.C. Meningie	Public Toilets etc.—Meningie	36 000	18 000	25.1.84
C.T. Moonta	Moonta Bay Caravan Park—Planning	21 000	10 500	17.10.83
Mount Gambier Jubilee 150 Committee	Develop Lady Nelson Park—Construction	700 000	100 000	16.11.83
D.C. Murray Bridge	Tourist Information Bay—Murray Bridge	13 254	7 100	2.4.84
D.C. Paringa	Tourist Lookout Headings Cliff	26 950	13 500	19.10.83
C.T. Port Augusta	Visitor Information Centre—Consultancy	6 000	4 810	18.8.83
D.C. Port Broughton	Artificial Fishing Reef	8 600	4 300	8.11.83
D.C. Port Elliot and Goolwa	No. 19 Beacon Redevelopment—Consultancy	5 100	2 600	7.12.83
D.C. Tanunda	Public Toilets—Bethany Reserve	23 500	11 750	13.8.84
D.C. Waikerie	Riverfront Power Supply	2 750	1 375	22.9.83
D.C. Yankalilla	Normanville Caravan Park—Redevelopment	600 000	115 500	28.3.84 21.8.84

2. Applications for facilities grants received since December 1983 are—

Sponsor	Project	Estimated Cost \$	Sponsor	Project	Estimated Cost \$
D.C. Tanunda	Menglers Hill Lookout	13 000	D.C. Tanunda	Menglers Hill Lookout	13 000
D.C. Tumby Bay	Tumby Bay Caravan Park—Seal Roadways	15 000	D.C. Tumby Bay	Tumby Bay Caravan Park—Seal Roadways	15 000
D.C. Yankalilla	Public Toilets—Delamere	22 000	D.C. Yankalilla	Public Toilets—Delamere	22 000
D.C. Yorketown	Coobowie Caravan Park New Ablution Block	40 000	D.C. Yorketown	Coobowie Caravan Park New Ablution Block	40 000
D.C. Beachport	Woakwine Cutting Lookout	8 000			
D.C. Dudley	Penneshaw Jetty Reserve—Redevelopment	224 489			
D.C. Hawker	Redevelop Hawker Railway Precinct	612 000			
	Hawker Caravan Park—Handicapped Facilities	6 400			
	Tree Planting	33 000			
D.C. Kapunda	Tourist Information Bay—Kapunda	3 000			
D.C. Le Hunte	Rest Area, Public Toilets—Wudinna Tourist Information Bay	65 000			
D.C. Loxton	Riverside Reserve Irrigation System—Loxton	3 124			
	Houseboat Wharf—Loxton	75 000			
D.C. Minlaton	Port Vincent Caravan Park—New Ablution Block, Sullage System	300 000			
C.T. Mitcham	Mt Barker Road Information Bay—Consultancy	5 000			
D.C. Morgan	Tourist Lookout—Morgan	8 000			
D.C. Mt Barker	Public Toilets—Hahndorf Recreation Grounds	30 000			
D.C. Northern Yorke Peninsula	Moonta Mines Redevelopment	50 000			
C.T. Port Augusta	Tourist Information Bay	6 000			
C.T. Renmark	Bus Parking Bay—Renmark Toilet Septic System—Plushes Bend	27 090 6 885			
D.C. Robe	Tourist Information Bay—Robe	14 500			

### BAROSSA VALLEY WASTE WATER STUDY

100. The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What consultation, if any, has there been between those preparing the Barossa Valley waste water study and the South Australian Tourism Development Board, the Barossa Valley Regional Tourist Association, the Department of Tourism or any other tourist authority?

2. If there has been no consultation, will the Minister undertake to refer the recommendations to establish a regional treatment works near Tanunda to the South Australian Tourism Development Board or the Department of Tourism for a tourism impact study.

3. Are recommendations of the Barossa Valley waste water study in any way in conflict with the heritage survey of the Barossa region and, if so, what action will be taken by the Government on these recommendations?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. During the undertaking of the Barossa Valley waste water study, the consultant contacted various local tourist development centres in the Barossa Valley to gauge the response of tourists to odours emanating from existing waste



water disposal practices, particularly in the lagooning of winery and distillery wastes, as one of the objectives in developing a waste water management strategy for the Barossa Valley is to eliminate odour nuisances arising from stored waste water.

2. The Barossa Valley waste water study report, which contains four broad treatment and disposal strategies for handling waste water in the Barossa Valley, including the regional treatment works option, has been released for public comment. As part of the process of seeking comment, a copy of the report has been provided to the Department of Tourism. The various treatment options are presented in concept only and no decisions have yet been finalised on which option or options might be adopted to solve the waste water problem in the Valley. When the final decisions are made, they will, of course, need to take into account the desires of the community as well as providing a practical, cost effective solution.

3. The consultant, in undertaking the study, was aware of the Barossa region heritage survey report, and has developed waste water management strategies framed to be complementary to findings of the heritage survey.

### ST JOHN'S BOYS HOME

102. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: How many juveniles have been referred by the Minister or his Department to St John's Boys Home, Brooklyn Park, in each year for the past five years and, if none, why not?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** No figures have been kept on the number of children referred by the Department. Admission figures since 1982 are: 1982, 4; 1983, 7; and 1984, 3. Earlier figures are difficult to obtain.

### STUART HIGHWAY

103. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Highways Department intending to let any further contracts on the Stuart Highway and, if so, on what sections?

2. With the current availability of funds, when is it anticipated that the road will be completed to the Northern Territory border?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes: Coober Pedy (South) to Mirikata; Mount Willoughby to Pootnoura; Marla to De Rose Hill; De Rose Hill to Northern Territory border.

2. December 1986.

### CEP FUNDS

104. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the Engineering and Water Supply Department made application for Commonwealth Employment Programme funds to assist in completing some of the 32 uneconomical projects which are currently unable to proceed?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Yes; however, as yet advice as to the outcome of the application has not been received.

### HIGHWAYS FUNDS

105. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How much money has the Highways Department allocated in the current financial year for the Quorn to

Wilmington, Orroroo to Hawker, Burra to Morgan and Lock to Elliston roads, respectively?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The replies are as follows:

Quorn to Wilmington road \$350 000

Orroroo to Hawker road \$220 000

Burra to Morgan road \$95 000

Lock to Elliston road \$200 000.

### NATIONAL PARKS

106. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Does the National Parks and Wildlife Service have any plans to purchase more land in the Flinders Ranges for national or conservation parks and, if so, where?

2. Have negotiations commenced to purchase any existing pastoral properties and, if so, does the Government have any plans to compulsorily acquire any such properties in the Flinders Ranges where negotiations are not successful?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Flinders Ranges National Park Management Plan recommends that the Wilpena Station adjacent to the park should be purchased in its entirety as a highly appropriate and important addition. Approval has recently been given for the purchase of the property known as 'The Dutchman' in the lower Flinders Ranges, west of Quorn.

2. The Government does not intend to use compulsory purchase in either of the above cases.

### EDUCATION COSTS

107. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the cost to the Government for each child educated in a Government school?

2. What is the cost to the Government for each child educated in a non-government school?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. Government school cost

Average cost to State (includes Commonwealth funding to State):

Primary student \$1 947

Secondary student \$2 764

2. Non-government school cost

State contribution:

Primary student \$296-\$370

Secondary student \$450-\$638

Note the rates vary depending upon the school category.

In addition, Commonwealth funds are paid to non-government schools.

### Mr M.G. LUCKMAN

108. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister of Transport responded to the letter from Mr M.G. Luckman, who was the transport driver involved in the fatal accident near Port Pirie on Easter Sunday and, if so, on what date and what was the reason for the delay and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The Minister of Transport's office has no record of any letter ever having been received from Mr M.G. Luckman.

**BUDGET ADVICE**

110. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: How many persons have received budget advice in each of the past three years?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Records are kept only of the number of the new clients seeking budget advice. The figures for the past three years are: 1981-82, 2 130; 1982-83, 3 304; and 1983-84, 3 645. In addition, some earlier clients would be receiving ongoing help, but the number involved is not recorded.

**YATALA PRISON**

111. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Correctional Services: When will the Yatala Labour Prison industries complex be completed and fully commissioned and what are the reasons for the delay?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The proposed opening date for the total industries complex is 5 November 1984. The industries complex has not been fully utilised to date because of questions of staffing and funding that have been the subject of negotiations.

**EMERGENCY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

112. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: What are the exact numbers and total amount of emergency financial assistance provided to fam-

ilies and individuals in crisis or hardship in each of the past three financial years and what is the average amount of financial assistance granted to each applicant?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The information is as follows:

	Nos of Approved EFA Applications	Total EFA Expenditure	Average EFA Grant Per Applicant
		\$	\$
1981-82	27 236	780 586	28.66
1982-83	29 271	978 618	33.43
1983-84	32 377	1 070 493	33.06

**RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES**

113. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: How many residential care facilities or hostels are owned or leased by the Department for Community Welfare, where are they located, what was the capacity and average occupancy of each during the past financial year, and how many staff are employed at each?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The replies are as follows:

Facilities owned by DCW. = 24

Facilities leased by DCW. = 6

Note: Staffing of these facilities is based on a roster system to provide 24 hour supervision and service.

\*These units are involved in providing services to individuals in the community on a non-residential basis.

There are no departmental staff based at the family homes listed herein; these are departmentally owned or leased properties with families in residence who receive foster care subsidies for children placed in their care and minimal financial assistance for rates and maintenance of the home.

Training and Assessment Centres	Lease/own	Capacity	Average Occupancy	No. Staff as at 31.8.84
South Australian Youth Training Centre Glen Stuart Road, Magill Telephone (08) 31 3171	DCW	83-84 76 Re:Structured 60	48	120.6
South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre 46 Harewood Avenue, Enfield Telephone (08) 260 6999	DCW	50	18	73.0
Miscellaneous Vaughan House 46 Harewood Avenue, Enfield	DCW	—	Not operational	
Central Northern Region Admission Unit Markham Avenue, Enfield	SAHC	—	Not yet occupied	
Central Southern Region Group Home 58 Pleasant Avenue, Glandore 5037 Telephone (08) 297 4081	DCW	6	6	7
Ceduna Family Home 6 Morrison Avenue, Ceduna Telephone (086) 78 2453	Minister of Works	5	1	—
Dartmouth Family Home 47 Dartmouth Street, Port Augusta 5700 Telephone (086) 42 3764	DCW	5	3	—
Kandarik Cottage 20 Tarlton Street, Somerton Park, Telephone (08) 294 4052	DCW	8	8	11.0
Lochiel Park* Hill Street, Campbelltown, Telephone (08) 337 9533	DCW	16	14	23.7
Loxton Family Mackey Road, Loxton Telephone (085) 84 2252	M of W	8	2	—
Magill Home* Church Street, Magill Telephone (08) 332 6555	DCW	105	118	126.5
Marion Units 318 Diagonal Road, Sturt Telephone (08) 298 4774	DCW	8	6	7
Mt Gambier Family Home 8 Acacia Street, Mt Gambier Telephone (087) 25 9772	DCW	5	N/A	—

Ceased operation  
January 1984

Training and Assessment Centres	Lease/own	Capacity	Average Occupancy	No. Staff as at 31.8.84	
Pt Lincoln Family Home 54 London Street, Pt Lincoln Telephone (086) 82 1814	DCW	4	2	—	Ceased operation April 1984
Pt Pirie Family Home 23 Butterick Street, Pt Pirie Telephone (086) 32 2362	DCW	7	8	—	Operational Sep 83-Feb 84
Pybus Family Home 84 Pybus Street, Pt Augusta Telephone (086) 42 2706	DCW	3	—	—	Not operational
Slade Cottage 10 Ferris Avenue, Somerton Park, Telephone (08) 294 3946	DCW	8	5	7	
Stuart House 52 Hill Street, North Adelaide Telephone (08) 267 2629	DCW	16	12	9.7	
Whyalla Family 9 Baldwin Street, Whyalla Telephone (086) 45 7577	Leased SAHT	4	3	—	Ceased operation March 1984
Oars 1 James Street, Cambelltown Elizabeth Family Home	DCW	—	N/A	—	
34 Marleycombe Road, Elizabeth Vale Naldera Cottage	DCW	5	N/A	—	
25a Naldera Street, Glandore Irene Women's Shelter	DCW	—	Occupied by ICRA		
52 Pleasant Avenue, Glandore	DCW	—	N/A	—	
36 Gordon Street, Glenelg Malvern Cottage	DCW	—	Vacant		
72 Cheltenham Street, Malvern	DCW	—	Occupied by Southern Areas Mothering Unit		
ADMISSION UNITS					
Central Northern Region Admission Unit 403 The Parade, Kensington Gardens Telephone (08) 31 1384	DCW	8	6	11.0	
Central Southern Region Admission Unit 28 William Street, Clarence Park Telephone (08) 293 5850	DCW	8	5	7.5	
Central Western Region Admission Unit 4 Rowells Road, Lockleys Telephone (08) 43 5478	DCW	8	5	7	
COMMUNITY UNITS					
Gilles Plains Community Unit 643 Main North East Road, Gilles Plains Telephone (08) 261 0431	Leased from Shell	8	6	8.1	
Hay Community Unit* 48 Lurline Street, Mile End Telephone (08) 43 8087	Leased from SAHT	6	4	8.0	

### SPEED LIMIT

114. Mr **BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government propose to reduce the residential area speed limit of 60 km/h to 50 km/h as indicated by the Minister prior to the last State election and if not, why not?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The question of a lower speed limit in residential streets has been examined by the present Government. The examination showed that it is evident that the imposition of a lower legal speed limit in residential streets will not necessarily result in a reduction of operating speeds or improve road safety. Vehicle operation speeds are influenced more by physical conditions in the residential street situation.

The majority of average drivers will respond to speed limits which are realistic and this factor must be taken into consideration when determining speed limits if it is intended to reduce the proportion of vehicles travelling appreciably faster than prevailing conditions safely permit. It is likely that a lower speed limit would be poorly observed by many drivers and could then be a hazard to other road users and pedestrians who rely on its observation.

It would not be practicable for police officers to enforce lower speed limit provisions in residential streets. If speed limits were lowered there would be a resultant increase in fuel costs and an increase in air pollution. For the above reasons the Government does not propose to lower the speed limits in the residential streets at this stage. However,

the whole question of speed limits will be discussed at the next meeting in February 1985 of the Australian Transport Advisory Council; no doubt further consideration will be given to this question taking into account the discussions at this meeting.

### SOCIAL SERVICES

116. Mr **BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: Has the Minister responded to the submission by the South Australian Council of Social Service Incorporated dated 4 May 1984 and, if so, what was the reply, and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I responded to the South Australian Council of Social Service Incorporated on 6 June 1984. In my letter I gave an undertaking to write again as soon as I had considered the recommendations of the Local Government Assistance Fund Advisory Committee and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Information Services. These reports have not been finalised as yet.

### ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

117. Mr **BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Has the Electricity Trust of South Australia applied for an increase in tariff rates at any time since 1 July 1984 to be operative from October, November or December 1984 and, if so, what is the result of such application?

2. What further action is the Government taking to assist pensioners to meet their electricity accounts and, if none, why not?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A new M tariff schedule has been introduced which results in increases ranging from 3.1 per cent to 15.5 per cent depending on consumption. The increase for tariff J is a flat 12 per cent.

2. The present Government introduced the pensioner concession scheme on electricity accounts. There are currently 121 000 consumers receiving the concession out of a total of 502 000. The cost of the scheme in 1983-84 was \$5.4 million. There is no proposal to extend the level of concession at the present time.

### SOFTBALL

118. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General: What complaints did the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity receive against men participating in mixed competitions conducted by the South Australian Softball Association Inc. and, if any, what advice did the Commissioner give the Association?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has received no complaints against the South Australian Softball Association Inc. However, on 24 July 1984, the Commissioner received a letter from the South Australian Softball Association expressing the Association's concern regarding the application of the Sex Discrimination Act, 1975 in relation to mixed participation in primary school sport. On 25 July 1984, the Commissioner responded to the letter, outlining her interpretation of the law, a copy of which has been supplied to the honourable member.

### HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

119. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Highways Department own a property situated at 177 Anzac Highway and, if so, how long has the property been vacant and is it to be disposed of, and, if so, when and by what method?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The subject Highways Department property has been vacant since 18 December 1983 pending disposal as part of the Governments, Inner Western Metropolitan Programme. Approval has been given for the sale of the property situated at 177 Anzac Highway to the Minister of Public Works, for lease by the Jas I Malgosia Polish Nursery Association as a child care centre subject to planning approval. The timing of the transfer of title from the Commissioner of Highways to the Minister of Public Works is not yet known as it is subject to planning approval requirements. The proposed method of sale is by private treaty between the Commissioner of Highways and the Minister of Public Works.

### PORTFOLIOS

120. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Government considering a reduction of one Ministerial position and, if not, why not?

2. What criteria is used in allocating portfolio workload for each Minister?

3. How much time is spent by each Minister in each of his portfolios?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There is no justification for a reduction. South Australia already has two less Ministers than Western Australia, which has a similar population.

2. The Premier determines the allocation of portfolios on the basis of the overall needs of the Government.

3. The time that is necessary and appropriate to the particular portfolio.

### TAB

121. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. How many times, when, why and for how long on each occasion, have the TAB computers broken down during the past two years?

2. What has been the estimated loss of revenue during the breakdowns?

3. What action can the Government take to ensure TAB patrons are not inconvenienced in future with computer breakdowns?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Totalizer Agency Board evaluates the performance of its computer by expressing the time that it has been available on a percentage basis. The monthly percentage performance of up-time for the past two years is as follows:

Monthly percentage performance of up-time		
Year	Month	System up-time
1982	September	98.83
	October	99.87
	November	99.81
	December	99.96
1983	January	99.31
	February	99.11
	March	99.74
	April	99.52
	May	99.90
	June	99.75
	July	99.61
	August	99.79
	September	99.88
	October	99.21
	November	99.91
	December	99.79
1984	January	99.59
	February	99.79
	March	99.43
	April	99.56
	May	99.86
	June	99.76
	July	99.44
	August	99.13
	September	99.77

2. It is extremely difficult to estimate the loss of turnover and revenue during the breakdowns; however, if there has been an effect it is considered to be insignificant because the financial performance of the TAB over the past two years has been the best in the history of the organisation.

3. I quote an extract from the TAB Chairman's report to the Minister which was tabled in Parliament recently:

The TAB's current computer equipment was commissioned in February 1976. In terms of computer technology the equipment is now superseded and an evaluation was carried out during the year which resulted in tenders being called for replacement hardware and software. The successful tenderer was General Instrument (Australasia) Pty Ltd and it is planned to have the new system operating by July 1985. The improved technology will provide cost savings and improved system availability.

The Government can do no more than what the TAB has currently planned for the central site computer system.

122. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Are TAB staff permitted to receive cash

bets over the counter whilst the TAB computer is broken down and how can these bets be placed with the TAB if the transaction is conducted during a computer breakdown?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** TAB staff are not permitted to receive cash bets over the counter whilst the TAB computer is broken down. Bets cannot be transacted during a computer breakdown.

### MOTOR CYCLE INSURANCE

124. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: With respect to third party personal motor vehicle insurance, does the Minister intend to create a further division for motor cycles above 250cc (for example 250-500cc) and, if so, when?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The methods used to determine third party premiums are at the discretion of the Third Party Premiums Committee. The honourable member may wish to take this up with the Chairman of the Committee.

### ASBESTOS IN SCHOOLS

125. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Further to the reply to Question on Notice No. 37, what attempts have been made to ascertain from the Australian Teachers Federation the exact schools which were 'at risk' in respect of asbestos?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD** On 4 July 1984, Acting Minister of Labour, Mr Hemmings wrote to the President of the Australian Teachers Federation, Mr Van Davy, requesting advice as to the schools surveyed and the nature of the asbestos reported, that is, whether the material was the dangerous sprayed/loose or rigid asbestos-cement sheeting. Mr Davy's reply of 11 July 1984 stated that the information requested was confidential.

On Mr Hemming's instructions, the Chairman of the Asbestos Advisory Committee, Mr Ford, contacted the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, Mr Jackson, asking for a list of schools at which staff and students were considered to be at risk from asbestos fibres. Mr Ford was informed that the information was confidential but that Mr Jackson would advise schools in the survey to consider the matter of asbestos and to contact Mr Ford directly where appropriate.

### TREE PLANTING

126. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Further to the reply to Question on Notice No. 26, will the Minister institute research into the possible risks associated with planting of trees and large shrubs near commercial premises?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** No.

### DOMESTIC HEATING

127. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Does the Minister intend to assess the atmospheric effects in the metropolitan area of Adelaide of the use of combustion heaters and the like for domestic heating purposes?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** This matter is under consideration.

### REAL ESTATE VALUES

128. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Has research been undertaken into the impact of rising real estate values on the ability of low income earners to own their own home and, if so, what were the results and, if no research has been undertaken, will the Minister instigate it?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The State Government undertook a major review of its home purchase assistance programme during 1983. As a result a number of significant changes were made to the programme in October 1983 and February 1984 aimed at increasing the access of low income households to home ownership. These changes included re-introduction of the rental purchase scheme, which has proved to be particularly popular with low income households, and introduction of a new interest rate structure for concessional loans and rental-purchase which is targeted closely to household income, allowing households on lower incomes than under previous arrangements to obtain home purchase assistance.

The effectiveness of the concessional loan and rental purchase schemes in assisting low income households into home ownership is reviewed constantly in the light of developments in the real estate and financial markets. In this task I am assisted through the regular provision of information on the state of the housing market from my Housing Advisory Council, the Office of Housing, and other sources. I am aware that rapid inflation of dwelling prices in Adelaide in recent times has caused difficulties for some applicants for concessional loans and rental purchase, and also for many other households. This matter is currently being investigated.

### STANDARD CHARTERED BANK

129. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Exactly what incentives have been offered to the Standard Chartered Bank to establish a head office in Adelaide?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The South Australian Government is supporting the application of Standard Chartered Bank to obtain a general banking licence in Australia. Detailed discussions are taking place on a confidential basis.

### ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY

130. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: When does the Minister intend to introduce legislation to create a statutory authority to cover the operation of the Royal Zoological Society?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Royal Zoological Society has deferred its decision on this matter to a further meeting. No action can be expected until the results of that meeting are known.

### POWER SUPPLY

131. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Has a submission yet been made to the Federal Government concerning funding of a power interconnection between Victoria and South Australia?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** No. However, the matter is under consideration.

### ABORIGINAL TEACHER HOUSING

132. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Further to Question on Notice No. 213 of last session,

what action has been taken to offset the massive costs of Aboriginal Teacher Housing in the last financial year so as to minimise the rental increase for teacher housing in other areas?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In 1983-84 the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority achieved an almost balanced budget in maintaining houses for teachers servicing Aboriginal schools when interest debt for capital works in these areas was excluded.

	\$
Rental income was	60 000
Expenditure on repairs and maintenance was	62 000

Capital payments in 1983-84 of \$2.775 million included \$900 000 for providing housing to teachers servicing Aboriginal schools and a further \$1.2 million will be spent in 1984-85 on housing for these areas which will complete a programme to provide 24 additional and replacement houses.

Interest payments on the Authority's total debt were stabilised by providing a special Government grant of \$200 000, e.g.

	\$
1983-84	
Interest payments were	1 325 000
Grant provided	200 000
paid out of rental income	1 125 000
1982-83	
Interest payments were	1 116 000
The net increase was only	9 000

In 1984-85 the Government will be providing a further \$328 000 to offset rising debt servicing commitments and approved rental increases to ensure continuation of acceptable levels of expenditure on housing maintenance.

The Government is looking at the problem of debt servicing and closely monitoring rising interest costs with a view to providing an equitable balance between levels of rent income and Government assistance.

Rent increases are not a function of the cost of housing in Aboriginal areas; they are dependent upon the policy that has been in place for some years, namely, the setting of THA rents at 4/5 of the equivalent SAHT rent figure.

#### PROPOSED DENTAL SURGERIES

133. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health: Further to Question on Notice No. 368 of last session, what are the estimated costs of manpower and construction for the proposed dental surgeries at Noarlunga, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth over the next three years?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The replies are as follows: Noarlunga Health Village, estimated capital cost of dental service, \$160 000; estimated annual staffing cost, \$100 000.

Port Adelaide: Plans for the dental service at Port Adelaide have not reached the stage of cost estimates.

Lyell McEwin Health Service: estimated capital cost of dental service, \$220 000; estimated annual staffing cost, not yet determined.

#### AMERICA'S CUP CHALLENGE

134. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government be required to advance any loan moneys in respect of the America's Cup challenge being launched from South Australia?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes.

#### TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

135. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many traffic infringement notices were issued during the year 1982-83.

2. What was the gross value of the expiation fees and what was the gross value of payments made in expiation in relation to those notices?

3. What were the figures for alleged offences committed within the metropolitan area and outside the metropolitan area, respectively?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** The replies are as follows:

1. 117 374.

2. Gross value of fees, \$5 703 990.

Gross value of payments, \$4 865 140.

3. Metropolitan, 103 891.

Country, 13 483.

#### GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

136. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: In relation to the disposal of surplus Government motor vehicles during the 12 months to June 1984:

(a) how many vehicles were sold; and

(b) what percentage of vehicles sold were designated as being unroadworthy?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

(a) 2 050.

(b) 0.05 per cent (one vehicle).