

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 11 September 1985

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

## PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by the Hon. J.W. Slater.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on preschool education was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

## QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## LOTTO UNI-SYSTEM

In reply to Mr **HAMILTON** (21 March).

The Hon. G.J. **CRAFTER**: The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has now completed an investigation of the scheme known as Lotto Uni-System. This number scheme has been marketed nationally by Mr E. Harris of Subiaco, Western Australia, since about November 1984. In his advertising, Mr Harris claims, among other things, that Lotto Uni-System is a guaranteed winning program, leaves nothing to chance, that it turns the odds definitely in your favour and that it is guaranteed to win every week. The scheme promoted by Mr Harris has been analysed by the Adelaide University Statistics Department, which has advised that:

- (1) there is no advantage to be gained by using Lotto Uni-System over any other method of selecting lotto numbers;
- (2) that the odds against winning are reduced only by reason that the system recommends multiple entries;
- (3) that Mr Harris would need to sell 48 000 copies of his system before he could claim that the system is guaranteed to win every week; and
- (4) that Lotto Uni-system still leaves a great deal to chance—in a 6 from 40 lotto game there are 3 838 380 different entries possible. Mr Harris' system provides 80 entries.

I am advised that Mr Harris has now ceased advertising Lotto Uni-System in South Australia. This is the second scheme of this nature to be investigated by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs this year. In both cases it was found that the promoter's claims were without foundation. Consumers should be wary of advertisers who promote number systems as a way of beating the odds. The simple fact is that Cross Lotto and Pools are games of chance and no number scheme can systematically eliminate that element of chance.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Children's Services Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—Fifty-eighth General Report.

## QUESTION TIME

## BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr **OLSEN**: Why is the Premier continuing to make misleading statements about his budget strategy by claiming that increased mineral and petroleum royalties will reduce the projected \$80 million deficit next financial year? In a statement in the *Advertiser* this morning, the Premier is reported as saying that rises in mineral and petroleum royalties will help the Government offset the serious budget difficulties identified by the Auditor-General in his unprecedented report tabled yesterday.

However, information already presented to Parliament by the Premier shows that, far from assisting the budget position next financial year, there will in fact be a decline in mineral and petroleum royalties which will place even more pressure on the Government's finances. This financial year, receipts from royalties are estimated at \$52.3 million, but next year royalty receipts have been forecast at \$40.9 million—\$11.4 million less than in 1985-86, and in 1987-88 there is to be a further reduction in the royalty take to \$32.1 million—\$20 million less than this year.

These projections were supplied by the Premier himself, in reply to a question on notice from me on 7 May, and totally contradict the suggestions he is now making about how a massive budget deficit can be avoided under a continuation of his Government's financial strategy. Added to the shortfalls next year in receipts from the highways fund and housing, identified by the Auditor-General, and reduced Commonwealth funding, they indicate a deficit next financial year approaching \$100 million.

The Hon. J.C. **BANNON**: As usual, the Leader of the Opposition is being completely simplistic in his approach, and he knows it. There has been a series of misrepresentations throughout in every statement that has been made about the state of Government finances. As far as the Auditor-General's statement is concerned, as far as it goes that is fine. In fact, it does not take into account the balances that are held in various other accounts in the total global picture of the public sector financing area. What he says about future years is quite correct, and I have said so myself—we cannot afford to adopt the irresponsible policies that were adopted by the previous Government where they propped up the recurrent deficit by using at vast public expense our capital funds to do so. We do not plan to do that.

The important thing to record is the total inconsistency of members opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition, as they fumble their way through their policy statements. On the one hand they claim that there should be greater expenditure in this, that and the other area, but on the other hand they suggest that the deficit is going to burgeon out. On the one hand they say that there should be tax cuts—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** They say that there should be tax cuts, not in the orderly way when we can afford them, but months ago. I remember that that was the Leader of the Opposition's first comment. He said that this should have happened weeks or months ago, because the Opposition has been calling for this. He asked why it had not happened earlier. The answer is that, if we adopted that sort of policy, we would be looking at major deficits and there is no question about that. If we had made the tax cuts as and when he suggested or, alternatively, if, as he urged, there had been no attempt to get our finances in balance, what would the deficit have been then?

The very fact is that this Government, taking an excess of \$60 million cumulative deficit in the last financial year, reduced that by \$13.8 million. We have reduced it when in fact we budgeted to increase it. That is not a bad effort. We have done that not only by an increase in receipts, but by ensuring that on our expenditure side we came in below budget. That has not been achieved since 1978-79.

To listen to the mishmash of figures and nonsense from members opposite really defies credibility, because depending on whom they are talking to, the occasion, and which one of them is saying it, they are totally inconsistent policies. As far as the Government's future receipt outlook is concerned, sources of Government receipts come from a wide range of areas, not just from what is called—

**An honourable member:** Mainly the taxpayer.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Not mainly from the taxpayer. This shows the complete ignorance of members opposite. In terms of our receipts, the proportion of State taxation is around a quarter, I would suggest, of our total receipt area. There are so many other areas where it is important, for instance, our statutory and commercial enterprises, operations like SAFA—the very things that the Opposition wants to sell.

Let us look at their prescription: increased expenditure over a whole range of areas, whether it be education, welfare, roads, you name it, and reduced taxes and charges over a whole range of areas, irrespective of the consequences of that. Those two things do not balance. Sell off anything that is making a profit, thus relieving the burden on the public debt, and somehow or other we will have a nicely balanced account! It is a prescription for disaster. From a range of receipt areas—and royalties is just one of the non-tax areas I mentioned—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. Following the precedents established by my predecessor, I have allowed a generous amount of interjection during the lead question of the day. It has now gone too far. I call the Leader of the Opposition to order and remind honourable members on both sides of the effects of that.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The level of interjection and carry on simply indicates the absolute frustration and impotence felt by those opposite at the financial and economic performance of this Government and this economy. We know that their strategy is to bring it down. We know that the more investment dollars they can frighten away from South Australia in the next six months the better for them. However, my Government will not tolerate or accept that. We will continue to manage in the successful way that we have already demonstrated.

#### TAB SUBAGENCIES

**Mr WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the number of hotel TAB subagencies that have been approved and their location?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Sixteen subagencies in hotels have been approved at the following locations: Windsor

Gardens, as we all know; the Belair Hotel; the Blumberg Hotel at Birdwood; the Bolivar Hotel at Bolivar; the Ventnor Hotel at Port Vincent; the Streaky Bay Community Hotel at Streaky Bay; the Noarlunga Hotel at Old Noarlunga; the Ceduna Community Hotel at Ceduna; the Aberfoyle Hub Tavern at Aberfoyle Park; the Oakbank Hotel at Oakbank; the Alma Hotel at Lobethal; the Williamstown Hotel at Williamstown; the Cummins Community Hotel at Cummins; O'Brien's Alberton Hotel at Alberton; the Victoria Hotel at O'Halloran Hill; and the Crown Inn Hotel at Reynella.

The criteria for establishment of hotel subagencies ensure that they do not affect other TAB agencies in the surrounding district. The policy adhered to by the TAB board is to ensure that they are located a sufficient distance away from normal agencies. This has been eminently successful in providing additional service to the public and, consequently, additional turnover beneficial to the racing industry.

I noted an interjection from the member for Alexandra in relation to the Willunga Hotel. I have only this morning had the opportunity to read his letter in which he advocates—and it is marvellous how things change from time to time—a subagency at Willunga. I recall some time ago that the Opposition was extremely critical of any hotel subagency. So, the tide has turned. As I said, I had the opportunity to read the letter from the member for Alexandra only this morning. It will be given consideration and I will seek information from the TAB about the establishment of a subagency in that district.

#### BUDGET STRATEGY

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Premier reject the Auditor-General's unprecedented warnings about the Government's budget strategy? If he does, what action does he plan to avoid a massive deficit at the end of the next financial year? The Auditor-General yesterday warned in his report about the Government's methods of funding both recurrent and capital spending. He has identified a recurrent receipt shortfall of \$26.3 million next financial year because of the way in which the Premier has manipulated the intake of funds into the budget in 1985-86 and has foreshadowed that this could significantly increase the accumulated deficit.

The Auditor-General has also repeated a warning he issued in last year's report about the use of borrowings from statutory authorities to fund the capital works program. He has warned that care needs to be taken to ensure that the use of these funds does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of debt servicing costs on the budget and on taxation. Of course, this is the track down which the Federal Government has gone, as we all know, to our peril and cost. This is a warning that the Premier has again ignored, because there is a 56 per cent increase in borrowings in this financial year—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman is now debating the matter. I ask him to proceed with his question.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** With respect, Mr Speaker, I am giving facts about the effect that this will have on a further rise on debt servicing costs.

**The SPEAKER:** I have ruled that the honourable member is debating the matter, and I ask him to proceed with his question without doing so.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am referring to the figures that appear in the Auditor-General's Report tabled in Parliament yesterday, and I am referring to the State's indebtedness that inevitably will increase dramatically as a result of the present Government's budget. I put to you,

Mr Speaker, that I am stating a fact in explanation of my question.

**The SPEAKER:** I have asked the honourable member to proceed with his question.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Premier has again ignored this warning, because there is a 56 per cent increase in these borrowings this financial year, with a consequent further rise in debt servicing costs. The Premier's reaction so far to the Auditor-General's Report suggests that he intends to ignore these warnings again. Therefore, I ask what action the Government contemplates to prevent the State's finances being plunged into an even bigger deficit.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is displaying, like his Leader, an abysmal ignorance of the structure of the State's accounts. He is totally misinterpreting what the Auditor-General has said. I suggest that, rather than reading media comments on it, and attributions and interpretations, they should actually look at the report and try to understand what the Auditor-General is saying—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Rather than interjecting, listen, and you might then understand something.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** They do not want to hear the facts. The comment on the Auditor-General's Report has completely misinterpreted the position that he himself has set down, and I will explain why. First, let me say that I agree with him, and on a number of occasions I have said, throughout the time I have been Premier and Treasurer of this State, that we must address the accumulated deficit and that over time the Consolidated Account deficit must be reduced. I have also made the point that one cannot do that in isolation, that you have to look at the three areas: the maintenance of government services; the level of taxation (and on both of those we have the Opposition braying to increase the one and reduce the other—and that does not compute); and attention to the accumulated deficit. In 1984-85 we addressed every one of those points successfully, and that is stated in the report. In relation to the accumulated deficit, let me quote:

At 30 June 1985 the accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account had been reduced to \$51.1 million by \$38 million.

The Auditor-General goes on—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, I will go back to the statements that the Auditor-General made leading up to that point. In referring to the surplus of \$13.7 million, the Auditor-General recorded the treatment of certain moneys, particularly the larger amount, being the deposit account under the housing advances legislation, which he said indicated that we must have concern about the result for 1986-87 and beyond.

I quite agree with the Auditor-General that we must have concern to address that problem. Indeed, that is exactly how we have planned. If we had not planned in that way, there would have been no tax package in 1983, and we would have left things drift, as the Tonkin Government did, and we would have been in a diabolical situation today. We certainly would not have been in government. That is the first point. We have been looking ahead. We looked ahead in 1983 and in 1984 and, in fact, our performance has been much better than even we predicted.

We now come to 1985-86, and the Auditor-General simply restates the point that we must be careful about the future: indeed, we will. But, in relation to the treatment of those advances that people have used to add to the \$51 million, I make the point that the retention of these moneys in a suspense account at the end of the financial year,

pending a decision on their allocation, is in accordance with a procedure that has been followed since 1979. That procedure was established by Mr Tonkin when he was Premier of this State. One makes the decision on that, and I have cited the document in which this procedure was adopted in 1979. In that document, which was signed by the then Premier, he refers to the fact that repayments can be made from the advances for housing account under the Act, they can be applied to advances into the State Bank under a loan account, or they can be applied to the Revenue Account. They can be treated in a number of ways. That is taken into account year by year. It does not imply anything about the 1986-87 result.

Having said that, as invited by honourable members opposite, I will read to the point where the Auditor-General says that the Consolidated Account deficit has been reduced from \$51.1 million—by \$13.7 million. He goes on to point out that balances in special deposit account and trust fund account at Treasury, which are part of the overall public sector financial position, amount to \$276 million—an increase of \$83 million over the balance for the preceding year. That is not a bad situation to be in in respect of those areas.

He then goes on to point out that cash and investments held at Treasury as at 30 June amounted to \$223 million—an improvement of \$97 million over the previous year. If that is a bad result in terms of our overall long-term position, then no-one can read the accounts. I suggest that honourable members opposite cannot read the accounts. We can look at what the Auditor-General is saying, namely, 'Let us try to address the recurrent deficit but put into context the total picture of public sector finance.' One can see why we have confidence that in future years, despite the problems that will arise, provided that we maintain a curb on expenditure and ensure that our outlays do not increase, and over time, the cumulative deficit will be reduced. Our record is on the board.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The record of the previous Government saw it progressively increase. It saw deficits increase and all sorts of major problems. For there to be any credibility opposite, at least we would see some reference to the record of their period in Government. So, read all that the Auditor-General says and bear in mind his strictures, as indeed we will. But, also look at the overall position and the performance of SAFA. The fact that it is allowed to ensure that it can make money on behalf of the total public sector borrowing program means that in future years we will get increasing sums of money from that source that can be applied to revenue. It is those non-tax areas which this Government has developed and nurtured that will allow us, as we have done this year, to keep the level of State taxation at or below the level of inflation.

## ART GALLERY AND MUSEUM

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Premier assure the House that the Government does not intend to introduce general admission charges for either the Art Gallery or the Museum? I ask this question because in June this year the famous British Victoria and Albert Museum introduced a policy of a £2 voluntary donation for admission. It is only voluntary, but people would have to have the hide of a rhinoceros to refuse to pay.

Admission charges for the Art Gallery and the Museum would prevent many people from having access to our cultural institutions. This is not idle speculation. In 1974,

when Mrs Thatcher was Minister for the Arts she introduced museum and gallery charges, the results were appalling. Attendance at the Victoria and Albert Museum dropped by over 50 per cent in 12 months. At the Science Museum, attendances dropped from 240 000 people to 129 000 people; the National Portrait Gallery lost over 40 per cent of its visitors, and so on.

The Thatcher Government failed to learn from this, and has reinstated this appalling pursuit of cultural elitism. In view of the Opposition's childlike adoration of Thatcherite principles—particularly when it comes to privatisation—I am sure that both the House and the general public, who believe that the State's great cultural institutions should be available to all, would welcome a reassurance that the Government does not intend to introduce general admission charges.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As well as selling off those areas of profitable commercial activity of the State Government, and thus increasing the burden on the taxpayer, there is no question that under the Liberal's policy the 'user pays' principle will certainly be taken to its ultimate end—although that depends on whose view one is listening to. I note that, in terms of the funding of a compulsory third party system the views of Opposition members are quite divided.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The wets and the dries.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes indeed, there is very much a wet and dry approach, as evidenced by members opposite. However, that is just one of a number of examples in that regard, and I thank the honourable member for raising his point in this area. Let me say, first, that in a situation where there is a special exhibition, touring exhibition, or something of that nature, one can justify a reasonable level of admission charges in order to defray the costs involved and where a new establishment is set up with a particular or limited function in mind, again, admission charges can be justified in order to ensure that the overall burden on the State is not unduly increased.

But, having said that, there are certain basic major institutions, such as our Art Gallery and Museum, in relation to which the principle of free public access has been established in this State, and this applies to Australia as a whole. It is a system which was derived from Britain, but which unfortunately is under attack there, and I guess the symptom of that sort of Thatcherite policy is flowing right through to the sickness that seems to be pervading the whole British economy. For goodness sake, the proposal is to have experts invited out by the Leader of the Opposition to advise us on how to go down the same track! How many Birminghams will we have if we introduce the sort of confrontationist—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That struck a nerve! The economic and social malaise in Britain, of which the incident in Birmingham is a symptom, is an end result of six years of policies which have wiped out local authorities like the GLC, which have some kind of regard to the human and social needs of those living in that area, and so on, throughout the country. If we really want to learn about expertise from Britain, I commend to honourable members a series of articles that P.P. McGuinness is currently writing for the *Financial Review* concerning what six years of Thatcherism has meant.

Members will recall that Mrs Thatcher established her reputation by charging fees for school milk and lunches provided by the British education system during her unfortunate stint as Education Minister in the early 1970s, and she has certainly gone on from there. So, let us have more of that sort of attention!

Turning to this area of art: yes, indeed, the so-called voluntary entry fees have been established, as the honourable

member has pointed out, and they have resulted in a fall off in attendances—a block of access. What would be the situation here? In 1984, a survey of visitors to the Art Gallery of South Australia shows that nearly half (that is, 48 per cent) the number of people who attend the gallery would not come as often if a \$1 entry fee was charged. In this case in relation to Britain we are talking about the equivalent of \$2 or \$3 or more.

Is that what we are really on about in terms of our great basic cultural institutions? They are funded by the people of the State for the people of the State, and they should be accessible to all. I guarantee that we will not be introducing general admission fees at the Art Gallery or the Museum. The public should well know that, if the Opposition applies the user-pay scheme, in the arts area, these institutions will be closed to access by the people going there. After all, about 500 000 people visit the Museum and Art Gallery in this State, and many of them would be deterred.

The Leader of the Opposition is on about cuts in his hit list, but will not tell us where they will be made. Apparently, there will be many of these big cuts in expenditure, but where, who and how is never specified. We are told that it involves some areas of the arts, although I do not know which areas, but I do know that, for instance, in the Film Corporation, which the Opposition has had in its sights for many years, staff members are concerned that their work would be in jeopardy under a change of Government, and I would appreciate why they would be concerned. Therefore, I repeat our commitment to funding in the arts and our commitment to ensure that they are accessible to all.

#### BUDGET STRATEGY

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Why has the Premier claimed that his Government's budget strategy has reduced the borrowings of the State when the total State public sector debt has increased by 9.4 per cent in real terms under his Government and is now the equivalent of \$53.80 per person per week? The Premier claimed in this morning's *Advertiser* that his Government had reduced the State public debt. However, an analysis of the figures provided in the Auditor-General's Report tabled yesterday shows that over the last three years the State Government's indebtedness has increased by just over \$1 billion—or by 9.4 per cent in real terms. This compares with a real terms reduction of 16.3 per cent under the former Liberal Government. The State public debt is now the equivalent of \$53.80 per week per man woman and child in South Australia, compared with \$40 three years ago. Rather than decreasing the State Government's burden on future generations of South Australians this government has increased it by a massive amount.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that the honourable member go back to the budget papers, study the tables and look at the reason why those figures have altered.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that the member for Glenelg could learn something if he tried.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. The Chair will maintain dignity in the House and address itself to the honourable member for Glenelg if and when required. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** These questions display a staggering ignorance of public sector finance and a staggering inability, by those who profess to comment on it, to read the very documents that they are meant to be commenting on. For instance, the member for Light, in asking his question, concentrates on only one side of the equation, saying absolutely nothing about what is happening on the State's assets side, which has an impact on the burden of

debt about which he is talking. Rather than go through it (because I know the complexities would be just too difficult for the honourable member to handle today in Question Time, and I do not want to hold up those other members from asking questions on vital affairs of State), I foreshadow that the Treasury at present is compiling a document that will assess the true nature of public debt in this State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I name the member for Bragg.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Did you say 'warn' or 'name', Mr Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** I name the member for Bragg.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. The honourable member for Bragg may be heard in explanation.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, on my knowledge of the operations of this House, it is quite unprecedented to name a member of Parliament and then proceed to his exclusion without that member having been warned. You do follow that procedure, Mr Speaker, because you have warned me today, which has had—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warned the member for Bragg.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Speaker, I certainly did not hear it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bragg may be heard in explanation.

**Mr INGERSON:** In the last 10 minutes I have not uttered a word, and I find the sort of statement—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bragg will be heard in silence.

**Mr INGERSON:** Mr Speaker, I repeat: after being warned, I have not uttered a word in the last 10 minutes, and I suggest to you, Sir, that there was probably some mistake in hearing my voice.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In these matters the normal procedure is that there is an opportunity for the Opposition to move a motion in relation to the explanation that has been given. I think that the Government would be happy for that procedure to be followed, and we will assess whatever is put forward.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Speaker, I move—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman will be heard in due course. The Deputy Premier is quite right in what he says and, clearly, I am quite prepared to listen to the honourable Deputy Leader.

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

That the explanation of the honourable member for Bragg be accepted.

I point out that on occasions mistakes are made from the Chair. I know that a mistake was made yesterday when I was warned, when the member for Torrens was interjecting. Likewise, I know that yesterday the member for Light was warned when I think the member for Torrens was again interjecting. I am not trying to do in my colleague the member for Torrens, but the fact is that mistakes are made, I would say honestly, by the Chair, because usually, in situations such as those we have experienced, a lot of members are interjecting.

I know that it has happened to me. It just happens to be the luck of the draw. I am not suggesting for a moment that we do not interject, but on this occasion I believe that the member for Bragg is speaking the truth and that a mistake has been made. Under those circumstances I believe that his explanation should be accepted.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, while I think the matter through. This was the sequence of events. First, I warned the honourable member for Bragg. There was no doubt about that. I have a note to that effect and the honourable member, in his explanation, as I took it accepted that. He then interjected three times.

I guess that there is a differentiation between a shouted interjection or an unpleasant, devious interjection. Clearly, the Chair has a discretion in these matters. But I want to make clear to the whole House that I am not being dictated to by either side of the House in terms of discipline. I also want to make quite clear that I totally reject what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition just had to say. However, addressing myself solely—and let this be quite clear—to what the honourable member for Bragg had to say, I indicate that, since the three interjections were not of a loud or violent nature, if he is prepared to apologise to the House then I will accept his explanation.

**Mr INGERSON:** Mr Speaker, since being warned I just repeat what I said before: I have not spoken in any loud manner since being warned. I think that that is about all I could say. What I have to apologise for I have no idea, but if it is necessary I will do it. I would like to say again that I have not spoken and I would like that purely and simply recorded.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member then leaves me with no alternative. Since I warned the honourable member I have clearly heard him interject on three occasions. The honourable member denies that he interjected at all: that I do not accept. I have a motion from the Deputy Leader before the Chair. Is that motion seconded?

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Yes.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** Mr Speaker, the Government finds itself in this position, I think, that I as an individual member of this Chamber am not in a position to comment directly on the behaviour of the honourable member for Bragg. I have not been sitting here and taking specific note of particular interjections or of the frequency of interjections from honourable members. There have been times when, in fact, I have adopted that expedient.

That is not something that I have done today. So, it is not for me to say nor am I commenting in these remarks as to the accuracy of what has just been put before the Chamber by the member for Bragg. However, I can say that there is a very important principle which relates to representative institutions and that is that the authority of the Chair must be respected at all times and that the House must uphold the authority of the Chair.

Now on this occasion, Sir, you gave the member for Bragg the opportunity to make a particular statement which I believe would have saved the House from proceeding along the lines that we now appear to be proceeding. What the honourable member gave to us obviously fell short of what was required of him by the Chair.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order. I believe that there has been a misunderstanding. In my opinion, the member for Bragg was apologising. He said, 'If it is necessary I will.' I think that, in saying that, he meant that he was apologising (if it was necessary because of your ruling that he needed to apologise) if you, Sir, wanted to accept that apology. I believe that that was his clear intention, and I would like him to clarify the situation.

**The SPEAKER:** Although it is not strictly a point of order, I do take note of the seniority of the honourable member for Fisher, and I will again ask the honourable member for Bragg to apologise to the Chair for the interjections that he made after he was warned. If that apology is received I will ask for no further action to be taken, but it must be a clear withdrawal.

**Mr INGERSON:** I apologise to the Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member has still not complied—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked the honourable gentleman to apologise in respect of the interjections that he made. If he is willing to use those words, that will be the end of the matter. I cannot be any more clear than that.

**Mr Mathwin:** Just kneel on the table and say it with your hands clasped.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will come to order.

**Mr INGERSON:** Mr Speaker, I apologise in line with the comments made by the Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In view of the apology and withdrawal made by the member for Bragg the Chair would not be offended in any way by a withdrawal of the motion now before the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** As I understand it, the question is that the explanation be accepted.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need the advice of the honourable member for Alexandra. The question before the Chair is that the explanation be accepted.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it intended that the Premier will continue with his answer?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, it is.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. At the time you called me to order to deal with the matter that we have just discussed I was saying that I was not going to detain the House with a lengthy explanation of the points I was making in respect of the question of the member for Light. I was simply concluding—and I can do it in one sentence—by saying that Treasury is in fact working on the material on which I hope I will be able to report in the not too distant future and clarify the situation for the honourable member's enlightenment and demonstrate his misunderstanding of the tables that he has looked at. Again, I urge members opposite, if they wish to try to make interpretations of statements or figures appearing in the budget documents, to look at the total picture and perhaps get themselves up to speed on public finance and the structure of public sector borrowing and accounts.

## COMPUTERS IN SCHOOLS

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Is the Minister of Education prepared to initiate a program for the correct ergonomic operations to complement computer studies of primary and secondary school students? Children and youths are now involved in the use of computer technology in schools and in some instances in the home, as preparation for work involvement. Points which could be addressed in such a program include constrained or awkward posture, poorly designed furniture, training in the use of new technology combined with ergonomic design of workstation and equipment, the load or force required to perform a particular movement or task, and effective and efficient lighting. The understanding and prevention of factors contributing to repetition strain injury is being given some priority as publications are now making this point. I seek the Minister's response to the matter to ensure that youth who are going into a work environment have occupational health understanding that will benefit the employer and the employee.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The suggestion raised by the member for Brighton is an excellent one. It would be most appropriate for the matter to be investigated and followed through and I shall certainly do so. I shall instruct both the Director-General of the Education Department and the Director-General of Technical and Further Education to come back to me with suggested guidelines and specifications that we could use. The guidelines will in fact be addressed to schools and TAFE colleges, when they install computing or word processing equipment in their sites, to pay attention to the furniture that they themselves may use within the school.

The other point that needs to be addressed is that of specifications when tenders are called for furniture to be purchased by the Education Department, and that would have to be addressed by my colleague, the Minister responsible for services and supply. Once I have advice from the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education I shall pass on their suggestions to my colleague so that he may consider them with respect to tenders.

In regard to guidelines, as many schools make in-house arrangements they need to be aware of what are the important issues. It is true that, as more and more students have access to word processing and computing equipment in our schools, they should be aware of the principles involved for the proper use of that equipment. That is not simply because there is any real danger of their getting RSI from use within the school but rather the implication of what it will be like later in the workplace or the community generally unless they have established good practices on how to use it. It is not simply a matter of the furniture one sits down to, but also the way in which one uses the furniture and oneself's posture in relation to it. A lot of advice exists that ergonomically designed furniture, appropriate lighting, and such like, must go alongside appropriate postural arrangements of the person using the equipment.

The suggestion made by the member for Brighton is excellent and I am happy to take it up. In terms of educating people to use word processing and computing equipment, one of my responsibilities must be to educate them to use it appropriately so that their own well-being is enhanced and so that we have them using it with furniture that is reasonably ergonomically designed and in conditions that are environmentally sound, taking into account such aspects as lighting.

## AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My question is to the Premier, who no doubt will be rather relieved to be excused from a series of questions on the Auditor-General's Report this afternoon.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is totally out of order.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Does the Premier support his Minister of Health in criticising the Auditor-General in relation to his report on the operation of the Health Commission and, if not, what action will he take over the release to the Auditor-General of doctored figures by the Health Commission for which the Minister is responsible? In tabling the annual report of the Auditor-General in another place, the Minister of Health said of Mr Sheridan:

He has got his sums wrong in criticising the operation of the Health Commission.

The Minister also went on to state:

There are some errors of fact, and some of the figures are quite wrong.

In responding to the Minister's extraordinary statements, the Auditor-General said that his findings had been based on figures supplied by the Health Commission. I ask the Premier to note that. By the Minister's own statement, this means that the Health Commission, for which the Minister is responsible, has supplied doctored figures to the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman is debating the matter. I ask him to come back to the question.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am highlighting that, on the Minister's own accusation, apparently the Health Commission has supplied doctored figures to the Auditor-General.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think that that is a ludicrous conclusion to draw. It is interesting that the member for Davenport has now become an expert on health matters as well—just to add a further range to his widespread portfolio activities. In respect of anything in the Auditor-General's Report, I should have thought that it was quite proper and appropriate for the Health Commission, for instance, to respond to the criticisms that were made. Indeed, the Auditor-General invites response to the matters that he raises. In fact, he suggests a certain course of action that should be taken. If there is a dispute over figures, that will have to be resolved between the Auditor-General and the Health Commission, and no doubt that process is under way at the moment.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister of Transport comment on the adequacy of arrangements at the Adelaide Airport for the reception of a large number of tourists and other visitors who will come to Adelaide for the Grand Prix as well as other important forthcoming events? I have been informed that the member for Davenport has made a statement—

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not believe that it is proper for an honourable member to ask a Minister to comment.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order, as the question was seeking a comment.

#### SOUTHERN INDUSTRY PROJECT

**Mr MATHWIN:** Will the Deputy Premier apologise to the Southern Region of Councils in relation to the inaccurate information that he gave to the House regarding a project that the Southern Region of Councils had undertaken and the damage that he and his colleague the member for Mawson (Ms Lenehan) have done to this project? The Chief Executive Officer of the Southern Region of Councils (Mr Lindsay) has referred to this matter in the *Southern Times* and also in a press statement. The matter was reported in the *Southern Times* as follows:

Kingston MHR Gordon Bilney and Mawson MP Susan Lenehan have claimed that the appointment of Fisher Liberal candidate Grant Chapman as a consultant to the Southern Region of Councils industrial attraction program was endangering the project's success.

But Southern Region chief executive officer Bruce Lindsay has hit back at the allegations, claiming they are part of an orchestrated smear campaign against Mr Chapman.

'It appears that there has been an organised attack by State and Federal Labor MPs in an attempt to scuttle Grant Chapman's chances of winning the State seat of Fisher at the next election, but those who have engaged in this attack have had scant regard to the potential damage of their actions to our important project. If the potential damage were not so serious to our region's most promising move to attract new industry and create more jobs, then I suppose this whole charade would have made a very good script for a Goon Show,' he said.

Mr Lindsay said the allegations could endanger continued funding of the project which was aimed at attracting industry to the south.

Many allegations were made in State Parliament by the member for Mawson, Ms Susan Lenehan, and the Deputy Premier in relation to a question asked by Ms Lenehan—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I allowed the honourable gentleman to proceed completely with his quote. Is he now quoting or is he commenting on the quote?

**Mr MATHWIN:** I am quoting from a press release by Mr Lindsay, in which he said that Mr Don Hopgood (representing the Minister of Labour) maintained an inaccurate reference to CEP funds being used to support Mr Chapman's consultancy fee, and quoted material dragged up from a speech made by Mr Chapman in Federal Parliament five years ago when opposing the Government's intervention in job creation schemes. However, the quotes supplied to Dr Hopgood have been tampered with in an attempt to show that Mr Chapman's remarks referred to the CEP scheme, one of which at that time was not even under consideration by the then Liberal Government. In other words, the Deputy Premier, in replying, supported the allegations made by the member for Mawson (Ms Lenehan) and the federal member for Kingston (Mr Bilney) in saying that the region would suffer from Mr Chapman's appointment to the area as an adviser. In other words, I suggest that the Deputy Premier misled the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's remarks are out of order.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The only ground on which the honourable member's charge as to my statement is correct is that Mr Chapman is unlikely to win the seat of Fisher. I make clear that in no way did I mislead the House. Indeed, I was careful to delineate between the two sources of funding involved in this matter, and I refer the honourable member to the *Hansard* record. In no material particular could the honourable member demonstrate that I was inaccurate in anything that I said. The member for Mawson made no allegation: she simply asked for information. I supplied that information which I had available with me, and I indicated at the time that I would ask the Minister of Labour to investigate further. I understand that Mr Lindsay has to a degree cooperated in that investigation, which is proceeding, because I have had correspondence from him in relation to the matter. In no correspondence from Mr Lindsay has any of the flavour that the honourable member has quoted been included.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister of Transport inform the House of the arrangements being made at Adelaide Airport for the reception of large numbers of tourists and other visitors to the Grand Prix and other important events to be held soon? I have been informed that the member for Davenport has today made a statement to the media to the effect that these visitors will face vast embarrassment on their arrival at Adelaide Airport because, he says, facilities are totally inadequate. I assume that the honourable member was referring to the international terminal. As I have heard it, the honourable member conjectured that an influx of 10 000 visitors was expected.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. My officers have been contacted by the *News*, which said that the member for Davenport had made the statement that the member for Henley Beach has now brought to the attention of the House. Frankly, I find it staggering that the member for Davenport continues to be so critical of the actions that his Party when in

government took on behalf of South Australians. His Party was not prepared to fight for the best interests of South Australia when in government: rather, it accepted from the Federal Government an airport that was designed for Townsville, in Queensland, or certainly not for a major capital city such as Adelaide. Nevertheless, I have previously given credit, and I give credit again today, to the previous Government for obtaining an international airport for South Australia. It is something for which we should be thankful, but the previous Government should have stuck in there and obtained for South Australia the type of airport which the Fraser Liberal Government provided for Brisbane at a cost, I think, of \$700 million. Look at the airport that it gave Adelaide!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am glad that members opposite have raised that matter, because one has only to go back a few weeks when the member for Davenport was flashing a telegram around the place a few days before the announcement of the federal budget. He and I both know that one does not persuade a Government suddenly to provide money for a major project two or three days before a budget is announced, because by then the budget is cast in concrete. So, that honourable member timed his telegram very well. The federal Minister, who had discussions with me last Friday week, told me that he is not prepared to respond to stunts. He has been around the place long enough to recognise a stunt when it occurs and so have I. The honourable member's action in trying to change the federal budget at the last moment is seen for the shallow sham that it was.

At the start of the planning for the next budget, I had discussions with the federal Minister about improvements that might be effected to the Adelaide International Airport. The Minister has told me that he will certainly monitor the performance of the airport over the Grand Prix and the busy period that is in front of us and that, if that monitoring shows that there is a good case for the airport to be improved, funding may be provided. I have not been able to get a stronger commitment than that at this stage, but at least the federal Minister is willing to look at it. What have the State Managers for British Airways, Singapore Airlines and Qantas said about the Adelaide International Airport? They have all said it is adequate to cope with the numbers that we expect here for the Grand Prix.

That is, if we are looking at the Adelaide International Airport, but this Government has been very active in increasing the passenger throughput at the airport because, when members opposite obtained this rural city airport for Adelaide, they said that they did not have any knowledge of the number of services that would come into Adelaide. That is on record. This Government has increased enormously the throughput of passengers at the Adelaide International Airport. That is why the stress is now placed on it. If we have a number of flights arriving in Adelaide at the same time we will suffer great stress. However, if the flights are staggered, we will be able to cope. That does not mean that we have an adequate airport or that we should not fight for a better airport in future: it means that we were sold down the river a couple of years ago by the previous Government when it accepted the present airport when, if it had fought harder, it could have achieved for Adelaide what the Federal Liberal Government gave to Brisbane. The politics that were being played at that time were quite apparent, but that does not mean that I want to demean the efforts of the previous Minister of Transport in at least obtaining for this city an international airport, because we have profited by that decision.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Mr GRANT CHAPMAN**

**Ms LENEHAN (Mawson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Ms LENEHAN:** In the penultimate question today, the member for Glenelg suggested that I had made a number of claims against the endorsed Liberal candidate for Fisher (Mr Grant Chapman) and the Southern Region of Councils. In this regard, I refer members to page 590 of *Hansard*, where it is recorded that I asked the Deputy Premier a question in response to an article which appeared in the *News* of 26 August and in which certain allegations were made. I asked my question (and this is the second point on which I claim to have been misrepresented) because I was desperately concerned for the success of the survey. I have been involved in the Southern Region of Councils area in connection with that survey.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need the assistance of other honourable members. I ask the honourable member to continue.

**Ms LENEHAN:** The member for Glenelg suggested that I was trying to sabotage the survey. That is a total untruth. I asked the question because I was concerned about the lack of professionalism and integrity in the way in which the survey was being conducted, and I believe that the facts will prove me to be right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members will come to order.

---

**FUEL FREIGHT EQUALISATION SCHEME**

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its decision to terminate the fuel freight equalisation scheme thereby treating non-metropolitan people as second class citizens and in particular it draws to the attention of the federal Treasurer and Prime Minister the effects such actions will have in—

- (a) increasing freight costs on all consumer goods thereby further increasing the cost of living for non-metropolitan people;
- (b) increasing fuel costs in primary production thereby—
  - (i) forcing smaller operators out of the industry;
  - (ii) encouraging greater use of chemical farming as an alternative to traditional farming practices;
  - (iii) forcing an already cost-squeezed industry to the point of bankruptcy;
  - (iv) raising the overall costs of production; and
  - (v) raising the freight costs of primary products which will increase home consumption prices in particular of wheat, barley and livestock;
- (c) increasing the already high costs of the fishing industry which will, in cases where the respective fishery is managed with quotas, force many of those operators out of business; and
- (d) the tourist industry generally and, in particular, the hotel and motel, hospitality, caravan and tent manufacturing, airline, coach and busline, and vehicle and associated component parts industries;

and, further, this House calls on the Federal Government to immediately reinstate the scheme.

I have quite deliberately made that motion a lengthy one, putting it in the simplest possible terms and pointing out the concern that has been expressed by non-metropolitan residents about the abolition of the fuel freight equalisation scheme. There is a fundamental philosophy behind this motion, and that is that I believe that citizens in this State



should all be treated as equals. I do not believe that people living outside the greater metropolitan area should be disadvantaged by an excessive cost of fuel and the associated penalties. This is a State of one class of citizen, and we are all South Australians. I do not believe that persons outside the greater metropolitan area should be treated in a sub-standard way.

I believe that the federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister embarked upon this action to isolate people and divide the community, placing at a disadvantage those people least able to effectively defend themselves. The increasing freight costs on all consumer goods can only increase the cost of living for all the community and not just those living outside the greater metropolitan area. Obviously, the latter section is the one which first feels the effects, but further down the line people living in the metropolitan area who rely on and use primary products and processed primary products will suffer the imposition of increased costs.

I believe that increasing fuel costs have already forced many primary producers out of the industry and that that will continue unless those costs can be contained. It was not so long ago that the freight component in the total cost of primary production was relatively small, but it is now very significant. Some 35 or 40 per cent is often quoted as being the fuel component in the cost of production for many primary producers.

Further, there is an ongoing problem associated with that: there has been some concern within the community about the use of chemicals in agricultural farming. The greater the increase in the price of fuel, the more chemicals will be used in the growing of crops. My experience in chemicals has been fairly wide and I believe that chemical farming, at the right time and with the right soil and weather conditions, has a place in the industry, but I do not believe that it is necessarily a universal means of primary production. Collectively, with the traditional methods of farming and the use of chemicals in extreme circumstances under relevant environmental and farming conditions, these two aspects can blend well but, if the price of fuel rises, the proportion of traditional farming decreases and chemical farming will be accelerated.

We often wonder just how far chemicals can go and whether in fact there is a long-term detrimental effect on the soil. I do not know whether or not that is the case. Chemical manufacturers tell us that it is not. The manufacturers have told me that on occasions they have applied chemicals equivalent to an annual application over 300 successive years. The result was that for the first two years nothing grew in that soil, but during the third year growth was again noted. It was only in the fourth year that full restitution of a crop was observed. Maybe that is a good indication—I do not know. I am concerned that, with the use of chemicals, particularly those that do not break down, an accumulation of chemicals could occur in the soil, and we are forcing an already cost-squeezed industry to the point of bankruptcy.

As I mentioned previously, many farmers have gone to the wall. I believe that, unless costs are contained, we will see more and more people going to the wall. Unfortunately, the small-time operator has been unable to survive and the old adage of get big or get out has applied. These people are in an industry where they cannot control the returns that they receive: in other words, they cannot dictate the prices that they will receive for their commodities. They are in fact price takers and not price makers, and the less efficient or those who are unfortunately on smaller or less productive properties are being forced out of the industry.

All these factors help to raise the overall cost of production. We all know that if the cost of production rises so does the cost to the consumer, assuming the commodity can be

produced for the right consumer market. The raising of fuel costs on primary products will obviously increase home consumption prices, particularly in the case of wheat, barley and livestock. Wheat is a staple commodity; it is a product concerning which the farmer has from time to time been subsidising the home consumption price when it has been less in South Australia than that which could be obtained on the overseas market. Of course, it has occasionally happened in the reverse. However, generally speaking, we have had a very stable price structure for wheat of a milling quality for our home consumption market. That applies also to barley and livestock, and other primary products could be included. However, if the freight costs rise, so does the production cost.

I also mention the high cost of fuel for the fishing industry. I do not think that many people really understand the significance of the fuel component to the fishing industry. Without doubt, the smallest trawler would use much more than the largest farming operation. I know of one fishing vessel which, when on full power and full refrigeration, uses 80 gallons of fuel an hour. When a fisherman requires to use as much fuel in a week as an average farmer would use in a year, one starts to comprehend the massive nature of the fuel component in the fishing industry.

For example, the cost of fuel for some fishermen has risen by \$40 000 over the past year, and that is a phenomenal sum, especially when the people concerned are trying to contain costs. Without containing the money costs involved, many smaller operators in primary industry will go out of business. More particularly, we now have industries managed by way of quotas, tonnages applying in tuna fishing and the seasonal management scheme for prawns. Obviously, cost containment is of the utmost importance; otherwise people will go out of business. Some of the larger tuna vessels require a tonne of fish to pay fuel costs to get to the fishing ground, and they require another tonne to pay for fuel costs coming home. When we talk of costs of that magnitude, even a cent per litre is significant.

One industry seldom mentioned in a debate on fuel is tourism, and I draw the House's attention to the importance of fuel in that industry, particularly in a State like South Australia where our many attractions are spread along the coast and extend into the northern areas. Development of those areas is dependent upon reasonably priced fuel, and it obviously affects the hotel/motel industry and the hospitality industry generally.

We can take that argument further and talk about undertakings in the metropolitan area, including the caravan and tent manufacturing industries and other aspects of the tourist industry, including the airlines, coach services and other components. Many major industries throughout this State rely very heavily upon access to reasonably priced fuel. The previous Federal Government had a fuel freight equalisation scheme, and there is still such a scheme, although the teeth have been knocked out of it. Whilst that original scheme applied, at least citizens right across Australia had access to reasonably priced fuel or the freight component of that fuel was equalised.

All other factors being equal, there was no reason why citizens throughout Australia should not have been able to pay within 4 cents per litre for fuel obtained from the centre of Australia to the seaboard. However the denial of that facility to the people concerned means that those further from seaports will be more disadvantaged.

I hope that this motion has total support from both sides. In this debate we are looking after the interests of South Australians as a whole, not just people in the metropolitan area but country people, too. We are looking after people in the metropolitan area when it comes to job opportunities in the service industries, but we want something for all

South Australians. If the scheme were reinstated and backed by the State, it would make South Australia more attractive to tourists from within Australia and around the world, knowing that they could more easily travel around our fair State. That should be everyone's objective. I commend my motion to the House.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I have pleasure in seconding the motion, and in speaking briefly to it. The situation outlined by the member for Flinders in his motion is one that the Liberal Party supports. I do not propose to canvass all the details raised by the honourable member in relation to his concern for the rural, fishing and tourist industries. However, clearly the Liberal Party has set out its position consistent with that conveyed to the House by the honourable member today. I would have thought that this was one of those occasions when, as it is broadly a call on the Federal Government to reinstate a longstanding and well justified measure in South Australia, the Labor Party would support the motion.

I know of no reason at all in this instance which would cause members opposite to show the political bias or unreasonable nature they display in some other areas. It is most appropriate that the three industries on which country areas depend very heavily (the rural sector, the tourist industry and the fishing industry) be taken together in this regard. These three industries have proved capable of existing side by side and of sharing the benefits derived from the small businesses operating within them.

The impact of fuel costs on those industries is significant, and I refer particularly to the last subsidy removal on 23 May by the Federal Government. This is one way that we in this place can show in a totally bipartisan fashion our concern for those industries that have had little attention recently from the Federal or State Government. I look forward to the Minister's indicating the Government's support for the motion.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I move:

That this House rejects the proposed construction of a toxic waste disposal incinerator within the Murray-Darling Rivers catchment area and, further, opposes the establishment of such a facility in any populated area.

The carrying of this motion becomes all the more critical in view of the answer given by the Deputy Premier to a question I asked the Minister of Water Resources on 7 August.

I asked the Minister whether he concurred with his federal colleague (the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment, Mr Cohen) in supporting the establishment of a toxic waste disposal incinerator east of Broken Hill and, if not, what action was the Government taking to oppose the project. On that occasion I explained that the site proposed was some 22 km from Broken Hill and was within the Murray-Darling catchment area. I pointed out:

At present it is believed that about 10 000 tonnes of halogenated organic compounds are stored in Sydney alone. About 80 per cent of toxic chemical waste is generated in Sydney and Melbourne. It is proposed to transport this—mainly by rail—through the catchment area of the Murray/Darling river system.

These toxic wastes include dioxins, furans, polychlorinated biphenyls and many others, which are believed to cause foetal abnormalities and cancer, even when they are present in only a few parts per million. I also pointed out then that there had been a number of accidental spillages in Europe and the United States, and I mentioned the danger of rail and road spillages and the possibility that incinerator malfunction could have in this instance a catastrophic effect on people in South Australia when one considers that the majority of South Australia's potable water is now derived from the Murray River.

My concern was increased by the response of the Deputy Premier, when he indicated the four possible sites that were being considered in Australia for a toxic waste incinerator, and particularly the one proposed at Broken Hill. In concluding his reply, the Deputy Premier stated:

There are successful plants around the world, and I visited one very recently in France, but there is no proposition, nor does it make economic sense, to set up such a facility in South Australia or Western Australia. We oppose, have opposed and continue to oppose any proposition which would involve the transport of any such material across any part of the Murray/Darling Basin.

What the Minister failed to do then was to give any assurance that he would oppose the construction of a toxic waste incinerator in the Broken Hill area which we all know is within the catchment area of the Murray/Darling system.

The fact that the Minister was unwilling to give that undertaking clearly shows to the Opposition that the South Australian Government has indicated to the Federal Government and to Mr Cohen, in particular, that it would not oppose the establishment of such an incinerator at Broken Hill. However, the consequences for not only the people in Broken Hill but the people in South Australia could be catastrophic when we consider the material that will be processed if that incinerator is allowed to be constructed.

The House should look briefly at the materials about which I am talking. Just what are these materials? Dioxins are a bi-product of the manufacture of the defoliant 2,4,8-T. It is described as suspected of being a carcinogen that may cause serious health and environmental problems in extremely low doses. That is just one. Polychlorinated biphenyls are described as industrial chemicals that were once widely used as coolant and insulators for electrical equipment.

The third category that I wish to describe is chlorinated hydrocarbons, which include solid and liquid bi-products of plastic manufacturing and other industries. I do not profess to know much about these poisons—that is probably the best way to describe them—but many people throughout the world who have intimate knowledge of this subject have certainly expressed a great deal of concern. I refer to a letter written by Mr Cohen to Mr Hicks, member for Riverina, on 5 June 1984, in which he states:

I appreciate the concerns of your constituents about potential environmental and public health hazards. However, I am advised that incinerator facilities of suitable design are operating in other countries, for example, in the UK, Germany, USA and Denmark, with no adverse health or environmental effects. High temperature incineration breaks down persistent hazardous chemicals such as PCBs producing harmless gases to be released to the atmosphere.

That view is certainly not held overseas. I need refer only to an article that appeared in the *New Scientist* (4 August 1983) and headed, 'Governments Fail to Report on Toxic Waste'. The House has just heard that the Deputy Premier and the Federal Minister for Home Affairs and Environment believe that there are no problems with the operation of these incinerators in other parts of the world. However, this article goes on to state:

The European Commission is threatening to take seven European nations to court if they do not complete a report on the practices of toxic waste disposal. The countries promised to complete the reports by the end of 1981. But so far only three nations, Britain, Germany and Luxembourg, have submitted the required document. The reports are essential, say the commission's officials, to enable the EEC to draw up uniform regulations covering the handling and disposal of toxic waste.

'The failure to compile the reports is symptomatic of governments' attitude to waste disposal regulations', says Joyce Quin, a member of the European Parliament. Quin's questions prompted the commission to reveal it was taking action to push defaulting nations into writing their reports.

That hardly indicates that what Mr Cohen and the Deputy Premier are saying—that there are no concerns, that these incinerators work efficiently, and that there is no problem to the people at large—is really the case. Certainly, those incinerators have been going for a long time in other parts of the world and there is real concern about the effects on local populations.

On 26 August 1983 the Far Western Industry Development Board, New South Wales, wrote to Mr Bob Evers, Secretary, Broken Hill Action Committee, and stated:

As you may be aware the Far Western Industry Development Board is liaising with a Sydney-based company, Rinex Environmental Services Pty Ltd, who wish to establish a high temperature incinerator in the Broken Hill area that is capable of destroying halogenated organic compounds and to operate it as a commercial facility. The company was originally looking at a site near Griffith; however, political action prevented this company from proceeding with the site.

I can well appreciate the concern of people in the Griffith area about such a facility being established in their district. Obviously, people in Sydney and Melbourne do not want it in their cities, but that is where the material has been generated. However, the Federal Government and the Government of New South Wales are quite willing to try to shunt off this facility to some more remote country district, but the sites they have suggested in New South Wales, such as Griffith and east of Broken Hill, are both within the Murray/Darling catchment area. Hence there is real concern that any malfunction and escape of material could finish up in the Murray/Darling system and contaminate the whole water supply system of South Australia.

Just to indicate the attitude of people in Broken Hill, an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 27 April 1985 states:

Broken Hill does not want to be part of a dangerous experiment to destroy poisonous waste produced 1200 kilometres away in the cities. In an angry nutshell that's how the western New South Wales community of 30 000 feels about having a toxic waste burner 22 kilometres from the town.

Quite obviously the people of Broken Hill are extremely concerned. They had a massive public meeting in relation to this issue. The site is within the Murray/Darling catchment area and is a real threat to South Australia. As an indication of how this could affect South Australia, I refer to a letter written to me by Mr John Grosse, of Renmark, who spends considerable time flying in this part of Australia. He states:

Your concern recently expressed concerning the chemical disposal dump and incinerator in the Broken Hill area is well founded. I have flown over the area in question many times and I can assure you that the entire area drains southward through virtually dozens of creeks and channels, all of which terminate either in the Darling River or Lake Menindee and its smaller sister lakes. All stormwater falling on the entire Broken Hill area floods to the south as the entire area is 1 000 feet or more above sea level and the Darling and Menindee Lakes area is no more than 300 feet above sea level—a difference of 700 feet in only about 70 miles or less. I feel it is a hell of a mistake to have any toxic materials in the Broken Hill area, regardless of the assurances that have been given.

That clearly indicates the terrain and the fall of that land from the Broken Hill area towards the Darling River. One

has to remember that the Darling River is a major contributor of water to South Australia.

To sum up the attitude of the people along the River Murray in South Australia, in the *Murray Pioneer* dated 19 October 1984 an article headed 'Toxic waste plan opposed' states:

The Riverland branches of the Agricultural Bureau's 70th annual conference opposed the suggestion to transfer toxic wastes into the Murray/Darling catchment area.

This matter was debated at length and the motion was carried to that effect. The editorial in that paper of the same day also stated:

The Riverland Agricultural Bureau's annual conference has quite justly called for a review of the plan to establish a toxic waste disposal incinerator in the River Darling catchment area. It is claimed that there is no danger of contaminating the underground water supply in this area and that no toxic wastes will be able to be washed back into the Darling system.

It may well be that, in theory at least, there is in fact no danger. But the wisdom of building such a complex in a water catchment area must be questioned. Australia has many remote and virtually waterless areas where the potential problems such as a disposal station could cause would be minimal.

The siting of the planned incinerator about 20 kilometres from Broken Hill must also be questioned because of the risk of hazardous chemical waste residue finding its way to Broken Hill. Clearly there must be better site for such a project and the project will be viewed with suspicion and alarm by many people who draw water from the Murray/Darling system.

I am convinced in my own mind that the risks are far too great, not only from accidental spillage in the transportation of highly toxic waste from Melbourne and Sydney through the Murray/Darling catchment area but also from the siting of that incinerator in the Broken Hill area. We are well aware that we could avoid transportation across the Murray/Darling basin by shipping the material from Melbourne and Sydney to Port Pirie and then by rail to Broken Hill, but by the same token we would still be shipping it back into the Murray/Darling basin where it would for ever remain a very serious threat. I commend the motion to the House.

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

That this debate be now adjourned.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** This position arose last week while I was in the Chair. Whilst the Chair has no objection to the member for Alexandra, or anyone else in the Opposition, seconding or seeking the adjournment of a debate, it is usual practice that the Minister has the first option to do one or the other, namely, to speak to the motion or adjourn it. The Chair will adopt the position that has usually been adopted in the past. I intend to do that on this occasion.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, Sir, I apologise for any attempt to breach procedure, but our program for today is such that we are anxious to get through a number of other items listed. We have more to contribute on this motion from this side of the House and therefore seek in such circumstances—without offence or reflection on the Minister—to adjourn the debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is not taking a point of order but seeking to explain the position. The Chair will not be dictatorial on the question, but we ought to adopt what has been in the past the usual practice of the House. I ask the Minister whether he wishes to take the adjournment and, if not, I would accept that the member for Alexandra does.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction):** We are a generous Government—that has been proved over the past three years. Had the member for Alexandra come up and explained the situation to me, I would have been perfectly happy for him to take the adjournment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair will not allow the Minister to carry on a barrage of explanation. I simply ask,

and will continue to ask, whether the Minister wishes to adjourn. If he does not—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** No, Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not.

Motion carried.

### BLACKWOOD POLICE STATION

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

That this House strongly opposes any move to close the Blackwood Police Station and calls on the Government, as part of its program to involve the community in crime prevention, to establish a permanent 24 hours a day police service at Blackwood.

I move this motion out of concern for a proposal currently before the Police Department to close the Blackwood Police Station, as the closure would be a backward step and certainly against the interests of the Blackwood community. With police stations being opened in other districts and every effort being made to bring the Police Force closer to the community, it is incomprehensible that a police station should be closed in a growing urban area. There is definitely a proposal before the Police Department to close the Blackwood Police Station without any consultation with the local community. That proposal should be rejected immediately, and the community should be consulted on how the Blackwood Police Station could be used more effectively to serve the surrounding community. This would be a constructive way of involving the local residents in crime prevention.

The Blackwood/Belair/Coromandel/Eden Hills district has a population of over 30 000 people. It has grown considerably over the past 15 years and will certainly continue to grow. Going back a period of some 25 years, to a time when I was just a local lad in the district, the role and respect that the Blackwood police had in the community was considerable. I certainly have fond memories of some of the identities involved in those days. In fact, one such identity was the father of the present member for Florey and was the officer in charge of the Blackwood Police Station. My sisters in particular used to be friends with that police officer's daughter. I am sure that the present member for Florey would support my remarks about the importance of the Blackwood Police Station and the role that it played then and the role that I believe it should play today. As local lads, we would not dare step out of line because of that respect we had for the officer in charge. That sort of identity of an individual police officer in the community is what we should strive for today.

Local residents in the Blackwood area have asked that a neighbourhood watch scheme be established in the Blackwood district. A growing number of house breakings have occurred in recent years, and people are only too willing to participate with the police in helping to prevent such crimes and helping to catch offenders. I refer briefly to an experience that I had when I investigated a neighbourhood crime watch system established in an area of Melbourne. I was very impressed, first, with the number of local residents actively involved in that neighbourhood crime prevention program.

**Mr Hamilton:** When did this happen?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** About a month or six weeks ago. I looked at one such area, and not at many areas, and I did not look at the central organisation. In relation to this one area, I talked to some of the people involved. I was particularly impressed with the large number of residents who were participating in the program. I was impressed with the way in which the local police were trying to establish their officers and identities as local people to whom the community could relate. Because of this, local residents feel much freer about going to the police when seeking

assistance, or in fact reporting to the police any troubles that occur in their neighbourhood.

I was also impressed with the way in which local police on a three-monthly basis circulate a local newsletter to the community, highlighting crimes that have occurred in the community and asking residents to convey any other experiences or information that they may have. In that local newsletter they also promote action that can be taken by local residents to improve the security of their homes and to protect goods that they have in their homes.

While I was there a theft occurred nearby, and it was interesting to see how quickly both the police and local residents were involved in being able to report people who had been seen in the vicinity on the night that the theft occurred. Having seen that Victorian experience at the grass-roots level I believe that it has proved to be very successful, even though it was still in a relatively young stage of development. I believe that that type of development should be undertaken here in South Australia across the metropolitan area. I realise that such a neighbourhood watch scheme has already been established in the north-west suburbs.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** At Flinders Park in the north-west suburbs. I compliment the police on taking that initiative, but I now urge the police to spread that same program much more widely across the community, starting to apply it particularly in the south-west and southern suburbs. This is why I ask that such a neighbourhood watch scheme be established in the Blackwood, Belair and other surrounding districts, including Netherby as well. I have certainly had a positive response from local residents, who want to participate in such a program.

The Government has indicated that the Blackwood area as such would be covered by the 24-hour police stations at Darlington, Unley and Stirling. However, I point out to the Minister that the Adelaide Hills area is quite different to the Adelaide plains areas. It involves a different type of community, with different characteristics and different community involvement. To concentrate police services in a few large police stations would simply push the crime problem into districts where there is no permanent police presence. Of course that is the fear of people living in the Blackwood area. They are concerned that by removing the police station from Blackwood it will simply encourage an increase in crime in that area.

I find it difficult to understand why the Government is proposing to close the Blackwood Police Station while at the same time it is preparing to open new police stations elsewhere. In the past three weeks the Labor Party politicians have announced details of new police stations or improved police services at Norwood, Tea Tree Gully and Christies Beach. Such a two-faced policy seems hard to comprehend and justify. I refer to articles that have appeared in the Messenger newspapers recently. First, the 21 August 1985 edition of the *Southern Times* carried a front page story headed 'Christies Beach police get more staff' which stated:

The Christies Beach police will get more staff and a smaller area to patrol as part of a major reshuffle of police manpower in South Australia.

I refer in particular to what the Minister of Emergency Services (Dr Hopgood) had to say. Of course he is also the local member of Parliament for that district. He said:

We want the police back in the suburbs developing a firm trusting relationship with the community. The community based structure will allow the development of crime prevention and protection programs tailored to the needs of the southern communities.

I ask the Minister, who has responsibility in relation to the possible closure of the Blackwood Police Station, to apply

to that police station that same principle there. People living at Blackwood as well as residents in the Minister's own electorate want a close relationship with the police in their community, and they want a developing relationship and a permanent police presence in their area.

Another story appeared in the 21 August edition of the *Leader*, which is circulated in the north-eastern suburbs. The ALP candidate for Newland, Dianne Gayler, was out there announcing that there would be a new police coverage for Tea Tree Gully. I shall quote from that article which also appeared on page 1 of a Messenger newspaper, the *Leader*. It appears that there was a great operation by the press secretaries of the Labor Government that week to ensure that there was a series of announcements made about opening new police services in metropolitan areas of Adelaide.

**Mr Hamilton:** You wouldn't have done that when you were in government, though.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I just hope that the honourable member realises the contradiction between what was announced by his Government two or three weeks ago (and I shall refer to another article shortly) and the proposal before the Police Department to close the Blackwood Police Station. That is a complete contradiction. I wonder why that is so. Is it because one is a Liberal electorate and the other is a Labor electorate? I sincerely hope that that is not the case. I find it hard to understand why in the past three weeks there have been three occasions on which Labor politicians or would-be politicians have been able to make announcements concerning improved police services, and yet in the Blackwood area they are considering a proposal to close down the Blackwood Police Station. The article in the *Leader* states:

Newland ALP candidate, Dianne Gayler, said 48 police officers would operate five shifts from the new Tea Tree Gully Police Station. Tea Tree Gully, with its—

*At 3.59 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Call on the orders of the day.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, why cannot we extend beyond 4 o'clock the time for notices of motion?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is not up to the Chair to decide whether honourable members wish to continue their motions beyond 4 o'clock. I suggest that the honourable member for Davenport have a powwow with his new Whip and work it out for himself. I am merely following what is the normal procedure of the House.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That Orders of the Day: Other Business be postponed and taken into consideration after Notices of Motion: Other Business have been disposed of.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald (teller), Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.  
Motion thus negated.

### SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO STEAMTOWN PETERBOROUGH RAILWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY INCORPORATED

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** On behalf of the member for Eyre, I move:

That the time for bringing up the Select Committee's report be extended until Wednesday 9 October 1985.

Motion carried.

### MINDA INCORPORATED

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.G. Evans:

That this House—

- (a) recognises and applauds the major role Minda Incorporated carries out in caring for mentally disabled people and the resultant saving of taxpayers' money;
- (b) should do all in its power to see that no government action will result in decreasing the value of any assets held for the benefit of the mentally disabled by Minda;
- (c) recognises the great assistance Minda has given to the Golden Spur Pony Club, Riding for the Disabled and other community groups, by the use of land and facilities;
- (d) recognises the public demand for the Minda Craighurn Farm at Coromandel Valley to remain open space and, if Minda indicates it no longer requires all or part of that property, calls on the Government to acquire it; and
- (e) calls upon the Government to negotiate with Mitcham council, local sporting groups and the Minda Board to identify Craighurn land which will be required for sport and recreation in the future and to set funds aside ready to purchase such land.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 598.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish only to say a little more on this motion today and to add more later, because I am concerned with the two replies that I have received from the Minister for Environment and Planning regarding the hills face zone and the Minda Craighurn farm. In relation to Minda Craighurn Farm I asked the Minister whether there had been any indication or approach from the Minda Board saying that it wished to sell part or all of Craighurn, situated on the north of the Sturt River. I also asked whether the Government had considered buying such land that Minda suggested it did not require. The reply that I received from the Minister states:

A working party to report on the most appropriate use of the land known as the Craighurn Farm was established following an application by Minda Incorporated to subdivide the land. That application was subsequently withdrawn. The working party includes representatives from Minda Incorporated, the Mitcham council and the Department of Environment and Planning.

It is believed that Minda Incorporated representatives have indicated that they will not require some of the land in the foreseeable future, and that they may not need any of the land in the longer term. It is expected the State Government, the Mitcham council and any other interested organisation or person will be presented with the opportunity to purchase the land, in part or in whole and in stages. The deciding factors will be the cost to the Government when weighed against the benefits and other priorities for funds, and the timing of any possible purchases.

It is quite clear from that answer that the Minda Board has given an indication that it will not require some of the land in the very near future. It is also quite clear from the Government's answer that it is unlikely that the Government has the money to acquire any of the property at the moment. If it did have the money, I believe it would be

saying that it was prepared to start acquiring any part of that land that Minda does not require.

I wish to put to the Government a proposition as to how to overcome the Craighburn problem without losing the open space effect of the property, or having to find the full tote odds to acquire any part of that property that has a development potential according to law. A government could offer to buy the development rights on the basis that Craighburn (or the Minda Board, as we know it) would agree to have the area in total declared open space. That would then guarantee that the property would remain open space for all time. To purchase the development rights the Government would have to find something like \$6 million (it may be more or less) and the Minda Board could use the money for the mentally disabled, for whom it cares so well.

By that method the community would be guaranteed that the property will remain open space and then, if in future Minda wished to sell it, the purchase price would be much lower, because the development rights would already have been paid for. That would then provide an opportunity for local government, such as the Mitcham council, to buy some of the land for community purposes. That would be on the understanding that there was community demand and nearby community acceptance of any proposal put forward by local government. There are other things that I wanted to mention in regard to this topic, but I will do so at a later stage, because people are collating some information for me.

I recently asked the Minister what the position was in relation to the hills face zone. As that area has such a huge fuel load for potential major fires, I would like to know whether it is likely that the Government will reduce the size of the hills face zone in those areas which are declared hills face zone but which could not be seen from the city plains. In abbreviated terms, the Minister's reply is that, when the study is being carried out for the second generation parkland, the Craighburn property and other properties throughout the hills will be under consideration. The effect is that there will not be a decrease in the size of the hills face zone, but rather, the Minister predicts that there will be an increase, so I visualise that the Government has in mind that Craighburn may become part of the second generation park and may also be part of that property becoming part of the hills face zone area.

I take it that that would be an area that has development potential. If that occurred under legislation, without any compensation to Minda, then that fine institution of dedicated people, some paid and some voluntary, would be quite significantly handicapped in the work that it carries out on behalf of the mentally disabled. I believe that there is a halfway proposition which will remove the difficulties associated with the Craighburn property, and that is for the Government—and at the moment that means both political Parties because of an approaching election—to accept the proposition that we buy the development rights of Craighburn, give the money to the Minda Board, and the property, under that arrangement, would be declared open space. They are the only comments that I wish to make today in relation to that matter. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### HILLS FACE ZONE FIRE PROTECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.G. Evans:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should take immediate action to—

- (a) have the large amounts of highly flammable dead vegetation, olive trees and noxious weeds removed from the Government owned sections of the hills face zone;

- (b) assist and encourage more hills local community fire action committees to be set up; and  
(c) provide adequate fire tracks in the hills face zone.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 599.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish to refer to the reply I mentioned a moment ago, although I am not allowed to refer to that speech. Recently, the Minister gave me a reply to a question which I asked about the future of the Adelaide hills face zone and whether it was likely to be decreased in those areas where the subject country could not be seen from the Adelaide Plains: in other words, the valleys that are hidden in the hills face zone.

The Minister's reply indicated that, with the second generation park study, it was more likely that the hills face zone area would be increased, and not decreased. The motion that I have before the House at the moment is in regard to the huge load of fire fuel that exists in that hills face zone. The Minister and other members of Parliament have already received letters from residents living in Eden Hills, Belair, Crafrers, Crafrers West, Coromandel Valley and even Flagstaff Hill expressing their concern about the dangers that relate to the hills face zone as we know it today.

When we declared that area I issued the warning that, unless we cared for it, we would have a major problem on our hands. I ask members of Parliament and the public not just to sit in their cars or homes on the plains and look at the hills, thinking that they look lovely and green in winter, spring and late autumn, and that in summer they look dry in many parts and green in others, with attractive forest and native vegetation, because they are not something of beauty. As I said before, the area has the potential to destroy hundreds of millions of dollars worth of properties—houses, furniture and private possessions.

Also, it has the potential to take many lives. For example, the Stirling and Happy Valley councils have decided to close the connecting road between Bradbury and Mount Bold. Most members of Parliament would not know where it is but if one lives in the area just out of Dorset Vale, going towards Mount Bold, one would know that the only road leading out of that area is across the Onkaparinga River just below the Mount Bold reservoir.

Some people might ask what that road closure has to do with the hills face zone. There is a bridge in that area, built in the depression years of the 1930s—rather unique in its construction—that has reached a stage of deterioration causing a weight limit to be placed on it. Engineers say it is unsafe now, so they have closed it. That is an example of the great danger of people being trapped in that area. If a fire starts, there is no way out. So, we leave the hills face zone as it is because we are short of money: we close the Bradbury to Mount Bold road for that reason.

I will not say where we should get the money or in what areas we should cut funds, but we have many unemployed people in our community and there must be a way of using that resource to clean up the hills face zone. I ask the Premier whether he will take up the challenge and get cooperation from his Ministers to bring in such a program, if the community and the trade union movement will accept it, to employ, for instance, low security prisoners who have mainly committed rather minor offences to start clearing some of the more flammable, useless and non-native vegetation in the hills face zone.

A few small contracts could be let out to a couple of earth-movers to make better fire access tracks in some of the very difficult and inaccessible country for modern day firefighting equipment. It is easy for people to say that it does not matter and that fire is unlikely: it has not happened significantly in the Brownhill Creek area since about 1957. We have not had one around Panorama or in those areas

since about 1934. But each year the fuel load gains in intensity.

When it occurs, we all know that firefighters will not be able to be in all places at the right time to stop it. Once it gets a gale up, if it starts in the morning and not in the afternoon, we will be lucky if we stop it before it gets to Strathalbyn—as happened in 1939. I ask the Government and the Parliament to accept that we must do something about the hills face zone and manage it correctly. If we do not, we are kidding ourselves, and we will all rue the day when a disaster occurs. It is not 'if it occurs'; it will. There is no doubt about that. Young people ride motor bikes illegally, people walk through the area, some smoke illegally in summer, and motor cars run off the road, as has happened recently.

It needs only one incident like that at the wrong time and a fire is on its way. I ask the Government to take up the challenge. It is as important as supplying community welfare to families and individuals; and as providing homes for individuals. If we do not do it, we will lose many homes and have to provide more. People will make greater demands on community welfare. It is as important as health provisions. If we do not act, many people will be looking for immediate health and other treatment for nervous problems, such as breakdowns, through not being able to handle life after experiencing such a situation.

We have seen it happening recently and it will happen more often because fewer people work the land in the hills now (the hills face zone, particularly) than 20 or 40 years ago. Because we have stopped them working it, gradually each year the situation becomes much more dangerous. I hope that we understand the importance of spending money in that area. I encourage honourable members to support the proposition and to attack what is a dangerous situation for a large section of the South Australian community.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr M.J. Evans:

That this House believes that all children in South Australia are entitled to the benefit of an education which takes into account the multicultural basis of the community within the framework of a single mainstream system and, accordingly, the House opposes the establishment of a separate Urban Aboriginal School at Elizabeth.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 602.)

**Ms LENEHAN (Mawson):** I would like to continue from where I left off last week in this debate. I will not go over the points I made then, but hopefully I will be able to reiterate some of the things I said. However, I would like to introduce some further evidence into my argument. The Minister has made available to me rather a large document entitled 'Building a structure for educational success: the Maori experience with its implications for the Australian Aboriginal situation'.

This was a thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Bachelor of Education degree course at the Salisbury College of Advanced Education by Mr David J. Craig. In a very comprehensive and thorough analysis of the subject, I believe we can learn from some of the points made by Mr Craig in his thesis. I am sure that honourable members will recall that the last time I spoke on this matter I actually spent some time talking about the importance of developing a really good and positive self concept by Aboriginal people among their own cultural mores and experi-

ences. I note that in this thesis there is a section entitled 'Self concept'. It is important to have on the parliamentary record what Mr Craig says in his thesis about the importance of self concept, and I quote from his remarks:

Maori people, generally, are represented in most stratas of New Zealand society and there are many examples of successful Maoris for the youth to look up to. As a result, it is far easier for a Maori to have a positive self concept than his counterpart in Australia. This is not to say that all Maori people have successfully developed a positive self concept but because of the achievements of many Maoris and the more positive attitude of the Pakeha in New Zealand it is relatively easier for the Maori to view himself, in relation to the rest of New Zealand, in a better light. The Aboriginal on the other hand has very few successful members of his race to relate to. The attitude of the non-Aboriginal people of Australia toward the Aboriginal people has not assisted them to develop positive self-concepts as the general attitude is very poor.

That view points out that it is important that we look at this as one of the factors involved in establishing what the Aboriginal people of the northern suburbs have requested of this Government, that is, a separate Aboriginal school. Also, I refer to the conclusions in this indepth and thorough thesis, as follows:

Aborigines can learn to cope with modern society, as Maoris have, as long as appropriate learning experiences are provided. This may mean that the formal education system, as we know it, is not appropriate and situations such as the Maori carving school in Rotorua may need to be developed.

That is an important point in support of the argument that I am advancing. I go on to quote Mr Craig, as follows:

Aboriginal leaders are emerging, but this needs to be accelerated. Industrial development in the north particularly has brought changes and this will continue although it is unlikely that the Aboriginal people will grow into self-reliant people with initiative unless they are conscious of their cultural heritage, as the Maoris are. Schools can do a great deal to assist Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children to understand and appreciate Aboriginal culture. There are various groups in each State of Australia attempting to set up resource centres of people and artefacts which are available to schools and the community. The Aboriginal Community College in Adelaide has developed a very fine schools service which has Aboriginal speakers and artefacts freely available on request.

He goes on to say:

Achievements in the field of Aboriginal education are generally behind those of comparative systems in other countries, especially New Zealand, America and Canada. In these countries the stage has been reached where a great number of the indigenous people are actively involved in the education system of their own country and are often administrators of programs they have devised for members of their own communities.

This is exactly what is being proposed for Elizabeth. The thesis continues:

Significantly many conferences and programs are organised by members of the indigenous communities and, in fact, many of the indigenous people deliver papers and run sessions. At the moment this is not possible in Australia but will become so in time. Perhaps Maoris who are successfully involved in education would work with Aboriginal communities and assist them, as the Maori women of the play centre movement did in the 1970s.

This document is well worth a thorough examination and I refer members who are interested in this debate to this thesis, because it has much significance and importance for the development of this school. I want now to pick up just a couple of the points that have come through not just in this debate but certainly in the media. First, there has been an overtone of racism. Many slurs against Aboriginality have been raised in the debate on this Aboriginal school. I am not for one moment suggesting that the member for Elizabeth has been in any part of that. In fact, I believe that the exact opposite would be the case. I am not in any way referring to the member for Elizabeth, and I would like that on the public record. For example, it has been suggested that the mere presence of more Aboriginal children in Elizabeth, bussed in from other areas, 'could lead to social and racial tensions'. That was from the *Advertiser* editorial of 27 May 1985.

The Elizabeth council has mentioned the possible increase in the Aboriginal population in the community leading to social problems. These views are really saying that wherever there are Aborigines in the community there is some sort of negative force in the community that will cause disruption to community life—and the more Aborigines the worse it is. I know all members of the House will agree that this is a more racist view, and I believe the statements themselves are racist. To say that people of one race or culture are inferior citizens because they are of that race or culture is something that I hope every member of this Parliament would condemn.

Another point that has been raised is that somehow the people who are supporting the school are supporting some kind of separatism. Whilst the word 'apartheid' has not been openly used, there have been inferences that would lead people to believe that this is some sort of apartheid model. The desire to affirm aboriginality through the school system is not a desire for separatism at all but a desire for people to become strong and assured in Aboriginal identity and to be able to withstand the onslaughts that come from being a racially oppressed minority.

Surely, every member of this Parliament would agree that Aboriginal people are a racially oppressed minority. Maybe one day it will come about that the mainstream schools will have sufficient Aboriginal input so that Aboriginal children will have role models of Aboriginal teachers, successful students at year 12 level, and so on, to feel enough encouragement to remain and to be successful up to the year 12 level, but this is not the case at present. Aboriginal students and teachers are so few in number compared with the rest of the community that all that they are asking for is a chance to try to build a school environment where their children and teachers are not a minority, and where they can feel empowered by identifying with their own culture and learning, and acquire greater pride and confidence.

This should make it possible for them to move into the mainstream education system later and to remain in it for longer. This is a point on which the member for Elizabeth and I disagreed. He seemed to think that it was all right for Aboriginal children to be separated up to year 4, but somehow that that was the magical age when they should automatically move back into mainstream education. I suggest that we are being extremely patronising to the Aboriginal race in saying that children are ready for that at that time. Surely, it is up to the individual Aboriginal children and their families to make that decision, and to make a decision for each individual child that is best for that child. I certainly agree with the member for Elizabeth that the kindergarten experience is vital, but we could and should take it further.

I will quote from some of the remarks that the Minister of Education has made in respect to this school. He has suggested that the school—and I totally support these remarks—will allow the development of a strong partnership between staff and parents in establishing a school climate that will support Aboriginal children in developing both feelings of personal worth and academic skills. He said that the school would provide an opportunity for Aboriginal students to succeed in a supporting and caring environment. That is what the Aboriginal community in the northern suburbs has asked for.

The other important point that needs to be highlighted is that the close association with the Elizabeth High School, the staff of which strongly supports the proposal, will in the future allow guided integration of secondary age students into high school classes with adequate pastoral and tutorial support. Aboriginal parents, who will be in the majority, not in the minority as is the normal case, will have a strong voice in educational issues and, indeed, have requested that the school be established in this manner and on this site.

The school will allow different learning approaches and experiences to be used, which take into account that Aboriginal children learn and that Aboriginal students will be in classes where they are in a majority, although—and I stress this—there is no exclusion of white children. In fact, this school will be open to children of any colour, creed, or racial background. This is not a school that is exclusively set aside for Aborigines: it represents choice and diversity within our educational system in line with the philosophy that has been espoused by this Government about providing the widest possible educational experiences and choice for all students.

It is important that this Parliament support the need for the separate school at Elizabeth, and in giving that support we will be saying to the Aboriginal people in the northern suburbs that we appreciate their needs, have responded to their requests and will support them in their endeavours to provide adequate education for their children as well as helping them develop a pride in their aboriginality and a self concept that will enable them to go forward as Australian citizens and participate equally in our community.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## TRANSPORT SYSTEM

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

That this House deplores the transport policies and performances of the Government and in particular its failure to plan for the long term transport needs of Adelaide residents and its waste of public funds and condemns both the present and previous Minister of Transport for their lack of ministerial control during the past 2½ years.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 606.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** In supporting the motion, I wish to refer to some of the points raised by the member for Davenport, and will also raise one or two others matters, I make clear from the outset that I have been concerned, not only for the past 2½ years but over the past 15 years that we have been neglecting our transport needs, whether it be road construction, new developments, upgrading, or public transport facilities including buses, trains—

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. EVANS:**—or to that small vessel the *Troubridge*, to which my colleague refers, which connects a foreign land, Kangaroo Island, with South Australia. I say that facetiously to upset the member for Alexandra; I have great respect for the good people of Kangaroo Island, who have given me a free feed of fish now and again.

My first point is in regard to the lack of planning on the stretch of the main south-eastern road from the Tollgate to the Eagle on the Hill. I make the point with much feeling. I am conscious that the Federal Government has just made available \$100 000 for a special study to see what can be done to that part of the road. I am not an engineer, but rather a practical person. It annoys me to think that we spend \$100 000 on someone telling us what to do when I believe that our own engineers should already have the detail that needs to be put into operation in the practical form.

I first started asking for upgrading of that section of the road in the early 1970s, without success. A holding ramp was created for the Mount Osmond turn-off and I am grateful that that was done, although it took three years to achieve. There was slight modification to roads with widening of the pavement in places to provide for a park lane for vehicles to pull off to the edge if in difficulty. Two run-



off ramps were created for semitrailers that might lose control. They were more applicable when semitrailers did not have air brakes which convert the motor of the vehicle to a compressor. It compresses air and the compression hauls it back, as against brakes on the wheels. They also had brakes attached to their transmission wheels that are held off in some cases by air. If they lose air pressure they lock on, similar to the railways method of braking.

Since those forms of braking have become more popular, there is less likelihood of runaway transports on the roads. There is a piece of road on that section where motorists travel in opposite directions; by law it should be at a speed of 80 km/h or under, but many travel at 100 km/h. That happens on most roads—people exceed the speed limit and a few are booked, but we cannot expect the police to be on hand to catch them all. The slightest deviation from the route along which one is travelling, towards the centre of the road, brings about a head-on collision. The amount of deviation required is about a metre and a half in many cases. If there are two vehicles (which are really weapons) travelling between 80 and 100 km/h with only about a metre and a half or one metre between them, it only needs the slightest error of judgment and there is a tragedy.

In some places there is a centre kerb or median strip. If the front wheel of a vehicle strikes that strip, it automatically drags the vehicle into the path of any oncoming traffic. I became determined about this matter in 1980, when I lost a very close friend in a road accident which caused two others in the other vehicle to be partly paralysed for life. Regardless of whether it was human error or vehicle fault, if there had been centre barriers to deflect the vehicle that transgressed on that occasion and place it back on its proper path, in all probability there would have been no death; and I am certain that the two people in the other vehicle would not have been injured at all.

Since that time there have been several other accidents, including one very recently in which another very close friend was involved; she is still suffering and trying to recover from that accident. In the early 1980s I set out to try to win support. I mentioned earlier that it is not just the present Government that is at fault, because I refer to the negligence of previous Administrations in not picking up the challenge. I will not say who signed the letters, but in the early 1980s I asked for barriers to be placed in the centre of the road to protect people. The suggestion of providing concrete barriers was rejected. I was told that it would be too difficult to provide protection around the butt ends. I then mentioned the concrete barriers on Goodwood Road, which were erected at Lonsdale after three young people (including one from Glenunga High School) were killed.

I was told by Ministers, acting Ministers and the present Minister that, because of environmental factors and costs (and in 1981 the cost was \$900 000), they could not afford to do it, even though at least two lives have been lost and many other people are now in wheelchairs. How expensive is it for society to have people in wheelchairs for the rest of their lives? It is too difficult to place a value on the loss of life. Of course, the ongoing cost of death is not a lot, but the emotional cost is very high.

What about intensive care for people who are confined for weeks and months? How much does that cost? However, we walk away from such issues, saying that we cannot afford it. We put environmental matters before human beings—we often do it in this place, where ministerial decisions reflect this. The environment is important, but a human being is part of the environment and, if we are to have what amount to weapons which people can drive and guide on the roads, we must develop roads to a point where such

a so-called weapon cannot accidentally destroy others or the person who is driving it.

The situation in relation to the South-Eastern Freeway, the main road link with the eastern States, is dangerous, but nothing is being done about it, apart from another study being undertaken in relation to the confounded thing. I was told in 1981 that the Highways Department was doing a study at that time. With the latest furore, a Mr Vincent wrote to the press asking what the Government intended to do about the matter. A subsequent report in the *Advertiser* stated that the Highways Department was going to carry out a study into what could be done. However, that was promised in 1981 but nothing was done about the matter. There is a lot more to be said on this motion, but as the member for Alexandra wishes to put a Bill before 5 o'clock, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 28 August. Page 607.)

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** When introducing the Bill in the House on 28 August, the member for Eyre provided to the House brief reasons why he wanted to amend the Country Fires Act to give greater powers to the board. The Country Fires Board may enter land or direct a private property owner to reduce the fuel load existing within the boundaries of a private holding. The member for Eyre has proposed that that authority of the board be extended to enable members of the board to direct owners of public property to reduce the fuel load on their land.

The honourable member cited as two major examples of property occupiers in South Australia the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Woods and Forests Department, in relation to which he would like the relevant authority extended. This matter does not need much further explanation than that provided in *Hansard* of 28 August at pages 606 and 607.

I take this opportunity to support my colleague's request, and on behalf of the Opposition I point out that the Opposition is indeed concerned about the build up of flammable fuel of one kind or another, coming from native vegetation, grasses and foreign species that have entered some of our national parks and public properties in the State. Within its manpower and financial resources the Woods and Forests Department makes every effort to plan and manage departmental properties throughout the State in order to minimise fire risk. It is fair to say that some attempts in the same direction are made by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Within the community that I represent, which includes Kangaroo Island, some 25 to 30 per cent of the area comprises parks and reserves in relation to which the respective officers in charge do their level best to contain the fuel load.

Many other areas within the State, including large areas such as Ngarkat and Billiat Reserve, and many smaller areas require sound management and attention, not only for the purposes of protecting the native vegetation and wildlife within the boundaries of the park but also to protect the neighbouring properties that have common boundaries with those parks.

It is in that context that I support the member for Eyre on behalf of the party. For the time being, I am looking after the matters associated with country fire services, in conjunction with my colleague the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning, in his role as acting spokesman

for the other State services. Together we believe that the member for Eyre is on the right track, and that what he is aiming to achieve in this instance is an extension of an authority that has proved to be responsible. If it is implemented, it will indeed reduce the fire risk in many vast areas of the State.

I hope that the Labor Party will support this private member's Bill, with a view to its speedy passage through both Houses of Parliament in readiness for implementation before the coming summer season.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### BLACKWOOD POLICE STATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Brown (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 832.)

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** I wish to continue my remarks concerning the Blackwood Police Station. I think at the time I was gagged by members opposite I was relating to the House the fact that the Newland ALP candidate, Dianne Gayler, on 21 September released a statement to the *Leader Messenger* in the north-east suburbs relating to talks about a new police station at Tea Tree Gully where 48 police officers will be stationed on a five-shift basis to service that area. Miss Gayler said:

That is a very large, remote and centralised operation. It has meant that on the ground we have one police officer stationed part-time at Tea Tree Plaza and only two patrol cars serving those 75 000 people, and then not exclusively.

That was the second case. The earlier case, announced in the same week, concerned the upgrading of police services at Christies Beach. Today's Messenger Press for the eastern suburbs contains a front-page story by Mr Greg Crafter and the Police Department concerning the announcement of a new police zone for the Norwood area. Under the heading 'Norwood Police Station planned', the following appears:

Plans for a big new police station at Norwood are part of a move to make police operations more community based... 'Recently adopted Neighbourhood Watch and blue light discos were two examples of police-community liaison,' he (Chief Superintendent Beck) said. 'There is very, very, strong community support. The indication to us is that the public do want to become involved,' he said.

Once again, there are three examples within three weeks of the establishment of a new police station or an increase in police services provided for an area. However, by comparison, the Police Department has before it a proposal to close the Blackwood Police Station, and I oppose that strongly. There is strong community support in Blackwood for a community watch service. Indeed, the Blackwood Chamber of Commerce has come out strongly in support of the retention of the Blackwood Police Station.

I am delighted that the member for Florey is now in the House, because earlier I referred to the days when his father was officer in charge of the Blackwood Police Station. I am sure that the honourable member for one will support the motion. I draw to the attention of the Minister of Emergency Services the long delays in getting police to Blackwood in emergency cases. I have heard complaints of delays of at least half an hour under emergency conditions and of up to two or three hours for less important matters.

I not only call for the retention of the Blackwood Police Station: I also believe that its service should be increased to a 24-hour service, which it used to be before it was reduced to the present 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. service. If there is to be a close liaison between the community and the police,

and if we are to involve these officers in the activities of the community and to encourage neighbourhood watch type schemes and the involvement of the community in crime prevention, a 24-hour service is necessary. After all, the vast majority of all crime is committed at hours other than between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. I would like to get the assurance for which some people have asked me, namely, that there be police in the area so that, when the local lads speed through the centre of Blackwood or run their drag races on local roads at night, a patrol car is close by to enable immediate action to be taken.

A number of members wish to participate in this debate. The member for Murray (shortly to become the member for Heysen), who happens to be the shadow Minister of Emergency Services, wishes to participate in this debate, and I understand that the member for Fisher also wishes to participate in this debate; and I support that participation. I ask all members to support the motion and to ensure that it is carried quickly.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### DOG CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Control Act 1979. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I move:

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

The principal aim of this Bill is to enable a deaf person, including a partially deaf person, accompanied by a hearing dog, to enter property open to or used by the public and vehicles used for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward without incurring penalties or restrictions under any Act.

Most members in this House would be aware of the provisions that are available under the Dog Control Act to enable blind or partially blind people, if travelling on public transport or going into public places, to use a seeing eye dog. I believe very strongly that the same provisions should be available for people who are deaf or partially deaf. The Lions Hearing Dogs Incorporated is an organisation totally funded by the Lions Club of Australia and Papua New Guinea. The project began as—

**An honourable member:** Good work that they do, too.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is excellent work. The project began in 1982 after a Lions member visiting America saw a demonstration of how dogs could be trained to help their deaf or hearing impaired owners. On his return to Adelaide the project was adopted as a Lions project. The training centre is situated in my electorate at Verdun in the Adelaide Hills and, being the only one, supplies hearing dogs all over Australia. Dogs are trained to alert their owners to ordinary everyday sounds that we take for granted, such as someone knocking at the door. Their dogs are trained to alert the owner to a whistling and boiling kettle, a baby crying, the telephone ringing and, in particular, a smoke alarm.

**Mrs Appleby:** What about people with asthma?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The member for Brighton refers to people who suffer from asthma. I understand that that is the case with these dogs, but I certainly have not—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member interjecting is not referred to in the Bill and that matter should not be mentioned.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I appreciate that the member for Brighton has an interest in this matter, because, if ever there needed to be a bipartisan situation, this should be it.

I think that it is one that all those who have any respect for people who suffer from deafness would recognise and would appreciate the need for the provisions under this legislation. I am told that the dogs investigate the sound, return to their owners, touch them and lead them back to the sound source. I have heard of some remarkable situations and examples of just how effective these dogs are.

The local RSPCA Dog Rescue Home provides these dogs, which are mostly chosen from crossbreed dogs who are friendly and eager to please. They are small to medium in size and between the ages of six to 12 months. On arrival at the centre the dogs are given excellent treatment. They are bathed, given a thorough physical checkup and are fully vaccinated. They are then quarantined for three to four weeks, during which time their training begins, and it is a very extensive training program indeed.

The first sounds taught are door knocking and a smoke alarm. These are compulsory, as everyone receives visitors and we think that every home should be protected against fire. So, all dogs are delivered having been taught about a smoke alarm. Basic obedience is also taught. I am told that the dogs are required merely to walk quietly by the side of the person involved, sit when told to stop, lie down, stay and come when called.

Once a person has applied for a dog a nearby Lions Club is contacted and asked to complete the necessary paperwork. This gives the group a comprehensive picture of the person's needs and requirements, and it is then able to choose a dog that will suit the individual and their lifestyle. The last few weeks of training is carried out with the needs of the new owner in mind. For example, if the person is non-vocal the training is silent with hand signals only. When the dog is ready for delivery a trainer stays nearby for five days. During this time the recipient and dog learn to work together. By the end of the week the dog has made the transition and is working for its new owner.

The help of three Lions Club members is then requested to visit weekly to help reinforce the training of the dog for a probationary period of three months. Reports are kept and forwarded to the centre concerning the progress of the dog. If, at the end of this time, the dog is well cared for and is working satisfactorily, it becomes accredited. It is interesting to note that there is a formal handing over ceremony of dog to owner. A special orange coloured blaze and lead are presented, which signify to the public that the dog is an accredited hearing dog.

The cost of a hearing dog is approximately \$1 500. This covers all veterinary expenses, training and delivery. The recipient bears no part of the cost. Each dog is sponsored by a Lions Club. I am told that to date 52 dogs have been placed with deaf or hearing impaired people throughout Australia. Something like 15 applicants are on the list waiting for the delivery of a dog. Letters are constantly received by the Lions Hearing Dogs Incorporated telling how the dogs have changed their owners' lives. I am aware of some of those situations.

One such owner is a lady living in Sydney, who has changed from being a person frightened to walk alone on the street to being a person who now travels all over Sydney giving public talks about the organisation and the changes that her hearing dog has made to her life. Another person is no longer the introvert her friends knew. This person now runs a stall at a local trash and treasure market, selling her craft work. The dog goes with her, and sits beside her on a chair. The dog gives her companionship as well as being her ears.

I am aware that mothers of young babies can go about their household duties quite confidently knowing that their dog will alert them if the baby should cry. Deaf and hearing impaired people, with the help of a hearing dog, often regain

lost independence. Dogs give elderly people who live alone a reason to go on living, with something to love and care for while also giving them confidence and companionship.

I am aware that recently the Lions Hearing Dogs Incorporated has received a grant from the Government for wages for the next three years. I know that that will help tremendously the work that it is doing. I encourage any member who passes through Verdun and who has a little time to spare to call in and see first hand some of the magnificent work being carried out. I also take this opportunity to record my personal praise and admiration, and I hope the praise and admiration of this Parliament, for the community service so freely given by Lions Clubs throughout Australia. This service is typified by clubs such as the one in my electorate of Hahndorf, where the numbers may not be large but where the spirit of service is very willing. The training centre at Verdun is run by very dedicated staff, who have to be able to communicate with people with specific difficulties.

I am sure that the work they are doing is well appreciated by the community generally. Dogs are trained to respond to sound stimuli that occur in and around a normal home. Although permission has been given for these dogs to accompany their owners on public transport, they cannot go with them into public places.

These matters need to be clarified and rectified. Hearing impaired people on holidays suffer tremendously as they are away from a safe, known environment. Take the example of a hearing impaired person staying in a hotel or motel. They have two choices: first, they can inform the desk staff that they are deaf and their door will not be locked—not a good idea these days, I suggest; secondly, they can lock their door but they would not hear a knock to signify breakfast or anyone trying to gain attention for any reason, such as evacuation in case of fire.

Telephone calls are missed. Many hearing impaired people are able to speak on the telephone, but cannot hear the phone ringing, even if it is in the same room. Mothers in strange houses, such as holiday houses, need to be alerted to babies or youngsters crying. Hearing impaired people staying anywhere other than in their own homes still need to know what is going on around them. They have become used to the security of a dog being their ears.

Hearing dogs are trained to alert their owners to prowlers and intruders—a common occurrence in households where there are deaf people, because burglars always assume that the home is empty. To stay in a strange place is a nerve-racking experience for the hard of hearing. Most forms of deafness include head noises to a varying degree. It is hard to tell whether something was really heard or whether the noise was in the head. Stress of any sort aggravates this complaint.

As the hearing dogs are trained to be with their owners virtually for 24 hours a day, working for most of this time, it is extremely stressful for owners and dogs to be separated, because the dog is not permitted to accompany its owner in certain places. Many owners of hearing dogs have reported that dogs have not only alerted them to burglars in their homes or gardens, but have also warned of characters approaching unexpectedly in deserted streets, even in broad daylight.

This is a common occurrence in larger towns. The hearing impaired who have hearing dogs become very used to relying on them in strange situations. Loss of hearing is an invisible but very real handicap to active participation in many facets of our society. Although the use of hearing dogs will never replace the pleasure and joy associated with the sensation of sound, it will afford a degree of protection to those of our fellow citizens who are not able to enjoy those pleasures personally.

I often think we take for granted the many pleasures which we can experience but which some of those less fortunate than ourselves cannot. That particularly applies to the deaf. I often feel—particularly as one of those who enjoy music of any sort—that it is an advantage that we take for granted and do not consider seriously.

I am sure that honourable members will realise the need and the assistance that can be rendered by guide dogs assisting their owners in moving to and from or seeking employment, in just going about their everyday business, and in relaxing at home in the knowledge that ears other than their own are protecting them. I commend the proposed amendment to the Dog Control Act to the House as a most humane measure. I hope that it will be accepted on a bipartisan basis. I commend the Bill to the House.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Government should take all steps necessary to extend 240 volt power to Wilpena and surrounding areas, including Blinman, and this House calls on the Government to honour the undertakings given by the then Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally) and the Caucus subcommittee on tourism when that committee visited Wilpena.

This motion is clear and precise in indicating that the people in these areas are entitled, and deserve, to have their properties connected to a reticulated electricity supply. There is no logical reason why, in 1985, people should have to tolerate a situation where large generators have to be run at Wilpena to provide electricity and where other people have to supply their own electricity.

I have been advised that this matter could easily be rectified and that there will be a considerable saving for the National Parks and Wildlife Service once that happens. There is no reason, other than the Government's wrong priorities, why it should not be prepared to supply the money necessary to provide a service that these people justly deserve. The Government and members of this House, in speeches made in this place have for a long time loudly supported the tourism industry, yet a situation exists at Wilpena where the large generators operating are incapable of providing powered caravan sites. It is accepted today that, if one wants an effective caravan park, one must provide powered sites: that is just commonsense. However, there are presently no powered caravan sites at Wilpena.

I have been raising this matter in this House for a long time. It is my responsibility to do so as member for the area. In fact, certain people went to Wilpena and made promises, giving clear undertakings that power would be extended to that area. That is why this motion is drafted differently from the motion defeated during the last session of this Parliament. The member for Mawson went into print (as usual, she could not resist the temptation to race out and tell the press how much she knew) and landed the Government right in it. I am advised that, at a meeting held, people were given a clear undertaking that this matter would be resolved. However, time is moving on and nothing has happened, so I have again had to bring a motion to the attention of members of this House. It is essential that electricity be connected to these areas.

This matter relates to Wilpena, Blinman and Parachilna, which are all in one general area, and in a letter the Minister of Mines and Energy (7 March 1984) stated:

I refer to your letter of 15 February concerning the supply of electricity to Parachilna. I have been advised by the General Manager of the Electricity Trust that several schemes for supply-

ing Parachilna with electricity have been examined on a number of occasions over the past five years or so. They have been rejected mainly because of the large contributions that prospective consumers would have to make towards the cost of the work involved which is very high compared with expected revenue from the sale of electricity to these consumers. On the information presently available, it appears that the best way of supplying Parachilna would be for the District Council of Hawker to extend its high voltage SWER system north from Edeowie—

we agree: the Government has to supply the money—

The District Clerk at Hawker has advised the Electricity Trust of South Australia that his council is prepared to consider again a scheme for supplying Parachilna when there is a definite expression of interest from a group of potential consumers. The usual procedure would then be for the District Clerk to arrange a public meeting of interested participants in such a scheme which Electricity Trust officers would attend to provide information on costs and technical aspects. Therefore, Mr Kirk should be advised to join other interested people in contacting the District Clerk at Hawker.

As a result of a similar inquiry recently from another prospective consumer in Parachilna, the trust's Regional Manager at Port Augusta, Mr Tom Beare, has already contacted the District Clerk at Hawker and offered assistance in bringing interested participants together and resolving the matter.

This letter highlights the problem in one area and it is my belief that all these areas—Wilpena, Blinman and Parachilna—should be considered and a scheme designed to provide electricity for all people in these areas.

Obviously, because of the high demand a three phase line must be built to Wilpena. If members have been to Wilpena recently (I do not know whether or not the Minister has) they will be aware that the National Parks and Wildlife Service has to have generators that are expensive to operate and maintain—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** And very noisy.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, and I am told that operating costs over four or five years would cover the capital costs of extending power lines to Wilpena. That seems to be a good business deal if one can recoup the cost in about five years. This is an attractive area and, as the property alongside Wilpena has now been included in the park, there will be more visitors and a greater demand for electricity.

The time has come for the Government to make the funds available to the trust. In regard to the environmental issue, I am advised that there is no problem. The council has considered the matter and agreed that the power lines can be sited so that they cannot be seen. I do not think that it matters whether or not the power lines are visible. Anywhere throughout the world, for example, Switzerland and Austria, one sees extensive power lines. That in itself is not a problem. However, residents and their families who have resided in this area for generations, and tourist operators also, are entitled to a reasonable crack of the whip. I have received a letter from the Minister of Mines and Energy (14 May 1984) in which he states:

Thank you for your letter inquiring about the status of electricity extension into the Wilpena-Blinman area. As you are aware, meters were installed at the suggestion of my department at Wilpena in 1982-83, and factors such as fuel consumption for the diesel generators have been monitored for almost a year by the Department of Environment and Planning. The results of this monitoring program are currently being reviewed. This review is at an early stage, but I am informed that the annual cost of operating the present system appears to be closer to \$80 000 than the \$200 000 you have quoted.

I question that, because the depreciation and replacement costs must also be considered, and one would be lucky to run such generating equipment for \$80 000. The letter continues:

When this lower figure is compared to the probable cost of electricity if purchased at the required general purpose tariff (which would be about \$50 000 per year), it will be apparent that expenditure of approximately one million dollars to connect Wilpena to the grid is not justified.

I understand that a preliminary economic analysis performed by my department has indicated that the current system is cheaper overall than would be the case if the grid was extended. However, it is recognised that other important factors need to be taken into consideration, and for this reason the review of electricity supply to Wilpena is continuing in conjunction with the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department of Environment and Planning and the Electricity Trust. This review will also reconsider other technological options, particularly diesel battery inverter systems, where recent significant advances show promise of providing much of the convenience of grid electricity at a lower cost than either the grid or current diesel-based systems.

You will also be aware that reticulated supply to Blinman, and those properties between Wilpena and Blinman, would require either the prior connection of Wilpena to the grid or the construction of a regional diesel power station near Wilpena. The cost of these alternatives would be similarly high, and both options require that the future supply for Wilpena is first clarified. I understand that some options for Wilpena such as the battery inverter system could be equally applied for other remote townships and homesteads to improve convenience and economy so that the Wilpena review may have more general implications in the longer term.

That was in 1984, and the people are still waiting. I have read both those letters into the record as they give some indication that this matter should not be forgotten and should not be put out of sight because at this stage the Government does not appear to have the funds.

What annoys me, as a member representing an isolated community, is that on a very regular basis I see Ministers making announcements, providing \$100 000 for this project or for other projects. I drove past the Aquatic Centre the other day and I understand that about \$7 million or \$8 million will be spent on this sporting complex. I am not against building sporting complexes, but I believe that bread and butter issues ought to come first. In the communities where I have come from we have had to supply our own sporting facilities: the Government has not come in and done it. I am not saying that the Government should not be involved, but electricity, water, reasonable roads and reasonable education facilities should come before those other non-essential areas. It is purely a matter of priorities: the Government has to get its priorities right.

The Government is trying to push tourism. The Flinders Ranges is one of the most significant and important tourist areas in this State, attracting tens of thousands of people every year, and we have to upgrade those facilities. It is beyond the resources of a local community to fund them. The State as a whole benefits from it. It would be a worthwhile Jubilee 150 project to provide funds to extend reticulated electricity to these areas that I have mentioned, and those local people, including pastoralists in those areas, would greatly appreciate it. I am sure that in the long term it would be money well spent.

I know that the Hawker council is keen to proceed, and was delighted when that Labor Party subcommittee went to Wilpena and gave the people a clear indication that it would support it and that the scheme would go ahead within 12 months. At this stage nothing has happened. I therefore call on the Government to give a clear and precise indication of where it stands on this issue. The Minister should respond in the very near future. No longer can any reason be given for the failure to answer my questions.

I have been concerned about this matter for a long time, so I did what is the normal thing to do, to be fair. I had written a lot of letters: I thought that I ought to put a question on notice. So, I duly prepared a question and placed it on the Notice Paper, and it sat there, very lonely, because there was no response. The session concluded and Parliament was prorogued. We came back and I put the question on the Notice Paper again. It was question 47, and stated:

1. Does the Government intend to extend 230-volt power to Wilpena and the surrounding areas, including Blinman?

2. Is the Minister aware of the undertakings given at a meeting at Wilpena with a Caucus subcommittee on tourism and, if so, does he intend to act on those undertakings?

Nothing happened, so I had to put another question on notice asking the reason for the delay in answering question 47. I have not had either question answered. My constituents have been left high and dry. We have had a flag waving exercise, headed by the member for Mawson—the publicity seeker—and that is all we have got.

*Mr Peterson interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** That is coming in the budget—it is another thing. The unfortunate aspect is that I could make about five speeches on various subjects concerning my electorate—all information which I am sure the House will be keen to hear. I am pleased that the honourable member has come into the House, because we will be waiting with baited breath for her to respond next week to this matter as she was the one who made the promises. The clerk of the council is in no doubt about the situation following that meeting of the subcommittee which visited Wilpena.

I have said sufficient on this matter to clearly explain to the House that an overwhelming need exists for this project. It should be a high priority. It is in the interests of the area and of tourism and the project will have long-term benefit for the people of this State. I commend the motion to the House and look forward to the Government's response.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Government should bring in legislation to allow district councils and corporations and the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to restrict and control or prohibit consumption of alcohol in public places, streets and roads similar to the legislation that operates in the Northern Territory.

I have also drawn this matter to the attention of the House on a number of occasions. It is not directed at any one section or group in the community. However, the time has come when anti-social and disorderly behaviour must be put to rest once and for all. Only on Monday I was approached by the secretary of a large hotel in my electorate. He was very concerned about what was going to take place. I explained to him, as I have on other occasions, that I would bring the matter to the attention of the House. It would appear that the time is long overdue for district councils and local communities to have this authority.

When the amendments to the Act were before the House I attempted to move amendments, as did my colleagues. We got some of the way, but not far enough. To clearly explain the need, I wish to quote from the *Transcontinental* of 4 September 1985. An article headed 'Council moves to declare dry areas' states:

City Council has applied to the State Government to have nine areas in the city declared 'dry' under provisions of the Liquor Licensing Act. At the council's meeting last week it was resolved to make a submission to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Mr Sumner, to ban the consumption of alcohol in Gladstone Square, Commercial Road, the foreshore, under the Port Augusta bridge and on the Great Western bridge, Holdsworth Triangle, the foreshore adjacent to the yacht club, the Port Augusta West foreshore, the memorial gardens in Loudon Road and the lawned areas opposite the Pastoral Hotel.

Recent changes to the Liquor Licensing Act provides local government with the power to recommend such bans unless authorised by a special permit. The submission was prepared following several meetings of council's subcommittee which investigated the problems of public drinking in Port Augusta.

Town Clerk, Mr I.D. McSparran, said he believed council's submission was the first from a local government authority since

the Act was changed. Mr McSparran said that following a meeting with the member for Stuart, Mr Gavin Keneally, he had spoken to a senior officer of the Licensing Court, who said there were no set procedures relating to implementation of section 32 of the Licensing Act, which made it an offence to consume alcohol in a public place.

Council was advised to resolve the areas which should be declared as 'dry' and to provide supporting evidence.

After consideration of the submission by the Minister, and on the basis that approval would be granted, regulations would then be drafted, defining the actual areas which council wish to have declared 'dry', said Mr McSparran. Following agreement (between council and the department) on the content of the regulations, the Minister would then take the draft regulations and the submission to State Cabinet for endorsement.

Once the regulations were gazetted, they would be enforceable by police. Council will also seek an implementation date from the State and Federal Governments of recommendations contained in the report of the ministerial task force inquiry into alcohol and related social and community problems at Port Augusta.

The recommendations include:

- Upgrading of services provided by the Woma organisation which cares for Aborigines with drink or drug problems.
- A working party be established by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Community Welfare to investigate the incidence and effects of drug abuse among young Aborigines at Port Augusta.
- That psychology and psychiatric services be provided for Aboriginal people in the area.
- That the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs provide funds immediately for a sports and recreation complex at the Bunga Oval.

That is a very cumbersome way of dealing with this problem. Anyone who has visited Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Port Augusta and a number of other areas would be aware of the problem. I believe that the local people should have the power to invoke provisions, with certain safeguards, to protect the community against hasty or ill-considered action.

It is a real problem and, of course, it is highlighted because, wherever there is a large number of unemployed or idle people, there will be problems. If we could solve that problem amongst the young—not only the Aborigines—we would be a long way down the track towards solving these social problems. There have been considerable problems with people being physically attacked and harassed in all these areas. The House should give this matter its very serious attention.

I do not bring this motion before the House seeking some cheap, short-term publicity. I am concerned to see the matter resolved once and for all. I know of the concern of the Port Augusta council and the Mayor, and I am aware of the concern felt by people in other areas. That is why I have drawn the attention of the House to this matter. One has only to visit these areas to see the problems.

I suggest that the Government should take up this matter urgently. I believe that the process outlined in the press article is too cumbersome. If local councils do not do the right thing, the local residents should have the right to vote them out at local government elections: democracy will take care of the problem. These people can take any course of action they like, but it has little effect on Parliament and the Government because they are so far removed from the problem. The local member for the area can be supportive, but he may be defeated in the Party room or he may not be able to get the numbers in Parliament. Therefore, in my judgment the decision should be handed back to the local people.

If the local councils do not make the right decision, they soon pay the penalty. We all know what the power of the ballot box can do; we have all seen it and experienced it, and it is rather sobering to see it in operation. I do not think I need to say any more, except to commend the motion to the House and hope that members give it respon-

sible consideration. I hope no-one uses this issue to grandstand, because we have had enough of that recently.

**Ms Lenehan:** Look who's talking. You're the greatest grandstander in this place.

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member—the 'mouth from the south'—talks about grandstanding. If ever there was a member who has set out to get cheap publicity without any regard to the facts or commonsense, it is the member for Mawson. Talk about a show pony riding a white horse!

**Ms Lenehan:** That's not a very good analogy.

**Mr GUNN:** If the cap fits, wear it. The honourable member has a reputation for being a publicity seeker—and, in her case, facts do not count. Her interjection clearly indicated her attitude: she is not a bit concerned about the welfare and the problems of these people, and is only looking for some cheap publicity and point scoring in order to try to convey to the people she represents that she is an involved and hard-working member. I suggest to the honourable member that she ought to take the time to consider this matter in detail, following which she may recognise some of the problems involved.

In relation to the matter previously debated, which I discussed at some length here, the honourable member was one of those people who went up and sought some cheap publicity, and once that had died away, nothing further eventuated, and again my constituents missed out. I commend the motion to the House, and I hope that honourable members will support it and that the Government will act on this matter.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### Alice Springs-Darwin Railway Line

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its failure to honour the undertaking the Prime Minister made prior to the 1983 federal election to proceed with the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line, as promised by the Fraser Government.

If ever a project could provide immediate, large scale employment and long-term benefit to the nation, it is this one. South Australia would have the opportunity of becoming the railway centre of Australia if this project was to proceed. It has been estimated that within a few years the number of road transports operating between Darwin and Alice Springs will be such that it will be very difficult for people travelling on the Alice Springs to Darwin road, because the volume of goods that will have to be transported on that road will be enormous. We know that Sir Peter Abeles, and others, have had their say and have influenced the Federal Government for their own short-term gain. However, I believe that a project of this nature should proceed as a matter of urgency. I have at my disposal a large volume of material, of which all honourable members would be aware, and I do not think it is necessary for me to go through it again at this stage—it is all in *Hansard*, as the matter has been debated at length.

People working in the Iron Triangle towns could provide the concrete railway sleepers; BHP at Whyalla could produce the rails for this project—a lot of work could be provided for the construction industry. It does gravely disappoint me that this is not occurring. Also, of course, Darwin would become the container port for Australia, and freight could be shipped from Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Perth direct to Darwin, from where it could be shipped overseas. There is a huge market in Asia that we could service.

This matter was originally agreed to by the Fraser Government after a great deal of discussion and work by the then Northern Territory Chief Minister, Mr Everingham, and other concerned people. Eventually the matter was approved, and we were looking forward to the commencement of the project. Unfortunately, there was a change of government, and those people in New South Wales particularly, who could see no immediate benefit to them, used their influence to have the matter put in mothballs. I have been reliably informed that the current Federal Minister for Transport supports this project, but he has been told to get into line, because it does not suit the hierarchy in the Federal Government to proceed with it.

That is what has happened. I make no apology for saying that Sir Peter Abeles has had a fair bit of influence over the Commonwealth Government. We all know why. He is not keen to see this matter proceed. That is an unsatisfactory arrangement, because the proposal would be of great benefit to the South Australian economy, and to the nation as a whole. One of the sad things in this nation is that people could not agree before federation about the rail gauges that should be adopted in Australia. When I tell people overseas that towns in my electorate have three different rail gauges they think I am telling funny stories. They cannot believe that places such as Gladstone or Peterborough would have three different gauges. They really think we are crazy.

It is recognised that heavy freight carted over long distances can be economically carried by rail. It is also recognised that the haulage industry is needed for transporting livestock and small quantities of freight over short distances. Both systems work very well together. The arrangement whereby Australian National currently carts semi-trailers across to Western Australia would be the sort of activity engaged in from Port Augusta or Adelaide to Darwin. That would be a sensible arrangement. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### FORESTRY ACT PROCLAMATION

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That the proclamation under the Forestry Act 1950 made on 16 May 1985 relating to the resumption of the forest reserve in section 665, hundred of Adelaide, county of Adelaide, be disallowed.

Most people would agree that this piece of land, which now encompasses some grazing land, plus pine forest reserve and some buildings unsuitable for a commercial forestry venture with huge machines working in slightly more than 20 hectares in the middle of a residential area. In the early 1970s, when the department started to plant pines in this area, before it was transferred to the Forestry Department in title, a group of residents objected to it being developed as a forest reserve because of the potential fire danger. I took up that challenge for them and the department stopped planting pines.

Of course, some pines had been planted many years ago, but those pines are now of moderate to considerable size. In some instances the community had the desire to retain that forest as is: some of them believed that if we did not go ahead with the type of action I am proposing now the area would always remain as a forest reserve and the trees would be preserved for all time. I do not think that that is the case.

If I am successful with this motion, Parliament would be saying that that area should be a forest. In that case, the department could move in and commence cutting the trees down, because Parliament would be telling it that it believes it should be worked as a forest. The Hon. Mr Burdett in

another place moved a similar motion and made a long speech regarding what he had been told about the area. If he had approached me, I could have given him a little more information. What he said about a resolution that was passed at a public meeting which I called and which was well attended at Hawthorndene was not accurate. He suggested that the resolution was that the community vote in favour of the trees remaining, and that was it. In fact, the resolution was that the community wanted nothing to happen to the trees until a committee had reported on what the land could be used for in the future.

Even though other people, for publicity purposes, picked up the suggestion of a committee and played on it, it was my suggestion. The composition of the committee was as I suggested—somebody from the Minister's department, local government and private community members. A large committee was formed at that public meeting and that committee recommended that 11 names be submitted to the Minister for consideration for membership of a review committee. It would be unwise for the motion that I am moving to be passed, either in this House or in another place, at this stage.

I am carrying out a holding process, and I hope that the other place will take note of that request from the local member and the community, because the community does not want it worked as a forest; it wants to find some compromise situation. I am grateful that the Minister has given a guarantee that he will not remove any trees until the committee reports. Then, if we have to take strong community action, we can. The opportunity is there, through whatever processes, for us to be able to do that. The community and I have a deep concern, but I do not think any of us should start playing politics in order to win a point when there is this tight situation within the community. That would be unfair to the community.

We should recognise that we represent the community and not just our own personal interests. I am grateful that the Minister is prepared to give the commitment that he has, and, on that basis, until I notice some change, I would like to see the holding process remain. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That for the remainder of the Session in relation to the Appropriation Bill—

*Suspension of Standing Orders*

(1) Standing Orders be so far suspended as would require the Bill to be considered in a Committee of the whole House.

*Consideration in Estimates Committees*

(2) On completion of the second reading of the Bill, members may discuss grievances on a motion which shall be moved by a Minister—'That the House note grievances'—on the passing of which, the proposed expenditures for the departments and

services contained in the schedules to the Bill shall be referred to an Estimates Committee. Such referral shall be on motion moved by a Minister, of which notice has been given, and which shall include a timetable by which (subject to paragraph (4)) the Committee is to order its business.

(3) There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A Committee may ask for explanations from a Minister, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

(4) The Speaker may, at the request of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, with one day's notice, reallocate any proposed expenditures from one committee to the other, or vary the timetable if, in his opinion, such reallocation or variation is necessary to facilitate the examination of the proposed expenditures.

#### Members

(5) Subject to paragraph (10), each Estimates Committee shall consist of seven members including the chairman.

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

(7) A member may be discharged from an Estimates Committee at any time, except when a division of the Committee is proceeding, immediately on delivering in writing to the Speaker or Clerk a request to be so discharged; provided that the member may nominate another member in substitution, such member indicating in the same notice his concurrence to serve.

(8) In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of an Estimates Committee, the Speaker may nominate a member in substitution but in so doing shall have regard to the composition of the Committee as elected by the House.

(9) An Estimates Committee may proceed to the despatch of business notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership.

#### Chairmen

(10) The Chairman of—

(a) Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees; and

(b) Estimates Committee B shall be nominated in writing by the Premier to the Speaker.

(11) Any member of the committee shall take the Chair temporarily whenever requested so to do by the Chairman of the committee during the sitting of that committee.

#### Quorum

(12) The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be four, of whom one shall be the Chairman or Acting Chairman and, if at any time a quorum be not present, the Chairman shall suspend the proceedings of the committee until a quorum be present, or adjourn the committee.

#### Participation by Other Members

(13) Members of the House, not being members of the committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum.

#### Sitting Times

(14) An Estimates Committee shall only meet in accordance with the timetable adopted by the House, or as varied by the Speaker. If a committee is sitting on any day—

(a) at 1 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour;

(b) at 6 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour and a half; or

(c) at 10 p.m., the sitting shall be adjourned.

#### Proceedings of Estimates Committee

(15) Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee shall follow, as far as possible, the procedures observed in a Committee of the Whole House.

#### Naming of Member

(16) If any member persistently disrupts the business of an Estimates Committee the Chairman shall name such member and—

(a) in the case of the member so named being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall suspend the sittings of the Estimates Committee until he has reported the offence to the House; or

(b) in the case of the member so named not being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall order his

withdrawal from the sittings of the Committee, until he has reported the offence to the House, and shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who will give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day.

#### Disagreement with Chairman's Ruling

(17) If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, such objection must be taken at once; and having been stated in writing, the Chairman shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day; provided that the Estimates Committee may continue to meet, but shall not further examine the vote then under consideration.

#### Meeting of House

(18) For the purposes of paragraphs (16) and (17), it shall be sufficient notice of a meeting of the House for the Speaker to cause notices thereof to be placed on the House notice boards before 10 p.m.

(19) If the House meets pursuant to paragraphs (16) or (17), it shall, after the Speaker has read prayers, hear the report from the Chairman who requested the meeting and—

(a) where a member has been named, proceed with the matter as if the naming had occurred in a Committee of the Whole. For the purposes of any suspension of a member, the sittings of an Estimates Committee shall be considered as a sitting of the House; or

(b) where a Chairman's ruling has been disagreed with, resolve the matter pursuant to Standing Order 164.

(20) Subsequent to any proceedings taken under paragraph (19), a motion may be proposed by a Minister to alter the timetable relating to that Estimates Committee's consideration of the proposed expenditures; such motion to be put forthwith, without debate, but no other business may be entered upon during the sitting.

#### Hansard Report

(21) A *Hansard* report of Estimates Committee proceedings shall be circulated, in a manner similar to the House *Hansard*, as soon as practicable after completion of the committee's proceedings.

#### Report of an Estimates Committee

(22) A report of an Estimates Committee shall be presented by the Chairman of that committee or a member of the committee deputed by him and shall contain any resolutions or expressions of opinion of the committee.

(23) On the reports from the Estimates Committees being presented, they may, subject to paragraph (24), be taken into consideration forthwith or a future day may be appointed for their consideration.

(24) In considering the reports from the Estimates Committees, a Minister shall move 'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to (and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the Committees in relation thereto be noted)'.  
(25) An amendment moved to the question proposed in paragraph (24) shall not require a seconder.

(26) Upon the completion of consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B, the question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate—'That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to'.

(27) When the Bill has been agreed to by the House, the third reading may be taken into consideration forthwith or made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

#### Time Limits

(28) The following time limits shall apply in relation to the following questions—

'That the House note grievances'.

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or member deputed by him—30 minutes. Any other member—10 minutes.

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

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or Member deputed by him—Unlimited. Any other member—30 minutes.

Members will understand why I do not want to read the motion as drafted. I am sure that all members have had an opportunity to read and digest its contents. The budget Estimates Committees have now become a recognised part of the procedure of this Parliament for dealing with the appropriation. I assure members that there is nothing in these orders that we are inviting the House of Assembly to



adopt that are in any way a deviation from what has happened previously or what has been fully discussed and, I hope, agreed on. I commend the motion to the House.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** The Opposition supports and accepts the motion. It is the result of distillation over several years of Estimates Committees. There is a small amount of editing in the document before us which was not there last year. However, it does not alter in any way the functioning of the Estimates Committees, and I trust that they will proceed with the same vigour and forthrightness that they have in the past.

Motion carried.

### APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 September. Page 802.)

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the Bill, for to do otherwise would be moving a no-confidence motion in the Government, and that is not the purpose of the exercise tonight.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** It wouldn't be inappropriate though!

**Mr BLACKER:** If honourable members would like to entertain that at some other time, well and good. I could well be there joining them in doing just that. However, on 29 August the Premier brought down a budget which he hailed as being very responsible and which he believed would lead the State to bigger and better things. I suppose many arguments develop from that point. I would like to comment, without getting into statistics and figures, about the principle of deficit budgeting.

This matter has concerned me for a long time, and I have mentioned it on numerous occasions in this House. I do not like the idea. I know that it is an accepted practice in some circles, but I adopt the old adage: if one has the money then one can spend it but, if one does not have the money and is selling off capital assets in order to keep going, one is going backwards.

I am concerned that we still have a deficit on the books. In fairness, it should be stated that the deficit existed when the present Government came to office and, although an undertaking was given by the Government that it hoped that within three years to remove that deficit, that has not been achieved. Nevertheless, there has been a slight reduction, which at least is in the right direction. From that point of view, the approach has been positive but has not lived up to the undertaking that the Government gave.

The complexities of budgets and the documents that have been placed before us leave considerable room for debate by the Government, the Opposition and the media. No doubt we could pick up one page of the document and find good reason for argument, yet we could also turn over a few pages a find a counter argument to the very same statement.

That seems to be what is happening at the moment. There is considerable debate about it. I restate my support for the principle of getting rid of that deficit as soon as we possibly can and for getting back to a balanced budget. The Government claims that it has had a balanced budget this year, and that is to be commended, but it has not been able to whittle back the deficit that existed from years gone by. I do not wish to say any more about that aspect, because I could probably be shot down in flames in many areas.

However, the Premier mentioned in his speech a couple of areas that are worthy of comment. At page 9 of the document he referred to the importance of primary indus-

try. Members would know that I strongly believe that the economy of this State and, for that matter, of this nation relies heavily upon that small number of people living in the country who are involved in primary production. The Premier said that the economic well-being of South Australia is also recognised within the budget. I applaud that statement, but regrettably it is only five lines of a 14 page document and is hardly a comprehensive assessment of rural industries in this State.

Further on in the budget papers, the Premier mentioned the Government's concern for preschool funding. I totally support the Government in any moves that it may be necessary to make to ensure that we have a high standard of preschool education throughout this State—not just in some areas, but for as many preschoolers as possible in order to cater for our up and coming generation. I know that Government has been reluctant to become too vocal at this stage, and I am not sure whether negotiations with the Federal Government are completely cut off yet.

Whilst there is a possibility of getting funding from the Federal Government, that avenue should be pursued in every possible way. However, if that proves to be an impossibility, we trust that the Government will honour a commitment to maintain standards for preschoolers throughout this State. I have been contacted by, I think, every preschool committee in my area, and I assume that every other member of this House has also been contacted and would realise the need for and importance of this project.

As the Minister of Water Resources is in the Chamber, I will make a couple of comments about water supply—brickbats and bouquets. I refer, first, to the bouquet: I am pleased with the advancement in the construction of the water scheme at Coffin Bay. It has been held by many as a very worthwhile project and, although there have been a couple of traumas with its development, they have been ironed out, and the project is to be commended. I believe that the Minister had a part to play in that. I recognise that involvement, as do people from the local area, bearing in mind that it was one of 52 uneconomic services that were before the Government at that time. The project had the Minister's support, much lobbying and support from local communities and has now come into being, for which I and the people of Coffin Bay are grateful. I also realise that it is a scheme in isolation. Its catchment area is to the south, south-east of Coffin Bay.

I understand that there is talk that some of that area will be declared a water reserve. I think that that would be recognised. I am not sure of the local ownership, involvement or the boundaries of the area required, but it is recognised as a catchment area for a very valuable water resource, one which I believe is of high quality and which needs to be preserved. To that end, the Government needs support.

I notice in the Treasurer's statement that, when referring to water filtration in the capital works program, there is mention of the extension of water and sewer mains in developing suburbs. I recognise that need, but there are many areas of this State that do not have a service. I realise that there is a problem with uneconomic services as compared to services installed in built-up areas. However, my preference is to get a supply to more people rather than to improve the quality of the existing. I am not saying that we should cut out water filtration, because standards of health are paramount. Nevertheless, I believe that greater emphasis should be given to supplying reticulated water to areas which do not have such a system at present.

I was fascinated to learn of the proposal for the Finger Point sewerage works. I was a member of the Public Works Committee when this project was first mooted. It was interesting to note the actions of Governments of both political

persuasions. I have always been a strong supporter of this project, the reason being that it is near a lobster catching area. It would only require a little bit of viciousness on the part of certain marketing people in saying that lobsters from the South-East come from a polluted area and our lobster export market could diminish overnight. I am pleased that these works are proceeding. I do not know whether it has been proven that polluted fish have been taken from that area, or whether that could be proved. Nevertheless, the risk exists.

**Mr Whitten:** It is the same everywhere else in Australia.

**Mr BLACKER:** I recognise that there are many similar areas, but if Finger Point is covered then South Australia can confidently say that fish caught in its waters come from waters free from contamination. I appreciate that there is a cost involved, but I also appreciate that we could lose this industry overnight if someone played a vicious marketing game by spreading a rumour that fish from this area could be contaminated. I support the construction of these works for this reason.

Another project that I am hoping will be physically commenced in the next few weeks is the Lincoln Cove marina development, a project which passed the Public Works Standing Committee at the same time as the Coffin Bay project, receiving the support of that committee. It is my understanding that the Premier will be visiting the area within two to four weeks to turn the first sod for that project. This is a long awaited objective of many people in the local community. It is estimated that the project will cost \$27 million. That is a preliminary estimate.

This is an ambitious project, one that is worthy of support and commendation. It is a project that has brought together private enterprise, State and local government and, to a degree, the Federal Government. I do not believe that there is similar financial modelling of such a project anywhere else in Australia, so it is being watched with envious eyes by many people throughout the community. There is no doubt that this project could not succeed if any one of those bodies, either private, State, local or Federal Government, had to build the project in its own right.

I do not think any one of them could do it alone; I doubt that any two of them could do it. However, we must bear in mind that there are components of tourism, local government, housing development and fishing involved. All these components are brought together and, in turn, become a focal point for a sporting stadium as well as an arts complex, and I believe it can be a successful project. I have been a strong supporter of it and have been involved in some of the deputations necessary to get the package together. Indeed, I am looking forward optimistically to the commencement of that work in two or three weeks. Certainly, I would like to give commendation to David and Ann Kelsey for their work with the project, which has been a pet project of theirs for four or five years.

The Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln has become involved and made a commitment to the project and so now has the State Government. It is not just a local project—it is a State development project and, as such, it will attract much attention to South Australia and bring much money to the State. There is no reason why the western waters of Spencer Gulf cannot become the offshore sailing mecca of southern Australia. We have beautiful sailing waters. Certainly, I am not talking about small Holdfast trainers but in regard to offshore racing, sailing and cruising we have magnificent waters and Port Lincoln can and will become the focal point for that activity.

A recent announcement by the Premier has been welcomed in the area in relation to the offer of abolition of the 10 per cent surcharge on electricity in some of the district council areas in my electorate. Until recently none

of the councils affected were in the District of Flinders, but there are now about five in my district and two other councils in the Mid to Upper North are similarly affected. The problem was created many years ago under the Playford Government when an arrangement was made for ETSA power to be bought in bulk and distributed through a network of electricity grids that were built and maintained by the councils in question. The councils bought ETSA power in bulk and acted as collection agencies and for the servicing of those areas. Under the arrangement the consumers paid the standard rate plus 10 per cent. The arrangement meant that consumers in those areas paid a 10 per cent surcharge on the power that they used over and above every other citizen in South Australia.

This position differentiated between some citizens and others. The irony of the situation is that councils on southern Eyre Peninsula were able to enjoy the same tariffs as those applying in the rest of the State, yet power came to them through Port Augusta and over the top, in fact, through the areas deemed to be subject to the extra 10 per cent, yet the areas on the southern side were charged only the normal tariff. That was an irony and an inconsistency that people could not understand, and I certainly support people in their quest to have the 10 per cent surcharge abolished.

I am not sure of the exact state of negotiations now, but I believe there was a meeting today between some of the ETSA people and the councils involved. Many negotiations will have to be undertaken, covering maintenance of work for the employees who could be displaced if the networks are taken over by ETSA in total, especially if it does away with substations or subdistribution points in those areas.

I hope that a reasonable and satisfactory arrangement can be reached between the electricity authorities and the councils to ensure that nobody is displaced. The Premier has in fact stated that nobody will lose a job. The difference is whether one wants to, say, reside at Streaky Bay in a pleasure resort or go to a northern power station. Some people may consider that losing a job; others may not. However those are some of the people problems that are likely to arise.

I hope that today's meeting has been a success. I have not had any reports, and am not likely to get them, but I hope that in the negotiations this 10 per cent tariff, which has been plaguing the district councils and citizens in those areas for many years, will be done away with.

One of the greatest issues involved in any budget is road funding. Whilst it might sound like harping on an age old problem, those of us who represent country areas—who are becoming fewer in number—are finding that, because our roads are not becoming any shorter and the cost of rebuilding and surfacing of roads is becoming more expensive, our road dollar is not going as far. That is a problem that no Government so far has even given serious thought to. I do not know exactly what the problem involves, although I do know that the present road funding formulas will not cope with the enormity of the requirement.

We have roads such as the Lock to Elliston Road and the Kimba to Cleve Road, both of which have been given priorities 1 and 2. At the present rate of funding, it will take 22 years to complete each road, without looking at any other arterial road on the Eyre Peninsula. If we look forward to some 30 years before we can get both those roads to a reasonable standard, what will be the standard of the remainder of the roads in the area? Where many of the councils each have several thousand kilometres of roads, the enormity of the problem becomes obvious. Present road funding formulas will not work to cover those sorts of situations. It requires the Government of the day to take a stand and give catch-up grants in order that some equality can be achieved in road funding.

I do not know where the money can be found, bearing in mind that the cost of roads is so exorbitant. It is not possible to provide sealed roads all around. All that most local people would be hoping for is a good all-weather road. I find it ludicrous that a road that is considered a rural arterial road between Cleve and Kimba cannot even carry a school bus. It is a very serious situation when children in this State cannot even get to school through the normal bus services on a road that is considered to be a rural arterial road. I hope that the Government recognises that point and seriously considers rectifying it.

At the time the formula basis was set up for road funding—and I cannot quote the exact formula, but it takes into account population, length of road, the extent of local government commitment and a couple of other issues—the idea seemed good. It was accepted by most councils and generally implemented by local government. That would have been fine, and I would have supported that formula right to the hilt if every council started off on an equal basis, but the system breaks down because every council does not and cannot start off on an equal basis: there is no catch-up provision and no allowance made for ministerial discretion as such. Those that were behind the eight ball before are getting further behind and are unlikely to be able to make any headway.

To that end, it is necessary for the Government of the day, in addition to its normal formula basis, to make provision for the Minister to have some discretionary powers for a limited catch-up period to enable money to be spent in those areas of most need.

Last night we heard a speech from the member for Fisher which caught many of us by surprise—it certainly caught me by surprise. He thanked members for the cooperation that he had received during his time in the House. During my time in this place, I have worked for over 12 years under the member for Fisher as Whip. I say publicly here and now that I have enjoyed the fullest cooperation, and I hope that I have likewise given him the same cooperation. I recognise the work that he did, and I can only say 'Thank you' to him for the work that he did in that position, because it made my job so much easier, certainly in the early stages when I was a new member and unaware of what could or could not happen within the Chamber. The advice that he was able to give me at that time was most appreciated. So, I thank the honourable member most sincerely for that cooperation. Likewise, I expect and hope that I can give the new Whip similar cooperation and will hopefully receive the same. I for one was a little disappointed for and on his behalf that he should find it necessary to step down from that position.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I would like to raise the issue of capital construction works in the redevelopment of the Wudinna Area School, which is a conglomeration of mainly transportable buildings. It has a small amount of solid construction, but basically the school has grown like topsy. I know that the Minister is not proud of it and would like to do something about it. It is the school with the most urgent requirement on Eyre Peninsula. To that end, I trust that the Minister will upgrade priorities for that area to ensure that the Wudinna Area School is given the priority that it justly deserves.

Wudinna is probably the most rapidly growing area on Eyre Peninsula. It is a thriving town and has an active district community committee with an equally active school committee. Some two years ago when the mouse plague was of some magnitude, it was a crying shame to go into that school and smell nothing but the remains of mice, mainly because the walls were lined with canite and there was no way in the world that one could keep out the mice, as they would dig in through one place and dig out through another.

It became an exercise of futility in even trying to keep the saucepans, cutlery and dishes of the domestic arts centre in a clean state. That is not a position which any of us would like and one which we would all be trying to alleviate as soon as possible. To try to do a patch up job on the Wudinna Area School is an act in futility. The school needs major redevelopment, and that is recognised by the powers that be. Of course, the matter gets down to one of dollars and cents.

I refer also to the National Parks and Wildlife people, and more particularly to Marine and Harbors. It has been drawn to my attention that the coastline adjacent to a national park has been handed out from the control of Marine and Harbors Department to the national parks authority.

While some people may not see any significance in that, it is of concern to me, because one of the major national parks in my area is the Coffin Bay Peninsula Park, which has a coastline of 100 miles or more. Much of the coastline is comprised of sandy beaches and many people who have the right boating equipment can travel along and camp on the beach. Camping regulations now come under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service; it is no longer the responsibility of the Department of Marine and Harbors. More particularly, I am concerned for the fishermen who use these beaches and landings for the conduct of their business.

Many of the fishermen travel by four-wheel drive from Coffin Bay to Avoid Bay where they travel by aluminium boat out to their fishing vessels to do their days fishing, after which they drive home in their vehicles. That is a convenient arrangement, but they fear that it could be jeopardised under the latest transfer, which occurred without any prior advice. The local district council knows about it now, but was not told about it previously.

I believe there are other national parks which are similarly affected including one on Yorke Peninsula—and the local member did not know about that. It is the approach by stealth which concerns me more than anything else. I trust that the Minister of the day will respect the wishes of those people who live locally and those who earn their living from fishing in these areas. I hope that an undertaking can be given that these people will not be prevented from pursuing their normal course of work in these areas. I also hope that the people who have used these areas for holidays and pleasure purposes (for the past 70 or 80 years over several generations) will be able to continue to do so without any restrictive red tape. I support the Bill.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the Bill. When in Opposition one is reluctant to support a budgetary Bill that appears to promise a lot but when analysed does not really offer a great deal. I will refer mainly to matters that relate to my own district and, in a couple of places, I may even thank the Government on behalf of my district for things it has done which are appreciated. In some areas of the hills we have been waiting for a long time to have some things done—in fact, up to six years, so more than one Government must be blamed for the delay.

I thank the member for Flinders for his remarks. When I was Whip, he was one of the easier members to whip, even though he belongs to another Party. He did not try to push his barrow too hard or demand an unreasonable number of questions or opportunities to speak; and he gave me fair warning of anything he wished to do when he might have required a pair so that he could leave the Chamber for family reasons, illness or to attend an important function. I thank the member for Flinders for his words and for his cooperation during my years as Opposition Whip and my three years as Government Whip.

First, I refer to a motion on today's Notice Paper in relation to the Blackwood Police Station. I will not talk directly to the resolution but about the Blackwood area in relation to the Police Force and the station. Those who have been talking about this matter recently in this place have not really taken an opportunity to study all the background. I say that advisedly, because when it was first suggested in the late 1970s that the station could be closed, I took the opportunity of asking the Police Department, with the Minister's permission, to send some people to Blackwood to address a public meeting.

At that meeting we were fortunate to have the person who is now Deputy Commissioner, Mr Killmier—at that time I think he was an inspector—and the other person present was Superintendent Bevan. Those two officers addressed that meeting held on 27 March 1977. The people who attended the meeting accepted that the Police Department did have a problem in justifying having the station open for 24 hours a day. At that stage the station was open after 5 o'clock: it operated until 9 or 10 o'clock. That was not necessarily all the time, because if the officers in attendance were called out there would be no-one in attendance.

About a week before another member of Parliament had an article published in the local paper saying that there should be a 24-hour service and that there was a lot of community concern about the possibility of the Blackwood Police Station being closed, I raised the matter in the local paper with a small article, and also I wrote to the Minister asking that we be guaranteed that the station would stay open, and that its hours of operation be extended.

Subsequent to that I had asked the Minister whether he was prepared, with the Commissioner's support, to arrange for police officers to address a public meeting at Blackwood and to talk again to the community about the plans that the Police Department had for the neighbourhood policing program, involving programs similar to that which operate at Flinders Park, which is the first experiment with such a program in this State. I believe that some 180 programs are operating in Victoria. I did receive an assurance from the Minister's office that that would occur.

I called a public meeting for 7 October, at which invited police officers will speak about matters relating to the police service in the Blackwood area, and people will be able to take some part in the decision-making in relation to those matters. With a population of more than 30 000 people, there is no doubt that people in the Blackwood/Coromandel Valley/Belair/Eden Hills/Bellevue Heights area are entitled to a 24-hour service, even though some of those areas are close to the Darlington area.

If the station cannot be fully manned for 24 hours, at least that is where patrols should begin their operations. It should be a patrol base, as problems are starting to affect the community, and I refer to things such as vandalism of public toilets, street signs, and so on. If we are to spend more money by employing more police officers for the new community based police operation, as the Premier claims, surely Blackwood is a place entitled to an adequate service.

The area is different from Darlington—it is further up the hill, and there is an attitude by some who provide services (I am not saying that this is the case in relation to the police) that it is easier to operate in other areas. It is a different type of community. That is the case, whether one likes to accept it or not. It is already a more community-based community in relation to the functions that are held, and the community operations, committees and organisations.

The community would cooperate with the police in establishing a neighbourhood policing program for Blackwood and surrounding districts. I make the plea to the Government that it take heed of the need to do that. I can assure

the House that I do not believe that the present Government or any future Government would have the intestinal fortitude to close the Blackwood Police Station. I point out quite clearly to the people who live in the area that I do not believe that any Government would close that station. However, I am advocating, like others have done, that the service be extended. The way that it operates at the moment is not good enough, even though the officers do their best with one patrol car floating backwards and forwards between Stirling, Mount Barker and the Mitcham hills, and there is a duty sergeant also moving around in his own car and working with those officers.

I understand the problem that the police have, because successive Governments have refused to accept the responsibility to appoint sufficient people to carry out the duties that we expect the police to carry out. Although that costs more money, if people are asking for that service, the end result is that we must accept that it be provided. I make only one further comment in relation to the new program: it seems ludicrous to me to tie the Belair Recreation Park in total (an area of some 800 hectares) to the Mount Barker/Stirling operation, when the main gate into the Belair Recreation Park is right alongside the Glenalta area, within a short distance of the Blackwood Police Station. I cannot understand why the department has placed that facility, under the new plan, in the hands of the Stirling-Mount Barker operation. It seems ludicrous to me.

In talking about spending money I suppose I would be failing if I did not raise the subject of the Old Belair Road and point out how successive governments—and the present Government is probably one of the biggest offenders—have tended to say, 'Well, it will be done next week or next month or next year.' I am talking about sealing it, not widening it to any great degree, but taking off a couple of the bad stony points and just giving it a good surface on which to drive a vehicle.

I would be remiss if I did not say that most people are disgusted with the facilities that are there now. I suppose it is 13 years since I wrote the first letter asking that the road be upgraded, and I was promised that it would be done within the next two years. Subsequently other works were carried out around Brownhill Creek and near Scotch College, on to Fullarton Road, and more latterly, James Road was sealed. Then when we got to the point when we might do something about sealing the main part of the Old Belair Road, the Gas Company decided to lay the gas mains up the middle of the road and along the edge in places. Then pressure from the community demanded that conduits for electricity should go underground on top of the gas mains. So that was another delay. We were then promised by the Government that it would be sealed by this Christmas.

I received a letter the other day from the present Minister, who is new to the job, but his letter said that it will be done some time between October and next March. It could be done by Christmas—I am not arguing that it will not be—but 'next March' worries me because, if it is not done by next March, we are into another winter and another delaying process. I am concerned with the continual delays and excuses for not doing the work.

Strange as it may seem, after all the years of talking, writing letters, speeches in here, and statements in the local press by candidates and members of Parliament, we suddenly find there are a few houses not connected to the sewer and the department has to be reminded—the Minister of Water Resources is here—that some properties are not connected to sewers, so it is very busy connecting them before the road is sealed. I suppose that is out of character with normal departmental practice: they usually wait until they get a good surface on the road and then dig it up and put the sewer mains in. This time we might have it solved.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That's a bit unfair.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I am not just talking about the present Government; I am saying that, over the decades, it has become traditional to have a nice new road finished and within a short period of time somebody comes along and digs it up to put in some particular service. In this case at least I think we have overcome the problem. But there is concern about doing up Old Belair Road. The Government is not going to provide footpaths; it is not going to provide for a cycle track. Let us think about that. There will be a much faster traffic flow and the road will not be much wider—and that is acceptable as far as I am concerned—but what are the chances of an accident with somebody walking a pushbike up that road, with the speed of the cars and the narrowness of the road? I believe we could have provided something for them to make it a little safer.

Many people use it. Every morning I observe three lads, who have more courage than I do, riding down that track. I take it that they return by some method, but I have not seen them returning. They are usually on the track when I go down in the morning.

The Minister has not yet given a guarantee as to whether we are going to have a guardrail on that road, nor has he given a guarantee as to James Road, where the recent death occurred. That death, which is the first one in my memory, was on an upgraded part of the road which had been resurfaced, so there was a fatality when somebody went over the edge. Whether or not a guardrail would have saved that person, I do not know, but at least it would have given them a chance. The cost of guardrailing that road, which has a steep embankment, would not be high. I hope that the people in that area have a Christmas present and that we have the road sealed, completed and forgotten about. We will then see if in the past it has been so bad that it was safe and, when it is completed, it is so good that we have worse accidents. I hope that is not the case, but that is a view held by some people.

I suppose the topic other than the police that is most predominant in the community's mind at the moment relates to road alternatives, one being from Coromandel Parade to Diosma Drive and then a bypass to the west around a residential area to a connecting point near Horner's Bridge on Murrays Hill Road and another, taking the main road from Blacks Road heading north along the main road right to the Blackwood roundabout. That means passing the Coromandel Valley Primary School and coming over the level crossing at the Blackwood railway station. The third alternative is to take the first half of the main road from Blacks Road to the junction of Winns Road in Coromandel Valley and upgrade Winns Road to Coromandel Parade; then, along Coromandel Parade to the roundabout.

The member for Flinders talked about the cost of roads. I also am concerned as to where we are going to find the money to achieve the objectives that each of our communities say they desire, need, or request, whatever it may be. The cost of the Winns Road proposition is about \$4.9 million; the cost of the main road proposition is \$6.9 million; and the bypass proposition is between \$4.6 million and \$4.7 million. After achieving that, we have dumped all the traffic at the Blackwood roundabout. It still has to get from there to Mitcham, Torrens Park, Fullarton, or wherever. Where do we put it? Old Belair Road will immediately be cluttered up. Any car parking space in the Blackwood main street will have to go, at least in peak hour times, for clearways. Some of the small businesses will go. I hold that view, but the departmental officers (and they may be better informed than I am) say that, if we build a good road from the Craighburn-Woodleigh area above Flagstaff Hill through to Blackwood, we will not encourage more traffic through that route.

I do not accept that proposition, because in the next six to seven years 11 000 more homes will be built in the Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley, Reynella and back of Morphett Vale area. The residents are not all going to travel on South Road, but I support my colleague the member for Davenport in saying that we must upgrade that main South Road and any other corridor that we can within our financial resources to drag as much traffic out of the south on to a transport corridor which will get them to the north or inner part of the city, or a good connecting link from South Road to the eastern suburbs. If that does not happen, Blackwood and its environs will become a cluttered traffic corridor.

Let us look at Diosma Drive, which is the most disadvantaged area at the moment. A residential street has been turned into a main road that caters for buses and trucks. It is narrow and it is breaking up. It was never intended to carry the heavy traffic.

This road presents a danger to motorists, is unfair to people residing in the area, and is very accident prone, as figures from the department indicate. If the main Coromandel Valley road was upgraded there would still be the problem with Diosma Drive because buses serve the community and go towards the Craighburn School on Murrays Hill Road. If the proposed bypass is constructed it would then bring all the traffic past the Craighburn Primary School—and that community is already concerned about existing dangers—and congest them at the Blackwood roundabout. However, we would still have them past Diosma Drive. That is the cheapest proposition before us, but takes the traffic close to residents in Craiglee Drive and Protea Avenue. That situation would then become unfair to those residents.

If that were done the department still tells us that the main road going through Clarendon and Kangarilla, and close to Cherry Gardens and Coromandel Valley communities is unsafe. Another 1 100 homes are to be constructed at McLaren Vale. Which way will that traffic go? Therefore, the main road at Coromandel Valley needs to be made safer, also. If \$4.7 million was spent on the bypass road we would still need to spend some millions on the main Coromandel Valley road and, at the same time, that would push more traffic past the Coromandel Valley Primary School. We would then have congestion at the Blackwood railway crossing with a buildup of traffic blocking off East Terrace traffic.

If we overcame all these problems, how would we overcome the Glenalta railway crossing problem? If a bridge is erected it would cost another \$5 million to \$6 million. When we are talking about doing up roads in that community the cost will be something like \$12 million in total. That figure is frightening. I think that the community will end up saying that they prefer to do nothing, except for the obvious moves that need to be taken to make some of the roads safer; and that something needs to be done to get traffic out of Diosma Drive. I believe that that is the view the community will express.

Straight after the public meeting at the Blackwood Football Club in relation to police operations there will be a public meeting in relation to roads in the area, and these issues are important to the community. It is no good for Parliament to say that some residents will have to suffer and if Blackwood is cluttered up with traffic, bad luck. Bypass roads were constructed around Gawler and other places, and that is what needs to be looked at for Blackwood—finding another way of getting the traffic out of the road. If that means infringing on the environment, then so be it. That is better than taking human life or destroying the quality of life for humans in a residential area.

I led the campaign in the early 1970s to stop Gloucester Avenue and Sheoak Road becoming the main link through to Crafers under the freeway, and I believe that that was the correct move by the community. The freeway is already overcrowded from Crafers onwards. If there is trouble with traffic coming from the south another route needs to be found. That route has to be somewhere at the back of Hackham, up over Penneys Hill Road, up the back of Kangarilla bypassing Meadows and Macclesfield and going through to what we used to call Chaney's Line. That is the only way a route can go, because the freeway is already overcrowded. If the Gloucester Avenue connecting link was built the heavy industrial traffic from the south would travel that route today.

So, I have no regrets about leading that campaign at that time. I thank the Government now for correcting the problem and injustice at the Eden Hills Primary School. I appreciated the fact that that school never came to me for about six years: they were prepared to use the system and play it fair, but that did not work. Successive Governments ignored them.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Yes, I belonged to a Government that ignored them. I could not convince my people at the time. It is only a little school but its needs are just as important as the big schools. They are now grateful that they have their yard sealed, and they have got rid of the ants and other problems. I say to the Minister, 'Thanks; it is appreciated.' I know that the Minister received a letter and photo of the children with a panel saying, 'Thank you, Mr Arnold.' I also received one. That shows how grateful they were.

However, I am not thrilled by what has happened at the Stirling East Primary School. We were to upgrade that school. One Government agreed. The school committee met and said that it did not want so many classrooms and that its population growth would not be so high. It asked to cut some out. The department agreed with the school council, but a change of government said, 'We will not approve it,' and because the committee did the right thing by the taxpayers they got knocked back. Any Government that did that should be ashamed of itself.

The present Minister has fairly taken up the challenge of building an activity centre needed at that school. I hope that he can say definitely that it will be built and that it is not being said just before an election. A change of administration could come in and we would then go through the same process again. It has taken seven years to get to this point. Because the committee was responsible, it missed out. If it had said that it would take what it did not want, wasting the taxpayers' money, it would have had the school completed by now. It is a lesson in trying to save taxes, because one is penalised.

I now want to talk about Heathfield High School. The Department of Housing and Construction has developed a method of building transportable classrooms, which are very big and cumbersome but effective. Lo and behold when we wanted one at Heathfield High School—agreed to by the Minister and the department—we were told that there was no way of getting it there.

So, the local member had to go around, measure the roads and do the tests himself to find a route that would enable the classroom to be brought in. Now I am waiting, because it was said to be ready to be delivered when no route could be found, but because I have gone to the trouble of finding a way in, which the local engineers and others think possible, I am now told that there is a delay. To make it even worse, to get that building from the north of Adelaide into Heathfield at Stirling, we can get it to the Tollgate but then the Highways Department says that we cannot take it any further because the road is not wide enough. That is

the South-Eastern Freeway, the main connecting Melbourne road.

However, if we take it to Truro, Sedan and Murray Bridge, we can get it in. It will go on a scenic tour of Sedan and come back through Murray Bridge to Stirling. Then we get within three kilometres of the school and are told it is impossible to go any further. We will solve that. I ask the Minister to say that from this budget he will make that classroom and a smaller building available to the school as soon as possible.

I have picked on local issues because it is easier to try to get the message home to Ministers in this way. We all know that this Government has been a high tax Government and that it has increased charges much more rapidly than any other Government. I do not need to tell that to the community, because people will soon make their own judgments. The Government has the job of convincing the community that it is not a high tax Government.

However, the community knows how much it costs us to live, how much people pay for services and how far their money is not going. I support the proposition before us reluctantly, knowing that it does not really set out the true position in our State. What if we were to talk to local councils and find out how much they have borrowed? Whether we look at State or Federal Government budgets and whether we like it or not, money lending is what is involved, and we are slaves to interest rates.

For every dollar that we borrow now 63 cents goes from the Commonwealth coffers to pay interest on what we have borrowed. This country owes more than Argentina, and we are told that Argentina is insolvent. I wonder where we are. I think that we, as parliamentarians, should take up this challenge, and that is why I raise this query about spending the sort of money that is proposed to be spent on roads in the Blackwood area. I believe that people in that area are prepared, if they are told what the position is to put up with a slower traffic flow rather than have the area congested by extra traffic flowing through it. I support the proposition.

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** I, too, support the proposition. There are several things to which I will address myself this evening. I guess easily the most important of these is the manner in which the Labor Party chooses to ignore the importance of the benefits that privatisation of industry can bring to the community at large. Privatisation simply means enabling people to own industries that are presently owned and operated by the Government. If the member for Hartley can raise himself I would be delighted to have his attention, recognising for the moment that he is in a state of repose—somnolent.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to continue with his address.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am, to the best of my ability, attempting to do so, at least for the attention of those members who are upright in the Chamber at present, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Whitten:** For Christ's sake, wake up to your bloody self!

**Mr LEWIS:** For your sake, too, the member for Price, out of your place, and on your third leg and all.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will not tolerate that sort of language and asks for an immediate withdrawal of such a disgusting remark.

**Mr LEWIS:** The member for Price—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The prime job of the Speaker is to avoid quarrels between members. The language that has just been used is quite outrageous, and I ask the honourable member for Mallee, whom I respect as a decent honourable person—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to show some respect to the Chair and the honourable member for Chaffey to do the same.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** I haven't said a word.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am amazed that such senior members would totally disregard the Chair while I was addressing the honourable member for Mallee. I ask the honourable member for Mallee, whom I respect as a decent, honourable member, to think about what he has just said and to withdraw his remarks. I do this on the basis that the prime responsibility of the Speaker as set out in Erskine May is that he must remove quarrels between honourable members.

**Mr LEWIS:** Mr Speaker, I will withdraw if the sacrilegious remarks made by the member for Price in his abuse of me as he wandered through the benches is also viewed by you as being worthy of equal withdrawal.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not understand the honourable member. If sacrilegious remarks were made, they have the full condemnation of the Chair. I do not recall that I said anything.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! All I ask is that the honourable member for Mallee withdraw the remarks that he made in relation to the honourable member for Price.

**Mr LEWIS:** I have no intention of further qualifying my desire or intention to withdraw unless the member for Price withdraws the words 'for Christ's sake'. I do not believe that the remarks I was making about the member for Hartley whilst he was asleep were in any way a quarrel between myself and him. He had in no way responded. The member for Price was the member of this place who, in the first instance, in my opinion, conducted himself in an unparliamentary manner.

**The SPEAKER:** To bring the matter to finality—there is no point in continuing it—if sacrilegious words were used by the honourable member for Price, those words stand condemned utterly by the Chair. I did not hear them. Certainly, I said nothing. I ask the honourable member for Mallee to reconsider the remarks that he has made and consider withdrawing them.

**Mr LEWIS:** For so much as it will enable me to continue my remarks and without qualification, I withdraw. I want to address myself to those problems confronting this State and this nation which presently mean that a far greater percentage of the people living in this State and nation who ought to be able to get jobs cannot do so.

I want to relate those remarks not only to the higher cost of wages and the real demand for labour and what it can produce (as an economist would put it) but also to the fact that that problem is exacerbated by the considerable number of enterprises into which government continues to engage and projects on which it continues to embark, where it would be better if those enterprises were left to the private sector or the individual, or whoever wishes to take a risk and provide those services for the probable profit that they would derive from doing so.

I notice, Mr Speaker, if you have not done so, that the member for Hartley has turned his back not only on me but also on you, and I regard that, even if you do not, as a breach of Standing Orders, and I invite you to draw his attention to the fact that Standing Orders require him to conduct himself in a manner that is duly decorous at all times while he is in this Chamber. Given that the member for Hartley has been the most stringent critic of the Liberal Party's privatisation policy in recent weeks and given that none of the arguments that he has advanced in support of the view that he has expressed have been in any way based on fact, I invite the honourable member to sit up and listen

to what I have to say. He is unworthy of his seat in this place if he is unable to do so.

It ought to be recognised that if every South Australian and every Australian were to be paid about \$1 000 a week in wages, in this present day and age there would be those trade union advocates who would say, 'We cannot retreat from what we have now. We have won these wages and conditions of employment to the benefit of all those people in South Australia who have jobs.' They would argue that, yet this would clearly mean that South Australian industry would be unable to compete, given not only what would therefore be a wage disadvantage but also a freight disadvantage to other States and the rest of the world. Jobs would disappear in their hundreds, week by week. Yet that is the kind of argument that we hear being advanced by the member for Hartley, and by members of the back bench of the Government.

That is the kind of flat earth society view they have of the world of reality—the demand for labour of course depends on its price like the demand for anything depends on its price. Clearly, if we therefore raise the cost of labour to the point where those people who would use labour in the process of producing goods and services for the community find that they can no longer use that labour profitably or even to sustain their continuing existence in the business world, or to sustain and maintain their capital investment without making a profit, we find that those people, notwithstanding those realities, cannot continue to expand their work force.

If they cannot expand their work force, they cannot employ the unemployed. If the cost of labour is higher than is the demand for the goods and services that that labour can produce, it is impossible for the economy to take up all the labour that is available. Economists call such circumstances—it is not a phenomenon: it is deliberately engendered by frictions induced into the labour market by artificial factors like trade union movements—'a real wage overhang', which means that the cost of each job in terms of the cash that goes into the pay packet, plus the group tax, payroll tax, workers compensation and the other oncosts involved is greater than the capacity of the employer to sustain and still charge an appropriate price for the goods and/or services that they provide to the rest of the community.

Now, members opposite, members of the Government here and, indeed, members of the Government in Canberra, Mr Speaker—if only I could enjoy your attention, and I note that the member for Hartley finds this so uncomfortable that he is leaving the Chamber—believe that there is some intrinsic value in the existing level of wages and that there is some intrinsic worth in sustaining that level, in spite of the fact that in doing so they deny a substantial percentage of the Australian population the opportunity to ever have a job. You, Mr Speaker, as much as any other member of the Government Party, are responsible for that immoral conduct of the labour market in this country. It is grossly immoral because it denies those people—most of them young people with a lifetime in front of them to offer this country—the chance to ever do anything in return for what they get as a living. They are required to sit back and accept a pension called 'the dole'.

Let us look at it from another point of view. Presently, members opposite, and the wets in this community, including them, believe that if they pay a significant enough proportion of their income to the Federal Government in the form of taxes—income tax—that the income tax that they pay at an increased rate, albeit, will be redirected towards providing not only the dole but also creating these Mickey Mouse pretend jobs in all the Mickey Mouse schemes that they can dream up, because it not only takes taxes

from their own wage packets, but from others who could provide them with real jobs, too. By collecting that revenue to pay the dole, we are therefore paying people to stay low in self-esteem, stay unemployed and stay in a state of social non-identity, where they can become psychologically disturbed.

The way in which the Premier spoke this afternoon in the course of his remarks suggest that he would have us believe that the problems that have arisen in the UK in the past 48 hours are the direct result of something that the Conservative Government has done in Britain. He is wrong. Without wishing to debate that at any length, I point out that the simple facts are that too many people have had their chances of working in the UK priced out of existence by an unrealistic demand for higher wages than the economy of that country can afford to sustain. The rest of the world cannot afford to pay the prices for which the goods would have to be sold to sustain those jobs in that country, leave alone the consumers in that country itself.

The same thing applies in this country. What is needed there is an increase of job opportunities by the determination of a wage that is realistic and by a reduction in taxation levels to enable the spending power of each wage earner to not be reduced, while the tax level is.

That is the only way in which we can in any sense in this country, that country or anywhere else, expect to correct that situation. The other thing that is needed there as much as it is needed here—as we will suffer the same fate in this country unless we wake up to what we are doing—is for everybody to be made aware that they are accountable for their personal behaviour, especially where it involves misdemeanors of that kind—violence perpetrated against persons and property of others. That is what the riots in Birmingham were all about. We are lucky. We have not had it here yet but, unless we wake up, we will have it here.

We need to wake up to the fact that wages are higher than their real value. We should not be increasing the level of wages and the level of taxation on those wages to pay a better dole but rather to decrease the wages and the level of taxation thereon so that everybody who wants a job can get one. The ultimate equation is identical; the result is better if one follows the proposition that I am putting, namely, to ensure that those people who do not want to take risks in the economy and become self employed are therefore able to get jobs. This will give them the same amount of cash and spending power in their wage packets to take home by reducing the amount of taxation that they must pay on the gross wage that they earn, to the point where such a reduction leaves sufficient money in the cash box of the employer to enable him take up the slack in unemployment and employ the considerable number of people in this country who wish to have a job and who could otherwise do a job if only an employer was able to afford them.

The benefit of the proposition that I put in general terms to members opposite and to you, Mr Speaker, is that we would immediately, by adopting this policy, solve the problem of unemployment and provide people who want jobs with those jobs, thereby restoring Australia to its competitive position in the world market place, and enabling Australian employers and manufacturers to employ Australian people to manufacture in Australia many goods that are in large part presently being imported.

The solution to the problem is not subsidies to the manufacturing industry but a wage level that is realistic in relation to the capacity of the economy to pay it. The accord between the ACTU and the Government which I read about today and about which we have heard so much over the last couple of years is a process by which we are making progress down the wrong track more slowly than would

otherwise be the case. The people who have jobs in this country need to recognise that they have those jobs only for as long as the demands made by their union bosses do not price them out of existence.

The rate of increase of wages, if it exceeds the capacity of the economy to pay such wages, will most certainly result in a reduction in the total number of people who have jobs in the population of those who want jobs. Put another way, that means that increasing wages beyond increases in productivity results in a decrease in employment levels. We cannot compensate for that by paying the dole. The fairer and more moral way is to enable everyone who wants a job to have one and for employers and employees, especially in small business arrangements, to make their own agreements with each other and register them in the Arbitration Commission outside the dictates of the union bosses who otherwise say that it is wrong and that to do so is to engage in the practice of scab labour.

Mr Speaker, you more than anyone else in this place, with your history and involvement in industrial relations, would understand what I am saying as well as anyone could—if only you would listen, and if only members opposite would listen. Anyone who believes that to pursue the present policy on wage structures is the only fair way—

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I thank the member for Florey for his comment, if it can be included. I do not know what it meant: he probably suffers indigestion from some previous experience and not from my remarks. This country and this State must accept that it is necessary to adjust wages for those people who want jobs and not the risk of having to become self-employed; we must accept the necessity for wage rates to reflect the demand on goods and services which their efforts provide within the Australian economy.

I have deliberately spent some time on this matter, and I relate it to the context of privatisation. One of the things which destroys incentive to create jobs in the private sector is the high level of taxation. The high level of taxation arises because wage levels in the public sector must appear to be comparable with those in the private sector (and we know that those in both sectors are too high because of what I have just explained to the House). We need to recognise that public sector costs necessitate the collection of taxes and the imposition of higher charges, for which this Government is renowned; and public sector costs are incurred because public sector enterprises lose money.

The simplest solution to this problem is to give public sector enterprises to the private sector. The formula that I propose is to make the first offer of these enterprises to the people who work in them: to offer them what is known as an employee share ownership plan (ESOP). This has been done successfully in other countries; indeed, it has been done successfully in this country with firms such as Dynavac and Fletcher Jones. In other countries, particularly the United States, such a scheme has helped companies which have been bankrupt or insolvent.

A fellow named Kelso had enough wit to work out that, if the employees were willing to take over the responsibility (although not for the previous debts, given that no funds were available to pay those debts; and not to buy out the former shareholders of the firm, given that there were no funds left to warrant that) to ensure that their jobs survived, those employees could form themselves into a trust. By guaranteeing that trust they could borrow the money necessary to continue the operations of the business and agree to repay the loan over an extended term.

That has been done very successfully under the Kelso schemes of arrangement in the United States. If utterly bankrupt organisations ready to go into the hands of a



receiver or liquidator can be brought back from the brink of disaster, surely we can do that with Government enterprises that lose money every year.

Why cannot we offer that to employees in the first instance, allowing the employees to do what has been done in those enterprises to which I have just referred? If they are making a profit, those employees will be able to enjoy the benefits of that profit, once they are outside the Government system and are working for their privately owned enterprises. In the process of enjoying that profit, like everyone in the private sector, especially the people with whom they are competing in the provision of goods and services, they will be able to pay taxes and therefore will not only reduce the burden or the prospective burden of tax on the rest of us who pay tax, including the people with whom they are competing, but also make a contribution to public revenue.

We will find that we will not have to find as much tax from taxpayers because we will no longer need the money to fund deficit operated clothing factories or glove factories, or whatever Government enterprise continues to lose money. Operations will recognise that they must survive in the real world of commerce and make a profit, and they will be able to make a contribution towards taxes, so that all taxpayers in South Australia will be better off it as a consequence of that policy and share a reduced burden.

We know that it has worked in other countries, despite what the member for Hartley has said in the past. It has worked in Spain, and the socialist unions in Spain, to which I have referred in previous speeches, have said how happy they are to have privatisation introduced. A fellow called Nicholas Redondo, the General Secretary of the Socialist Workers Union, said:

I'm not saying that this Government is following a reactionary line but in some cases it coincides with Ronald Reagan's policy. He pointed out that Spain's avowedly socialist government was planning further sales of State-owned industries to private companies. Another outstanding socialist, a fellow called Celedonio Martinez said, 'We are no longer for nationalisation.' He did not want the Government to go on taking things over. He is the general secretary of the socialist Chemical Workers Association. When talking about nationalisation he said, 'I don't think it solves anything.' If those kinds of people can recognise the economic realities, as they confront members of their unions in Spain, why is it that we cannot recognise economic realities in this country? Is it because we are so imbued with the self-righteousness of fools who believe in the flat earth society in economic terms—who just simply cannot accept that wages are too high and that youth wages are far too high and unrealistically pegged at those high levels, or is it for some other reason?

Why must South Australia in particular and Australia in general be unique in its defiance of the laws of economics? I challenge Government members to give me any good reason why that is so. Certainly, the member for Hartley only compounded the depths of ignorance in his attempted exposition of why it is necessary to avoid privatisation. He further involved his Party by making the remarks that he made, referring to the ridiculous situation of it not being appropriate to have industries, in which businesses are owned by both government and private sectors, owned by the private sector alone. Why did the present Bannon Labor Government sell off Housing Trust shopping centres? Why did it agree to the privatisation of Amdel? One has merely to look at the Auditor-General's Report to ascertain where it is possible to get the most efficient and economic cleaning services for schools—it is from the private contractors, and not those who are publicly employed. Why cannot members opposite acknowledge the validity of that proposition, especially when it means more jobs? Do they not care about

that? Do they believe that increasing taxation levels will increase the number of jobs? If they believe that, let them say so, but it is economic nonsense.

The most senior economic guru their Party has ever known has stated that in his textbook for university students studying economics. Professor Harcourt is no longer on the Adelaide University campus: he is in the United Kingdom. He was that man.

I now refer to a problem which has arisen as a consequence of the incompetence and deceit of the present Government and the people it has put in positions of responsibility. The sesquicentenary celebrations in this State were intended to commemorate those important aspects of the last 150 years of our existence since colonisation which are important to our continuing existence. They involved the Maritime Museum and a mining centre museum—a copper interpretive centre at Burra. I have some interest in that. One of the most significant initial copper miners in this country happened to have the name of Lewis. That is also my name. I want to know why the Government has not done what it said it would do in recognising the historical importance of mining in this State.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I rise tonight to support the budget debate and in doing so I would like to point out to the Government some of the areas in which I disagree with its actions very violently—the promotion of small business, taxation, and the way in which this Government has slugged not only the community but also the business sector. I will also refer to some areas of recreation and sport and the budget fiddles that have occurred.

However, I refer first to today's *News* editorial, which really shows how infantile and stupid (as it says) the current ACTU is—a group of people who recognise and are clearly prepared to stand up and say that profit needs to be controlled. Obviously we cannot take out of context particular comments in an editorial—and I would not attempt to do that—but it seems quite obvious to me that in this instance the ACTU has forgotten that profits mean jobs and that we in this country must realise that profitability is the way in which this country has to go. Without profits there cannot be any sharing; it is impossible to redistribute, whether it is done in a fair and reasonable way (as Liberal Governments have done) or in a very deliberate way (as Labor Governments have done). None of this can be achieved unless there is profit.

It is most unfortunate that a very important part of our community, the people who represent the unions, a group of people who represent sincerely the rights of the working people, is so strongly opposed to profits, because there is no question that individual employers and unions will have to work together in the future if this country is to progress. It is unfortunate that this very draconian attitude has been taken today by the ACTU.

I would now like to discuss taxation. It is interesting that some three years ago when I came into this place a document was floating around that said, 'We will not have any taxation increase.'

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I said 'about three years'. The document said, 'We will not have any taxation increase. We will not need to increase the revenue of this State, because we have all of those things under control.' Those were not the exact words, but in principle that is what was said. The State taxation collection in 1982-83 was \$549 million. Just

over three years later that same collection will be \$852 million, an increase of \$303 million or 55 per cent. Given that statement from someone who I believed was a very credible man at the start of his term some three years ago, that is a fairly massive increase in taxation. It is sad to sit here today knowing that all the promises—and in particular that major promise made so strongly to the community of South Australia that there will be no taxation increase—have been broken.

There was also the very strong statement saying, 'Look, I know what the state of the nation is. You do not have to worry about that, because my advisers have told me that we will be able to afford all the promises that we have made and there will be no taxation increases.' Then, early in the first year, we had a bleating Premier saying, 'Look what you have done to me,' even though, within days of his taking over the reins of Treasurer, a very strong statement was made by the Under Treasurer that, if the budget had proceeded along its normal lines, there would have been a \$13 million deficit instead of the final \$63 million deficit.

One must be fair about that, because a couple of tragedies occurred which no Government could have controlled but to still blatantly say to the people of South Australia that the Liberal Government would have ended up with a deficit of that type is quite incorrect. Anyone who has run a business knows that, if you have run a business for three months and somebody else has run it for nine months, you can hardly blame the person who ran it for the first three months for a disaster that occurred at the end of the latter nine months. The Auditor-General said clearly that one of the major problems of the budget was that the Minister of Health could not control his funds; that, in fact, there was an overrun of about \$25 million in the first year. The Minister of Health is and was at that stage so outspoken about his own belief in his abilities that he could not hear the Premier blatantly saying that the situation had been left in a mess.

Referring to the 1985-86 financial year, the Premier now says, 'We have had to tax in order to get back that \$63 million; we have had to increase the income from the statutory authorities to help us balance our budget,' but what have we got? Some \$303 million extra has been collected in taxation alone in three years under this Government. But there is only a reduction in that deficit from \$63 million to \$51 million. It must be recognised that at least there has been some attempt to reduce the deficit, but, with that sort of increase, where has the money gone? In true Labor tradition, if you do not know how to control the budget, you spend. Once you have spent, you get caught up in the rolling wheel and you have to either tax more (which this Government has done) or you borrow—the Government has done both of those things. It has spent like no other Government has spent in the history of this State.

Let us look at some of the taxation areas that affect business and the individual. Land tax—a direct tax on business—which the previous Liberal Government removed from the main personal dwelling, has seen an increase of \$14.3 million, or a 60 per cent increase over the base figure for 1982-83. At least this Government has recognised that payroll tax has put a significant damper on employment, and there has been some reduction in it. However, that reduction, in principle, has still meant an extra \$39 million, or a 17 per cent increase. While it is correctly recognised that payroll tax is a tax against employment, there still has been a massive hike in that tax during this Government's term in office. FID, the fiddle tax or whatever one likes to call it—the new tax that was not going to be introduced—now represents a \$31 million tax take for the Government. Being a very broadly based tax it is the kind of tax that

will keep jingling along and increasing rapidly in years to come.

Stamp duty tax, which has increased dramatically by some 90 per cent, is linked to a very deliberate decision, a decision on which I have previously congratulated the Government and on which I believe the Government needs to be congratulated—that is, to plough money back into housing. There is no question that the housing sector has a massive flow-on effect in the community. The extra tax from that area is due to the extra economic activity, and that cannot be strongly criticised other than that there should have been some recognition by the Government of the massive increase that new home buyers have had to pay because of the rapidly increasing costs. Apart from that, it is a recognition that should have occurred, and should have occurred earlier. That tax has come about from a very strong economy and good decision of this Government.

We then come to business franchises. Who cops that whack? Some 95 per cent of South Australia's business sector is in the small business area. Some \$58 million on top of \$63 million was collected during 1982-83—a massive increase of 90-odd per cent—from the business sector. Again we see a stifling of the small business sector, another whack around the ears from this Government for the sector that the Government says it is all about helping and protecting.

In relation to statutory contributions, there has been a massive increase by the State Bank to the Treasury and it is an increase that is welcome, because the State Bank has done a magnificent job in promoting itself and enabling many small businesses to obtain loans and be involved in the purchase of money that was not there previously. The State Bank needs to be congratulated for that exercise. Again, there is that flow-on effect to the budget which cannot be criticised because it is an area of employment and expansion on which we need to congratulate the Government.

We then come to ETSA—the greatest con of all: backdoor taxation. I was not here at the time, but the Premier's statements about backdoor taxation have been often quoted. It is a bit like the statement about the mirage in the desert. The Premier and Treasurer has suddenly decided that the mirage in the desert—the Roxby Downs project—is a fairly good one. We also see backdoor taxation in relation to ETSA seeming to be a fairly good and practical method. Since 1982-83 there has been a \$8 million increase (or 40 per cent) in the tax taken by way of a levy on ETSA. Who pays the majority of that? The consumer and small businessman.

It is interesting to go back an extra full year and look at the tax take. The levy from ETSA was some \$14.8 million under the Tonkin Government, but in three years it has now increased to \$28 million, or more than double the figure.

The other massive backdoor tax hike has been in the E&WS area. Some extra \$55 million has been taken out in the three years of this Government's term—a massive 36 per cent hike in charges in that area. The Auditor-General's Report shows at page 96 that, from 1982 to the end of 1985, the E&WS interest bill has risen from \$72 million a year to \$103 million. That may not sound very much, but when one looks at the line above and sees that payments by the department are only \$10 million more than the total interest bill of the E&WS, one questions the Government's management principles.

We have had a massive increase in the interest bill to the point that the E&WS is almost spending the same amount of money on its interest as it is paying in running its department. The other significant area of concern for business is marine and harbors charges. We find that some \$14 million increase has occurred in charges from 1982-83 to

1985-86—a massive 62 per cent increase in charges. Of course, those charges flow on right through the business sector.

As I said earlier, there has been a taxation increase from \$549 million to \$852 million in just over three years. Charges have increased from \$178 million to \$248 million. So, in that three-year term in taxes and public undertaking charges we have had a massive increase of \$373 million or some 51 per cent. The question that arises straight away is: where has it gone?

Last night the late *News* really started to put into perspective where some of that money might have gone. The article was headed 'Budget bombshell: South Australia faces a \$80 million deficit'. It is probably the first occasion for some time that after 24 hours the Treasurer still has not made any comment whatsoever denying that there is possibly a \$80 million deficit. I suppose one reason why he has not done that is because of the credibility of the Auditor-General. The independent umpire is sitting out there knowing full well that his comments have been taken up and extrapolated, and that they are right.

This morning in the *Advertiser* we saw the headline 'Deficit shock rocks Labor'. Of course, I can understand why it has done that, because over the past two or three years we have had a Premier who has stood up in this place and publicly as Mr Squeaky Clean. Today it has been shown clearly that there has been a budget fiddle and that some housing and highways money has been held back. We have had no denial today, in absolute terms, by the Premier—part recognition that the economic conditions cannot be allowed to continue and that there must be some sort of expenditure control but no direct denial that that figure of \$80 million put forward yesterday is not in fact correct. That is a pity, because it shows clearly that the Treasurer and the Government are guilty. I believe that any credibility they had has gone down the gurgler: that has been catching up with them for some time.

As I said earlier, one of this Government's great philosophies is spend and spend. The one way to fix that is to borrow. If one looks at the accounts one clearly sees that this Government has raped and borrowed from every single statutory authority one can think of. This Government has continually belted business and the private individual with its great tax hikes. We ended up with a so-called deficit of \$51 million. As the Auditor-General has clearly pointed out today, if expenditure is not brought under control, we need not worry about the deficit being \$80 million next year because it will be significantly higher: it was suggested today it could be as high as \$100 million.

I am glad to see that the member for Hartley has come back into the House because I want to make a couple of comments about his speech last night on privatisation. One of the things that was of interest in reading his speech is that all the areas of privatisation that he talked about—Telecom, Commonwealth Bank and others—happened to have a Commonwealth base. The two about which he talked at State level were the State Bank and SGIC. There was a clear denial in that respect at the very start of any comment made about privatisation.

It is interesting that the Minister of Housing and Construction is present, because I recall talking to him some two years ago about the value of selling off some of the shopping centres owned by the Housing Trust. I remember clearly the Government putting forward a good proposition for owners—individual businessmen who had been involved in those premises for 20 years or more. It was an excellent project and the Minister should be congratulated, because it is the best example of privatisation that this Government has undertaken.

What the Government did was go out and say that it would get a fair price for the projects by asking people currently renting those premises whether they wanted to buy them. In other words, it sat down and said that it would like to sell those premises and what it would do was ask the people in those centres whether they wanted to buy them. I believe that all of those centres have now been sold. Some took a little longer than others to sell because it was more difficult to say that, economically, in future they would be good centres—but they have all been sold. That is an excellent example of privatisation.

The Minister of Health said recently that there are State assets that are no longer required. He said that they would be put on the market, hopefully getting market price for them. He said that they would be sold off because we can use that money better in the general running of the State, either in a recurrent sense or in a capital investment sense. There is no question that those two instances are excellent examples of privatisation. In my electorate is AMDEL, a very effective public group. The Government, in conjunction with the board of AMDEL, recognised that if it sold that business the staff would have an opportunity to purchase shares. The companies currently investing in it as a public authority can now invest in it as a private company and take up shares. They will be asked to do that. Everybody has accepted the proposal: the staff has accepted it and so have the original investors. Those are three examples of successful privatisation that has occurred during the term that I have been in this House, and they have been undertaken by the present Government.

For members on the other side to say that they are totally opposed to privatisation, and in particular for the member for Hartley to say that, is erroneous because this Government is doing just what I have said. We have said very clearly that if there is a public benefit, and if there is an opportunity for the staff and management to purchase particular public authorities, we will go down that track.

That is exactly the same thing that this Government has done through the Housing Trust shopping centres throughout the State, and Amdel. It is an absolute sham for the member for Hartley to say that what his Government does is not privatisation but is for the good of the Government and the people, and what the Opposition does is privatisation, which is no good for anyone. That is the greatest lot of nonsense I have ever heard. The member for Hartley's speech is the greatest lot of economic nonsense that I have read for a long time. Next I want to talk about the public debt. Between 1982 and 1985 we have had a \$1 billion increase in moneys owed by this Government.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Is that the Premier's figure or the Auditor-General's figure?

**Mr INGERSON:** It is the Auditor-General's figure: \$1.3 billion, an increase of 37.5 per cent. As I said, if one spends and spends there are only two ways to balance the budget. One is to tax so that one has income or one has to borrow. This Government has taxed \$350 million more than three years ago, and it has also borrowed, some of the most massive borrowings that we have had in the history of this State—\$1 billion (\$1 000 million) more in borrowings than we had three years ago.

These are not my figures; they are not the Premier's figures, which we might think are fudged; they are the Auditor-General's figures. What about debt servicing and the amount of interest that we pay on that money? In 1983-84, just last year, this amount was \$283 million, yet this year it is expected to be \$354 million, \$70 million extra in one year. As any businessman knows, that is \$70 million down the gurgler—one cannot do anything with it. It is \$70 million of your tax take that you have to take in and wipe

off before you start. That is a massive increase, a 24 per cent increase in one year.

If we go back to 1982-83, when it was only \$160 million, one can see that there has been a \$200 million increase in debt interest in three years. Indeed, interest is now the third biggest department in government. It is almost the most prized department head position—the Minister for interest. We are confronted by an incredible position with the interest payments by the State being so high. The Auditor-General's report contained a comment on the use of the South Australian Government Finance Authority which concerns me and which should concern all members. The statement was along the lines that some \$4.5 million last year was paid to statutory authorities without this Parliament's knowing about it. That situation is wrong and needs to change.

Every member of Parliament ought to be demanding that all moneys paid out by the authority are paid out according to budget figures that are put forward or at least approved by Cabinet, and that they do not go through the system in any way other than they obviously have done.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am delighted to have the opportunity to say a few words in relation to the State budget, which sets out to appropriate some \$3 456 million, an increase in expenditure of in excess of \$400 million in one financial year. In examining the budget, if one has any knowledge of business, one looks very closely to see in which direction the budget will take us and what will be the long-term benefits to the State, and therefore to the people, because the expenditure of any large sums of money must occur in a direction which will build for the future, which will create jobs and which will give business and the community the opportunity to invest, develop and expand.

The only way in a free enterprise mixed economy such as we have in this State and nation that people will lift their standards of living and create the jobs that are necessary is to create growth. There is no other way in which we can achieve those aims, to which we all aspire, even though we look at them from completely different directions and even though we have different ideas. We must create growth, and, to do that, we have to create the economic conditions that will allow people to plan with confidence. Government has to get its fingers out of the way, and we must get over this idea that big government is good government and that high taxes are in the interests of the community.

It has been recognised for years that the countries with the lowest standards of living are those with the highest rates of tax. Therefore, Governments that continue to go down the track of imposing more taxes and charges and putting more restrictions on the community, business, and enterprises will continue to drag those enterprises down. We will get to the situation that we have had in the United Kingdom, where the few successful enterprises have been taxed to the hilt to prop up inefficient, outdated and unnecessary industries. It took courage for the current Government to redress about 50 years of socialist planning. The current Government in the United Kingdom is the only one that has had the courage to do so.

Over the past few weeks in this House, the member for Hartley—who is obviously the most articulate on the back bench and who has been designated the member who should endeavour to can the privatisation and deregulation policies of the Leader of the Liberal Party in this State—has attempted to use the most spurious and inaccurate arguments about the United Kingdom. He has failed to properly understand, grasp or have any knowledge about the history of what has taken place in that country. He has not told the people that, when the Thatcher Government took over, the United Kingdom was on the verge of bankruptcy. The

unions and the socialist philosophy had so interfered and dragged that country to its knees that it took a Government with great courage and foresight to make the decisions that would have a long-term beneficial effect on the country.

If the member for Hartley thinks that there is something wrong with allowing people to buy their own homes, which they may have lived in for two or three generations, he is in a fool's paradise and does not know what he is talking about. It is about time that he lifted his sights above that sort of nonsense and concentrated on the real issues.

I have been very disappointed that the current Government in its last few weeks in office has attempted to distort a well thought out and well planned approach to solve the economic problems of this State, that is, to clearly and effectively examine all Government operations, go through them very carefully and use that very basic criteria: what is in the public interest. Nothing will be turned over or even considered for privatisation unless it will be in the long-term public interest. The same applies to the deregulation program that a Liberal Government would put into effect. The former Minister of Agriculture, the member for Alexandra, was very successful in abolishing dozens of Acts of Parliament and getting rid of dozens of unnecessary boards and committees.

**Mr Groom:** That is not right.

**Mr GUNN:** That is right. It is deregulation and privatisation. We cannot discuss privatisation without discussing deregulation. The two are locked together and are part of a well thought out and well planned program.

**Mr Groom:** What about the Potato Board? You voted against the deregulation of the Potato Board.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan):** Order! I ask honourable members to come to order.

**Mr GUNN:** This Party knows exactly where it is going. I do not need advice from the two members opposite on how statutory marketing boards operate. I am one member in this place who has had experience of statutory marketing boards. I have been involved in selling considerable amounts of produce to the Australian Wheat Board and the Barley Board, and I have had the support of the Australian Wool Corporation. I make no apology. Those boards are in the public interest and are supported by those industries and not the Government. The wheat growers, wool producers and pastoralists, as well as those who participate in the Barley Board, are well organised and grower controlled.

The Labor Party has set out to put its sticky fingers into the good management and operation of the Australian Wheat Board, which has been one of the most successful marketing boards that this nation has ever had. To get up here and say otherwise is to talk absolute nonsense. There are a lot of subjects on which I do not know a lot, but members cannot tell me a great deal about the operation of the Australian Wheat Board. I do know something about it, and I suggest that the member for Hartley does his homework in these areas.

There are many statutory authorities, boards and committees that are no longer required in this State or nation, and they are eating up millions of dollars of taxpayers funds that could be better employed in providing very important services and facilities that are required by the State and the nation. My electorate is large and isolated and has many problems and it grieves me to see millions of dollars wasted on foolish projects such as the Aquatic Centre, when my people cannot get even a decent road or water. The preschool at Leigh Creek is bursting at the seams. At Booleroo Centre they can go for only two sessions a week because the Government does not have the funds to pay a teacher. They cannot get a decent technical studies room at Coober

Pedy where the conditions are deplorable. They cannot even get technical studies teachers at Miltaburra and other places.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** I do not need assistance from members opposite, and I will not be deterred. Whether members opposite like it or not, I have been here for six terms and will be here for a fair bit longer yet. I am determined to see justice for people in these isolated communities as they have been forgotten for too long. As far as the Government and certain Government officials are concerned, those people are out of sight and out of mind. I will ensure that over the next few weeks and in the future their problems are brought to the surface in this Parliament and properly debated. No Government will have adequate funds to look after and meet those needs if we keep building a bigger Public Service and have more statutory organisations, boards and committees. Someone should have the courage to examine all Government operations and get rid of those that are no longer necessary or required.

There is all this nonsense about trying to get a bit of cheap publicity and the scare tactics in which the Labor Party has engaged by sending out letters to the Highways Department. I heard on the radio on Saturday whilst driving to Quorn a press statement in the name of the member for Whyalla. We know that he did not make that statement, as he never makes press statements of that nature. He does not understand privatisation. Some Government press secretary peeled off the statement in his name. It was nothing but an attempt to frighten the people of Whyalla into voting for the Hon. Frank Blevins.

A few years ago I told the member for Whyalla that Councillor Murphy would make him unemployed. He went pretty close at the last election; this time he will get up. The average citizen is not silly enough to believe these sort of scare tactics. It is a pity that the current Government is attempting to put this sort of nonsense before the community. The political debate should focus on sound and sensible issues. At the end of the day, no matter what people like the member for Hartley and others put forward, there will be an ongoing policy of deregulation.

The public at large is absolutely sick and tired of the unnecessary regulations. There are constituents in my district who must obtain 21 licences to operate a small business. Does the member for Hartley support that sort of nonsense? There are armies of inspectors who check these bits of paper. What nonsense! This country was not built on that sort of premise; this country was built by encouraging people to go out and work hard. That is what this country requires, and that is what they will get under an Olsen Liberal Government. We will give people that opportunity; we will create the conditions and get out of the way. We will not have bodies such as the Road Traffic Board getting in the way of development and in the way of people trying to go about their business.

I refer to the nonsense of the State Planning Authority and the Department of Environment and Planning. The time has come to deal with some of these bodies. If ever there was a group of bureaucrats assembled to hold back South Australia, it is some of those in the Department of Environment and Planning. Those people who live in the Flinders Ranges are unlucky, because they must put up with this nonsense. The time has come to draw the line. The bureaucrats are deviously working in an attempt to take control away from the local council. Heaven help us! People have lived in these areas for 100 years and have done well. They do not need these instant experts and academics who never get their hands dirty telling them how to run their affairs; they have done it very well on their own.

It is time to put the cleaners right through these departments and take some of the millions of dollars they are spending and put them into projects that will create employment and improve conditions for a long time into the future. I am appalled that this Government has set out to misrepresent its policies. It is obvious that the Government is worried. The Government has nothing constructive to put forward, because day after day its members ask Dorothy Dix questions in this House; and members such as the member for Hartley put up smoke screens or try to drag red herrings across the trail of commonsense. However, I believe that the public will see through all of this.

When the public has an opportunity to digest this budget and the Auditor-General's Report, they will see through the nonsense which the member for Hartley and others have been putting up in this House. Average members of the community want jobs for their children and job security for themselves. They do not want to be interfered with. They are sick of petty officialdom getting in their way. They want to live a normal life free from the humbug and nonsense of Government and Government planners. That is where the deregulation and privatisation policy is going. It is not an attempt to get rid of the ordinary businesses; smoke screens of that type are fostered by the Labor Party. Our policy is not about denying people proper services. We all support those things. Only a fool would attempt to sell that story to the community.

There are many areas of government which are unnecessary and which can be handled far better by private enterprise, and I refer to one or two examples: do honourable members opposite believe that Government officials and employees could have built the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line as effectively as McMahons; or that they could have fulfilled the contracts for the Stuart Highway as effectively as McMahons? Do honourable members opposite really think that daily paid Government employees and Government officials could do that? Of course not. The Highways Department knows that. Members opposite should go out into the real world and look for themselves. It annoys me greatly to listen to the foolish comments of members opposite which are purely designed to hoodwink the people. I want to see this State develop; I want to see the facilities in my district improved; and I want to see job security and the development of this State so that young people have a good future.

Like most of us who came into this place at a young age, I have children who in a few years will be entering the work force, and I will attempt to ensure that decisions are made that will lay the foundations for their future. Businesses and people who are prepared to work must be given the opportunity to do so, but the way to do that is not by inflicting a capital gains tax on them. The effects of the capital gains tax on this nation must be considered. The Premier has been silent about this, and although the member for Hartley has done a lot of talking, we have not heard much about a capital gains tax.

What about the so-called perks tax? Where does the honourable member stand on that issue? Who will pay the tax on, say, the costs arising from an E&WS Department officer's taking a car home on the weekends, in case a water main breaks? We have not heard much about that tax. Let the honourable member explain to the House and the people of South Australia the benefits that will flow from that sort of nonsense. Of course, he cannot do so. It greatly annoys me that members opposite have been very selective in their criticism. That criticism has no foundation whatsoever. In the few minutes that I have remaining to me, I want to refer to some of the problems in my electorate.

**Mr Gregory:** Fourteen minutes is not 'a few minutes'!

**Mr GUNN:** Fourteen minutes is correct! I have a number of things that I want to say—I have already dealt with the privatisation issue—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan):** Order! The member for Eyre will resume his seat. I ask the House to come to order. Standing Orders do not provide that members can be clapping, pointing and cheering across the Chamber. I ask the member for Eyre to resume his speech.

**Mr GUNN:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I am very familiar with the Standing Orders of this House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Perhaps the member would like to abide by the Standing Orders in that case.

**Mr GUNN:** I am very aware of Standing Orders: I was under severe provocation, with continuous attempts being made to disrupt me. I am a very shy fellow when I am on my feet and am easily put off, and therefore I do not appreciate the barracking and everything directed towards me because it does have the effect of getting me off the track. Of course I know that members opposite often deliberately attempt to sidetrack me, to bait me, and to get me to reply to interjections. However, I now want to discuss some of the problems in my electorate. There are various problems associated with the 40 schools in my electorate. I bring to the attention of the House a problem involving one of those schools. A letter from the District Council of Murat Bay stated:

Council is currently aware that a joint application submitted by the Highways Department and the Education Department is currently before State Treasury, requesting funds for the construction of a road from the Eyre Highway to the newly constructed Miltaburra Area School.

It is of concern to council that the Government has constructed a new school in a rural area, without ensuring that safe road access to the school is provided. Council do not see that its ratepayers should fund such a project and note that Karcultaby Area School was serviced with a bitumen access road upon its completion.

As the Miltaburra school access road is a special road project, council is of the opinion that the Government should deal with it in a special, specific manner and so ensure the road safety of adults and children frequenting the school. Council seek your assistance regarding this matter.

I really hope that the Highways Department and the Education Department can get their act together to deal with this matter. A beautiful new school, costing \$3.3 million, has been provided, but there was a terrible crossing, and it was lucky that an accident did not occur there. I sincerely hope that something is done about the matter.

I refer to the matter of preschools in my electorate. The current level of funding for preschools is a matter that concerns me. I do not know a great deal about what is happening in other areas, although I am aware of some of the problems on the fringe of my electorate. Currently, there is a real crisis in the Leigh Creek area: the preschool is absolutely bursting at the seams, and there can be no justification for further delays, put-offs or any other excuses in relation to constructing a new preschool.

Although the school has difficulties with lack of space, the preschool could fit very well into the school campus, and that is an urgent need. I appeal to the Minister of Education. The Commonwealth Government was penny-pinching when it reduced the funds to the State on this matter. I realise that the Commonwealth does not have an unlimited supply of money. As the Premier said in his budget speech, it is beyond the resources of the Treasury of any Government to meet the reasonable demands of the community. I recognise that, and I often have to tell that to people in my electorate, because it is foolish to go out and lift the expectations of the community and tell them that the Government has sufficient funds to meet every request; therefore, it is a matter of priorities.

It concerns me that places like the Festival Theatre continue to run at massive losses. I do not object to the Festival Theatre operating, but I believe that people who enjoy attending that theatre should pay more to do so. I make no apology for saying that, because I cannot justify to my electorate the subsidy of millions of dollars made to the Festival Theatre when we cannot get a new preschool at Leigh Creek and when parents are forced into severe financial embarrassment because they have to send their children away to get reasonable secondary education. The allowances which are paid to the parents of isolated children who attend secondary school in Adelaide are deplorable, and I believe that this is an area to which we must urgently address ourselves. It is imperative that all students be given the opportunity to matriculate: if they do not matriculate there is no way they can enter a tertiary institution. Therefore, it is important that the lousy few dollars they are paid be drastically increased.

I believe there should be a minimum State contribution of at least \$1 500—it is about \$1 500 for Queensland—plus the \$1 500 they can receive from the Commonwealth. I do not think people have any idea of the cost of sending a child to a private boarding school in Adelaide. Certain people have no alternative but to do this, and some parents have to borrow the money over a long period. As taxpayers, they are entitled to a reasonable go. It costs about \$2 500 per term to send a child to a boarding school, plus a number of other costs. It is bad enough for the children being away from home. I do not know whether anyone has had much to do with boarding schools. We have had the actions of Senator Susan Ryan—

**Mr Ferguson:** Did you go to one?

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, I did.

**Mr Ferguson:** It must have been all right for you then. Look how far you've got.

**Mr GUNN:** If that is the standard of debate in which members opposite are going to engage—because some of us have had the privilege of getting elected to this place—no wonder the people concerned are being discriminated against. It is deplorable that this could be regarded as a joking matter. I would like members opposite to go out and talk to some of those people who make tremendous sacrifices to send their children to secondary schools in Adelaide. It is not because they want to; they have no alternative. In my judgment, it is more important to give those parents a subsidy to send their children to school than to subsidise the Festival Theatre.

I recognise that we have to have a public transport system in this State. It probably should be more efficient, but if we can afford to put nearly \$100 million into the State Transport Authority we can provide more money for school buses, for example. That is an area that the Minister of Education was confronted with recently in court—where privatisation can save money. We cannot afford to continue to spend money willy-nilly in certain areas while allowing these other areas I have mentioned to go unfunded.

The sort of areas of which I am speaking are areas that provide export income. We know what has happened to the rural industry. I want to conclude by quoting one or two things stated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which said:

With a 5 per cent decline in the volume of rural output and a 6 per cent price increase expected in 1985-86, the gross value of production is forecast to fall by 1 per cent to \$15 440 million. A decline of \$600 million is expected for wheat, with livestock slaughtering increasing by \$477 million.

The report further states:

The value of exports of rural origin is expected to rise by 2 per cent to \$10 700 million in 1985-86. There is likely to be some improvement in export prices, but the index of the volume of exports of rural origin is forecast to fall by 1 per cent.

Those figures clearly demonstrate the importance of the rural industry to this State and the nation.

I have not spoken at any length about the problems associated with elderly citizens homes, but I recently received a letter from the Minister of Mines and Energy, which stated:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 26 August concerning the electricity tariff applied to elderly citizens homes.

They are currently charged at a commercial rate. That involves a huge cost to these homes which are doing a great job looking after our elderly citizens, enabling them to spend their declining and twilight years in their own community, which is where they should be. The letter further states:

In March of this year I established a working party to review energy pricing and tariff structures. The working party is chaired by Dr Malcolm Messenger, director of the Energy Division in my department.

The letter further states:

The review covers both electricity and gas tariffs and all classes consumers. The matters raised in your letter relating to elder citizens homes are already being addressed by the working party—

It is all very well to address them, but I would like to see some action taken. I believe that it is more important to look after those people who cannot really look after themselves than to continue subsidising the Festival Theatre. There is also the case of millions of dollars being spent on the D&J Fowler building. I say that it has to be a matter of priorities. I also believe that, when examining that sort of finance, one has to look at the long-term benefits that will flow from that building, the income that is going to be generated, and the employment that it will generate.

I mention those two buildings in the context of considering a preschool at Leigh Creek, and extending water works to Ceduna which would provide export income to my constituents. We must have coal and we must have education. There was also talk about cutting out school buses in my electorate in the middle of the school year and I have had to fight for their retention. We are talking about providing adequate housing for teachers, and there are problems taking place at Woomera, yet we are prepared to spend good money after bad on some of these crazy projects.

I mentioned a few moments ago the effects of taxation. I now refer to capital taxes in this State. For years we had to fight to eliminate death and succession duties. If they had continued, they would have destroyed the agricultural base of this country and small business. No reasonable economic family farms would have been left if succession duties had continued. The crazy Government that currently manages the economy has allowed the money supply to go mad. We have the weakest dollar that we have had for many years, yet the Government is crazily dipping its hands in the taxpayers pockets. The latest attempt to introduce a capital gains tax, in my view, is an act of madness, particularly with the inbuilt death duties component. In conclusion, the *Small Business Review* said:

A capital gains tax on small business and farms would be one more socialistic nail in the coffin of free enterprise in Australia.

The article further states:

A capital gains tax on small business goodwill will destroy growth, investment and employment.

I hope that this budget is in the interests of the people of this State. I look forward to the budget committee deliberations when I will raise many matters.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton):** As this is National Aborigine Week I will relay to members a little of the legends of Aborigines in the electorate where I live. The track taken by the legendary hero Tjilbruke went from Kingston Park to Cape Jervis. Tjilbruke's springs at Kingston Park, Hallett Cove, Port Noarlunga, Red Ochre Cove (Maslin's Beach), Port Willunga, Sellicks Hill, Normanville, Second Valley, Rapid Bay and Cape Jervis gave life and pleasure to the Kurna Aborigines. Today they are popular and favoured centres enjoyed by the public. Stone monuments and plaques designed by Adelaide sculptor John Dowie stand at Kingston Park on the Bluff, which gives rise to this legend.

Among the few local legends to survive is a fascinating story telling of the formation of the many coastal springs on the Fleurieu Peninsula. The mythical being credited with the creation of these water supplies was named Tjilbruke. His story began when he rose out of the ground near Mount Hayfield about eight kilometres south-west of Bald Hills in the Hundred of Yankalilla. During winter this hero lived in the scrub at the camp of two men named Lepuldawi and Watiriorn represented by two dominant hills. Tjilbruke spent the summer at the coastal end of his hunting territory at Rapid Head. One day the rumour reached Tjilbruke that his sister's son had been killed near the Sturt River at Marion.

The supplementary development plan refers to burial grounds along the last remaining natural flowing section of the Sturt River. The young boy had broken a strict taboo which forbade him to kill emus. As a result he had been struck down at the precise moment when he was raking the head of an emu from the fire.

The body of the dead youth had been taken to a place near Brighton, where, in accordance with ancient custom, it was being smoked and dried. Upon arrival at the beach Tjilbruke seized the body and took it back to a spring on the beach at Marino (located on the Kingston Park reserve) where the smoking process was completed. Tjilbruke then gathered the body in his arms and carried it along the coast until he came to a spot near Hallett Cove where he rested with his burden. Overcome with grief, tears began to stream down his face and fall to the ground. A spring of water rose up to provide a permanent supply for successive generations of Aborigines.

Tjilbruke soon recovered sufficiently to resume his sad journey. Upon reaching Port Noarlunga he broke into tears again. Travelling on, he came to Red Ochre Cove, where he cried yet again and another spring came up from the soil, moistened by his tears. Tjilbruke then went on to a place a few hundred yards south of the old Port Willunga jetty. The tide was out so he sat down on the damp sand. Another flood of grief at the fate of his young nephew caused tears to fall on the sand, creating another spring. To this day fresh water can be found by digging in the sand at this spot while the tide is low.

The old man carried the body on to the beach at Sellicks Hill where he noticed a fine bay where sea salmon could be caught at night. He could not control himself and tears flowed down his face, bringing another permanent spring into existence.

Tjilbruke's wearisome journey along the coast continued beyond Myponga to a spot just south of Carrickalinga Head where a small swamp marks one of his resting places. He then went to Kongaratingga, where there is a cave in the

hillside. He camped near a small creek half a mile to the south. Before reaching the cave, Tjilbruke sat down and cried, bringing into being a small flowing spring. He did not enter the cave but walked south, passing the mouth of the creek and along the coastal cliffs as far as Cape Jervis. From Cape Jervis he returned northwards skirting the foreshore below the cliffs, eventually coming to another cave called Janarwing. He left his nephew's smoked body at the entrance while he walked into the darkness to find a suitable ledge where it could be deposited. He put up sticks in the manner used when smoking a body. The remains were carried in, placed on the platform and abandoned.

Tjilbruke did not emerge from the cave but continued into the hill until he saw the sun shining through a high crevice. He climbed up and, upon emerging on top of the hill near a swampy lagoon, transformed himself into an ibis. Tjilbruke spends the remainder of his days catching fish in the lagoon. The springs created during this Dreamtime epic are identified places associated with ancient camp sites. It is tragic that the uncontrolled metropolitan sprawl is destroying many of these last traces of the long occupation of the Adelaide Plains and Fleurieu Peninsula by the first Australians.

I would like to cite a small piece from *The History of Marion on the Sturt*, which was recently released by the Marion council. There is some reference to the Kurna tribe of Aborigines (or Adelaide Plains Aborigines) in the book. The encroachment of farming and pastoral activity on the land deprived the Aborigines of the very basis of their physical livelihood and their social, cultural and spiritual life. Introduced diseases have had devastating effects. The fate of the Kurna tribe was no different from that of the Tasmanian Aborigines.

In addressing Aborigines in this very special week—National Aborigines Week—we could all take some measure of the history of our State and the people who were the original South Australians and Australians.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I would like to refer to the subject on which I spoke earlier tonight—recreation and sport. First, a shemozzle has developed at Olympic Sports Field. The Government has decided to spend \$1 million to redevelop the sports field, for which it should be complimented. However, the Government has now decided to step in and take over total management of that centre. This falls in line with the more recent purchase of the pistol club at Virginia, which has been taken over in totality, with the introduction of a management system controlled by the department.

Instead of associations and individuals controlling the destiny of their sport, the Minister, through his department, now has very direct control in management of sport and, in particular, of the facilities. In relation to Olympic Sports Field, there have been few negotiations or attempts to get the bodies concerned to sit down harmoniously and agree on a future committee structure.

A situation exists at the Olympic Sportsfield whereby there is joint use, with the soccer club and the Athletics Association using the field for six months at a time. Both clubs have spent considerable sums of money on facility development and general upgrading of administrative facilities on that site. Burnside council owns the grounds and maintains the oval during the year.

The Government is attempting to set up a management committee that will totally take over the running of this sportsfield. It will remove the rights of the Athletics Association of South Australia and the rights and ownership of the Soccer Federation. In their place it will appoint a committee consisting of four members from the Burnside council, one member from the Department of Recreation and

Sport, and four members from other bodies. In other words, the people who have used and developed this facility will have their voting and controlling rights taken away. I support the need for better management of all facilities in which the Government has significant financial investment. What I do not support is a total takeover by a Government of any persuasion of the management of sports facilities.

I will now comment briefly on the recreation and sport budget. At first glance one sees an increase of \$1.6 million on the recurrent payment side of the budget. That looks like a startling increase, and on the surface it appears as though sporting bodies will benefit significantly from a large cash flow into the sport and recreation area. Fortunately, when one looks further, one sees that Treasury has not put \$1.5 million extra into the budget. What it has done is take an extra \$500 000 out of the Sport and Recreation Fund, a special fund set up three years ago to be used in capital areas and in special recurrent areas. That money is now being used specifically in an increase on the recurrent side of the budget.

Secondly, one finds that there has been a massive increase in administration staff and a massive increase in administration expenses, an increase totalling \$250 000. When one looks at 'grants and advances to associations' one sees that the people in this department have been specifically set up to pass money through in their administration to support them in the grants area.

One finds that only \$16 000, a meagre 1.4 per cent increase, has occurred in the area of grants and advances. On the surface it looks as though there has been a very significant increase so far as the associations are concerned, but most of the money has ended up in administration costs, directly in staff costs or in administration increases.

So far as the racing and gambling part of the department is concerned, it appears as though there has been a minor increase in line with inflation. In the intra-agency support area, the area which basically backs up the department, one finds that again administration expenses have increased by \$460 000, a massive 152 per cent increase in administration costs. We also have the figure of accommodation costs that have significantly increased by 30 per cent.

In summary, we have the situation that the total administration and clerical expenses of the department have increased by 16 per cent, almost twice the rate of inflation, and the total administration expenses for equipment and sundry areas have increased by \$540 000—a 119 per cent increase in administration expenses. One wonders why sporting associations and recreational bodies in the community are asking where the money is going. They are asking why there are not increases in budget expenditure for sporting and recreation bodies, yet all we are doing is increasing the costs to the department. Associations and sporting bodies are getting very little increase in this area.

Now I come down to the big one, capital payments, and one sees that \$2.7 million is going to the Aquatic Centre. I refer to the Auditor-General's Report; we were told that the final cost would be \$7.2 million, but the Housing and Construction Department now says it will be about \$8.2 million. In the last three or four months we have added an extra \$1 million to the cost of the Aquatic Centre.

It is also interesting to note in regard to the Aquatic Centre that for the second year in a row the Auditor-General has said that the department is still negotiating with Adelaide City Council to pick up the deficit on the centre. This is the second time in two years that the Minister has been told that it is about time he negotiated with the council and ascertained what the true deficit is and made an agreement. I find it unbelievable that the Auditor-General again should have to tell the Minister that it is about time he got out and did the simple exercise of finding how much it will



cost the State and the Government in deficit finance in that area.

This House has known for longer than six months that the cost would be about \$7.2 million, but suddenly it is \$8.2 million. Now we have the Minister saying that we can have a \$4.4 million project at Glenelg. He has only \$1.8 million in his budget for capital expenses. How will he fit that in and pay for the \$1 million that he has already put out for Olympic Sportsfield?

He has only \$800 000 to spend, but what about the \$4.4 million? That shows the sort of nonsense that the Minister is putting out to the community, and again the sporting and recreational community has been conned.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I just want to make some comments about the previous speaker's utterances to this House which I find rather peculiar, because the pistol club was not taken over by the Government: it surrendered itself to the Government. It said, 'Take us.' It had a capital investment that it could not service, would not service, and it would have gone bankrupt. It was certainly not a takeover by the Government. It gave itself to the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The difference is real—it is voluntary. Tonight I want to talk about garbage, but not the stuff we are getting from the other side of the House. It is household refuse and other stuff collected from houses by corporations. Some time in late 1984 or early 1985 the Corporation of the City of Enfield took this decision:

We raise no objections to Cleanaway approaching residents on a private basis.

The council neither supported nor rejected Cleanaway's introducing a 240 litre mobile garbage bin service at Enfield. The corporation decided it would not interfere if it was decided to introduce this service.

It is all said in the report in the *Messenger* on the basis that the Enfield corporation's unlimited collection of household refuse would still continue. The then Manager for Cleanaway said that it would order new equipment for its trucks. I wrote to the corporation at that time, indicating my concern because Cleanaway was going to hire these bins to residents who wanted that service. I contacted Cleanaway, wanting to know what the cost would be. It told me \$31.20 per annum. I wanted to acquire a bin of my own. Cleanaway told me that it would not sell one to me or collect it from me. Yet, I knew that the Naracoorte corporation had introduced a service based on the same mobile garbage bin and was charging ratepayers \$50 a bin on purchase. The bins were guaranteed for 10 years, and it would buy them back from ratepayers if they did not want the bin after a while.

The city of Brighton, at the time that I made an inquiry earlier this year, was selling bins to its residents at \$44 per bin. Brighton also had modified its truck at a cost of \$3 000. Inquiries at Brighton and Naracoorte indicated that as these corporations collected their own rubbish there was no extra cost in collecting the rubbish: in other words, it did not take any longer to collect the rubbish. Cleanaway, when it was approached, said that it would introduce that service later. In June this year the Walkerville council was going to introduce a similar service, except that it would sell the bins to its residents at \$43.50. At around that time, all the residents of Enfield received from Cleanaway a brochure that advised them of an alternative domestic collection service. It would cost 75c a week, which works out to \$39 per annum. There is a cost increase there from \$31 to \$39 in the space of six months.

When I made further inquiries in respect of this matter, I found that the service fee of 75c a week would be an

average increase on the average rate of 12.6 per cent. When one considers that the Enfield corporation paid Cleanaway in the 1984-85 financial year \$380 000 for the collection of rubbish from about 25 000 residents, one realises that it would work out at about 30c per week to collect the rubbish. Cleanaway wanted 75c per week to add its bin on to it. In other words, it wanted a 250 per cent increase to collect the rubbish from the people of Enfield who took up their option.

If one looks at how this money is made up, one can see, working on a basis of the bin costing \$45—which is being generous because Cleanaway gets them for a bit less than that—and assuming an interest rate of 17 per cent on the capital, that it would be a 1.4c per week cost to service the interest rate on that basis.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What are you talking about?

**Mr GREGORY:** I am talking about privatisation, and the honourable member will realise just what it means. If he works it out on a two-year capital recovery, the honourable member will see that it is 52.9c per week. On three years (which I have been advised by rubbish collectors is a fair assessment), it comes out at 28.8c a week. That would mean that after Cleanaway had serviced its debt of interest and capital repayment it would have 44.4c left out of 75c, which would be for promotion and for sending the bills. So, that is not a bad effort—privatisation in the local government area where the residents will be robbed and charged outrageously.

I then had some discussions with the Manager at Cleanaway, who disputed the fact that the garbage runners would collect the same amount of rubbish and lift from the same number of houses per week. He said that it was a 25 per cent increase in time. However, 25 per cent of 30c, which they are now paying to Enfield corporation, works out to 7.5c.

If one works that out, one will find that after Cleanaway has paid on the basis of three-year capital repayments, an interest rate of 17 per cent and an extra increase in time, it was clearing a profit of 47.6 per cent. That is not a bad rip off—and that is just exactly what it is, a straight out blatant rip off. It is an example of what is happening when people are allowed unlimited rein in a captive market. That is what happens.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The honourable member should sit there and behave himself and comply with Standing Orders. He should stop trying to interrupt.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

**Mr GREGORY:** I refer to comments made by the Brighton corporation, which experienced no increase in the time taken for rubbish collection. It has about 4 500 residents using the bins—about half the residents in the district. It said that injuries to runners and persons involved in the collection have been reduced by 50 per cent since the bins were introduced just over 12 months ago. It said that theft of bins was no problem and that they were selling at a rate of between 15 to 50 a week. They were going to put two hydraulic lifters on the back of the trucks but found that they only needed one. They believed they had reached about saturation point.

An interesting aspect is that the Manager of Cleanaway was quite clear about the advantages of the mobile garbage bin. He said that it was mobile, that the act of putting out the garbage was easier, and that it was vermin and dog proof. Another important benefit to councils was that the carts were easy to handle and hydraulically lifted in specially equipped trucks. They reduced the risk of injury to workers and the subsequent high workers compensation costs. We have a process that reduces the costs, and improves the safety of workers. Private enterprise, in being allowed to

take what action it felt it should, was able to have a massive and outrageous charge finishing up with a 47.6 per cent profit on that investment. It is really ripping off ratepayers. If that is an example of the proposals for privatisation that members opposite have been talking about, we can see charges going up and up. Either that will occur or services will go down, and that is precisely what is happening in

Enfield. The services have not decreased, but the charges have certainly gone up.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 12 September at 2 p.m.