

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 October 1985

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Native Vegetation Management,
Planning Act Amendment (No. 4),
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 4),
South Australian Heritage Act Amendment,
South Australian Heritage Act Amendment (No. 2),
Valuation of Land Act Amendment.

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 132 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish at Port Augusta the first arid lands botanic garden was presented by the Hon. G.F. Keneally.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOMOSEXUAL INFLUENCES

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Equal Opportunity Act to protect children from homosexual influences at school was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 145 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PRESCHOOL FUNDING

Petitions signed by 51 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on pre-school education were presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick and Mr Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 1 357 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement a neighbourhood watch program in the western suburbs of Adelaide during 1986-87 was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in

Hansard: Nos 27, 29, 40 to 42, 51, 83, 89, 93, 99, 100, 104, 107, 115, 118, 125, 127, 149, 156, 157, 160, 161, 164, 167, 173, 175, 176, 181, 183, 185 to 187, 190 to 194, 196 to 198, 200, 202, 203, 206, 207, 210 to 212, and 215.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the statement from the Registrar of members' interests, 1985.

Ordered that statement be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act, 1984—General Regulations, 1985.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—
South Australian Housing Trust Report, 1984-85.
Payroll Tax Act, 1971—Regulations—Travelling and Accommodation Allowance.
Parliamentary Superannuation Fund Trustees—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Small Business Corporation of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1984-85.
State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.
State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Planning Act, 1982—Regulations—Shopping Developments.
South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Police Pensions Fund—Report, 1984.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Lands—Crown Lands Act, 1929—Closer Settlement—Return, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1984-85.
Poultry Farming Licensing Committee—Report, 1984-85.
Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—Whyalla—Cowled's Landing Aquatic Reserve.

By Command—
South Australian Council on Technological Change—Report, 1985.
South Australian Egg Board—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Highways Act, 1926—Regulations—Highways Fund.
Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board—Report, 1984-85.
State Supply Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.
Public Supply and Tender Act, 1914—Regulations—Revocation.
Medical Practitioners Act, 1983—Regulations—Registration Fees.
Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.
Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1984-85.

Parks Community Centre—Report, 1984-85.
 City of Noarlunga—By-law No. 17—Traffic.
 Local Government Finance Authority Act, 1983—Regulations—Associated Organisations.
 Local Government, Department of—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Classification of Publication Act, 1974—Regulations—Builders Licensing Act, 1967—Regulations—Building Indemnity Scheme.

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1983-84.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1984-85.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: HOME LOAN ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER: I have to advise that I have this day received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:

Mr Speaker,

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move:

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That this House demands that the Government immediately review, before its final implementation, the assistance scheme announced last week for borrowers from building societies.

Yours sincerely,
 John Olsen,
 Leader of the Opposition.

Will those honourable members supporting the motion please stand in their places?

Members having risen:

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That this House demands that the Government immediately review, before its final implementation, the assistance scheme announced last week for borrowers from building societies.

For more than three years the Labor Party in South Australia has played seedy politics over the issue of home interest rates. Last week, it reached new depths of desperation and deception. It offered an election bribe. The Party's federal poll—reaffirmed today in the *News*—indicated that Labor was in trouble over interest rates in South Australia, so something had to be done in a hurry.

The Premier had been caught out in all the exploitation he has attempted since 1982 of the hardships and miseries of people facing rising home loan repayments. So, a scheme was concocted that offers the executive in Springfield with a building society loan some relief at the taxpayers' expense—until after the election, that is—while the clerk in Semaphore, struggling to meet commitments on a trading bank loan, will get nothing at all. That is the discrimination of the Government scheme. The scheme announced last week by the Premier is so thoughtless, so arbitrary and so outrageously expedient that it must be immediately reviewed.

I make clear at the outset that this is not something that a Liberal Government would have done. We have a much healthier respect for the taxpaying public. We believe that they want their taxes used properly, responsibly, and fairly. They can see through the bribing, pork-barrelling and vote buying in which this Government is indulging in its efforts to retain office. Government by opinion poll has replaced responsible and honest government.

Later, I will say what any honest government would have done when faced with these circumstances—and I do not ignore the difficulties. For many years, the provision of adequate and affordable housing was treated as a bipartisan issue by the major Parties in South Australia, but the present Premier changed all that in 1982. He embarked on a reckless campaign to dupe home buyers into believing that they would get a better deal under Labor.

In 1982, 'crisis' was a word that the Premier frequently used when referring to the housing situation. If home buyers faced a crisis in 1982, they are now confronted by a catastrophe. They are facing real interest rates that are about eight times higher than they were in 1982. Those seeking their first home loan are looking at interest rates in excess of 15 per cent from the State Bank and the building societies.

Most people on the average wage will find it impossible even to contemplate buying a new home at today's prices and interest rates, so they are forced to look to rental, where the Labor Party's negative gearing and capital gains tax are going to put them into further serious trouble, or they go onto the Housing Trust waiting list which, by the end of this financial year, is expected to total 37 000 applicants—9 000 more than when this Government came to office.

I remind members of some of the accusations the Premier levelled against the former Government when he moved a no-confidence motion on housing on 21 July 1982. He referred to 'the most desperate housing crisis that we have had for probably 50 years in this State'. Again quoting his words, he said, 'This is the biggest immediate social problem that we currently face, much of the cause of it due to the ever increasing interest rates for borrowers.'

The present Minister of Housing and Construction followed the Premier in that debate and dealt with three factors which he said constituted a housing crisis. They were: a marked slow down in investment in the building of private rental accommodation; frustrated home buyers remaining in the private rental sector and being unable to meet not only the deposit gap but also the high interest repayments; and the Housing Trust waiting list (then 9 000 fewer than it will be at the end of this year).

I am glad to say that, since those statements, the Minister has now seen the light, and I am glad that he is paying attention to the debate. He realises just how much his Party has misled home buyers. He knows that it will soon be called to account. Let the House note what the Minister said during the Estimates Committees last week. As well as predicting the return of the present member for Elizabeth, he said:

I accept that the mood of the electorate could mean that the member for Light is sitting in this chair next year. I am a realist. I am pleased that the Minister acknowledges all the opinion polls around the country as well as the one in today's *News*.

The Minister and his Government may want to be realists now—but it is a little late. For more than three years they have been content to mislead home buyers. Now, within weeks of an election, the Labor Party is again showing that its only answer to problems is to throw money at them. But, this time, this panic gesture has rebounded. It has been widely rejected and it has been seen for what it is. The Government has been found out.

It is trying to bribe the 25 000 people who hold building society loans, while it ignores the increasing difficulties

faced by many of the 84 700 other home buyers in South Australia who have non-concessional loans from the major trading banks. I do not deny the need for some assistance to those who simply cannot make ends meet and face the threat of foreclosure of their loan and eviction.

However, it is impossible, as well as unprincipled, to draw a line and simply say that all building society borrowers, no matter what their financial circumstances, should get Government assistance, and that the burden of that assistance should be placed on all taxpayers, while virtually all other borrowers will get no assistance whatsoever. Nothing could be more likely to encourage envy, greed and division within the community. Nothing could be more calculated to encourage a complete loss of confidence in the probity and propriety of Government. Nothing is more unprecedented and unfair.

The Government has done this for one reason only. It made interest rates a political issue, an election issue, in 1982. Now it is suffering the backlash. It is beyond dispute that Labor Party policies are a major factor both in the rise in interest rates and the rise in the cost of housing and rental accommodation. The higher spending and bigger borrowing policies of the Federal and State Labor Governments have made heavy demands on capital in the money markets. As well, the declining value of the Australian dollar has put further pressure on domestic interest rates. They are remaining high to protect the dollar.

Let me illustrate just how difficult it is becoming for a new home buyer to enter the market. In June 1984, the average loan approved by a building society in South Australia was \$39 000. The monthly repayment on that amount over 30 years was \$424—the equivalent of 28.6 per cent of average monthly earnings. In June 1985 (just a year later), the average loan approved by a building society had increased to \$53 000. At an interest rate of 14.75 per cent, the monthly repayment on that loan was \$660. It will increase \$31 to \$691 following the implementation of the latest interest rate rise approved by the Premier. That will be 44.4 per cent of average monthly earnings.

Because lenders, as a general rule, require that monthly loan repayments fall within the 25 per cent to 32 per cent range of salaries or wages, these rises over the past 12 months will make it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for people on the average wage to enter the home buying market. Now, all the Premier can say is that he is puzzled. The *News* of 9 September—a month and one further increase away—stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, today hedged around the question of whether he would approve another rise. 'I'm still puzzled about why interest rates are climbing. I know what reasons are being given but they do not seem to me to be logical explanations,' he said.

After being wrong on three occasions, the Premier is still predicting a fall, despite the reports of most economists, including the State Bank report released yesterday. The Premier's confidence about any easing of interest rates is ill-founded, to say the least. Home buyers seeking loans now face a grim situation, yet they will get not one ounce of support from the scheme announced last week.

The Premier said that the move would help to ensure that home building activity is not curtailed. That is nonsense. A decline is already apparent. Yesterday's State Bank report noted that the Indicative Planning Council for the Housing Industry, in its latest report, had projected private dwelling commencements in 1985-86 in South Australia to fall by 26 per cent on last financial year. It went on to comment:

Recent increases in home loan rates now suggest a somewhat greater fall.

It is just sheer fabrication for the Premier to justify his election bribe on the need to maintain activity in the building industry, because it will do nothing to help any applicant for a home loan over the next six months.

As a further smokescreen, the Premier has talked about the deregulation of home interest rates. He had his Press Secretary on the phone early this morning to radio stations, trying to beef up that argument yet again. What he deliberately ignores in raising it is that 56 per cent of home loans in South Australia are not in any way affected by Reserve Bank ceilings on interest rates. This applies to the State Bank's new market rates, in particular.

While the Premier grandstands on the deregulation question, the State Bank, which is a Government guaranteed institution that he owns, has put a great deal of heat on interest rates by pursuing its policy of market rates for home buyers. This is not a policy which the State Bank in Victoria or the Rural and Industries Development Bank in Western Australia has followed. All their home lending has remained within the Reserve Bank ceiling.

I understand, however, that last financial year, 5 800 loans, or 65 per cent of the State Bank's home lending, were at market rates. Market rates from the State Bank are higher than the building societies for all loans over \$50 000. The implementation of the State Bank's venture into market rates for home loans has caused considerable confusion to borrowers. The Opposition has been inundated with complaints, as I understand Government members have also. It appears that borrowers were not adequately informed about the full implications of market rate loans.

The State Bank, in its annual report, proudly proclaims that its share of the home loan market increased from under 20 per cent to close to 50 per cent last financial year. As I have pointed out, well over half this business was written at rates that are not governed by regulation. In supporting the activities of the State Bank, the Premier is being what one could call an absolute hypocrite in, at the same time, talking about deregulation as though it helps all home borrowers in South Australia. I have no doubt that the criticism the State Bank has attracted in recent weeks about increases in its market rates prompted the announcement of a three month freeze in interest rates. However, that was nothing more than another slick piece of public relations, because the bank had already announced earlier in September that its interest rates would go up from 1 October by half a per cent. It has also warned that this will have to be reviewed early in 1986. In this context, a three month freeze amounts to little, if any, comfort at all for the thousands of State Bank borrowers now on market rates.

It is regrettable that the State Bank has, to some extent, fallen into the same trap as the Premier in trying to put a gloss on the interest rates issue. The assistance scheme announced last week is completely selective and creates a dubious precedent about the way in which the Premier is prepared to use taxpayers funds to save him from further political fallout after his assurances earlier this year that pressure on interest rates would ease.

Instead of such an arbitrary move, the Premier should convene immediately a conference on representatives of all lending institutions—the banks as well as the building societies. That conference should discuss the problems which all home buyers (and I repeat 'all home buyers') are having in meeting their repayments. It should assess what the lending institutions themselves are able to do to alleviate the problems through an extension of the term of an individual's home loan, thereby avoiding the need to increase monthly repayments.

For those circumstances where only Government assistance can prevent foreclosure and eviction, the criteria for existing support schemes should be extended. In this way,

all home buyers would be eligible for consideration of Government assistance—not just building society borrowers. In 1982, a Joint Commonwealth-State mortgage and rent relief scheme was established by the former Federal and State Liberal Governments.

South Australia was the first State to accept the Commonwealth's offer to participate in this assistance program and the first of the States to make it operational. At the time, the present Premier complained that not enough was being done. Yet today, when the burden of interest rates is even higher, he can do nothing more than offer assistance in a highly selective and desperate way. Little thought has been given to how the Government will provide this assistance. A scheme has been cobbled together. I understand that as recently as this morning the building societies and the Treasury were still working out the details of the scheme.

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): That was a fine example of the Leader of the Opposition, in the course of his address and in his remarks, effectively proving that the strictures that he was levelling against the Government ought to be turned right back directly and specifically on him. For instance, he talked about expediency.

We were led to understand, I imagine from that, that what we were going to hear was a statesmanlike pronouncement with no question of referring to any sector or area of the electorate, any kind of political solutions, or whatever: it was all going to be very pure. In fact, the speech was totally schizophrenic. It is really separated into two bits, so that paragraphs can be chopped out very nicely perhaps and incorporated in letters or statements, depending on which audience he is addressing. It was a total example of trying to have it all ways at once and coming out with absolutely nothing.

To be lectured about cynical exploitation of an issue when we hear the sorts of advertisements running around the so-called law and order issue of the current Opposition is just outrageous. But, let us leave that and look specifically at the area of home loans. The Leader's speech was schizophrenic. On the one hand, in addressing the economic rationalists—the Thatcherite economists—in whom the Leader of the Opposition is putting all his future hopes for South Australia in terms of his policy, such as one could call it, in trying to curry favour with John Howard, his new Federal Leader, after his enthusiastic endorsement of the previous one and his abortive attempt to prop him up in Canberra, the Leader is confronted with the reality of a hard line economic rationalist Friedmanite and Thatcherite, in the form of John Howard, who wants to lift the lid totally on any kind of control of housing rates.

To appeal to that sector, the Leader of the Opposition devoted part of his speech to how nothing should be done. He would do nothing; it was terrible that the Government had acted in this manner. Do we not understand that there are forces beyond and above the Government of South Australia in relation to interest rates? Are we not distorting the market by intervening in this way? That was a particular aspect of his speech. Then, of course, the Leader double flipped and went back in completely the opposite direction by saying that on the other hand we should do everything about the scheme that the Government has proposed and that the sorts of measures we have taken, bearing in mind the constraints that we have, do not go far enough. There is discrimination involved, and we should be doing more in this, that and the other direction.

First, let us try to understand, if it is possible, just what the Opposition is going to do—what it proposes in relation to this area. I can see, and always did see both in govern-

ment and in opposition, the problems that one has in the macro area of control of interest rates. Let me quote from that same debate on 21 July 1982. With the housing industry at its lowest ebb since the Great Depression, with enormous problems including bankruptcy, with people having to sell their homes, and with values slumping, we moved a no-confidence motion condemning the housing policies of the then Government. It was interesting to see that on that occasion the Government, supported by many of those members opposite, turned that motion around into a praise event for the marvellous things that it was doing in this area. What an extraordinary thing!

Now, of course, the Opposition is trying to hammer this Government, which has the best housing record of any Government in this country in the last 40 years. Even there the then Premier had this to say:

The Leader—

referring to me—

generously spent a very small fraction of the time available for his speech—

it was more than that, and it was constantly more than that—

saying that he accepts that State Governments cannot in any way control interest rates, or indeed exert any influence on the level of interest rates which are set on the national money markets and to some extent on the international money market. Having given some token acknowledgement of that fact—

I certainly went much further than that and have consistently done so in government and in opposition, which is far different from the cynical and exploiting approach of the current Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts—

the Leader then turned around and spent the rest of his speech doing the very best he could to lay the blame for interest rate increases and spirals at the door of the South Australian Government.

He went on to say:

I totally refute his suggestion that the South Australian Government is to blame for the situation, either for high interest rates or, indeed, for any difficulty with housing or with the provision of adequate housing, particularly for those in the low-income group, because the record shows that those suggestions are totally without foundation.

That was the approach of the previous Government. It washed its hands of the matter and changed a motion in this House to congratulate itself for the disaster it was wreaking, all members, including the Leader of the Opposition who has just spoken, voting in support of that self-congratulation for a do-nothing policy. We are not prepared to sit back and do nothing. While recognising the great difficulties involved, we have attempted to do something to at least arrest and alleviate the problem.

What has the Leader of the Opposition said on the one hand, having hoped for his headline in the *Financial Review* about what a great economic rationalist he is, and on the other hoping for his headlines in the local Messenger newspapers as to how he is going to step in and do something for everybody and not just particular sectors of the community? Having had it both ways, he proposes to call a conference of the Parties. I do not knock that; I think that is a very useful and important process, and we follow that in Government in a whole range of areas.

Indeed, my colleague established such a conference to look at the building industry, but I seem to recall that every time that is mentioned we get attacked and criticised by members opposite. 'Act,' they say 'don't talk about it.' 'You're having a powwow,' says the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. How many times have we heard him say that? These Opposition members, who are all for action on this key issue, have now apparently adopted the powwow philosophy, in their terms. I am interested to see what the Deputy

Leader of the Opposition tells us about this suggestion of his Leader, of sitting back and doing nothing.

It may be appropriate for there to be such conferences. In this area, the occasion may arise when that becomes necessary, but we deemed it necessary in the current circumstances to take some action, to do something for people in their housing dilemma and problems and to try to ensure that, pending a clear indication of what the trends might be, they had some relief.

That is exactly what we have done. Far from being discriminatory, it has gone to all those in some way or another who have some kind of protection. The Leader of the Opposition outlines to us, as one side of his schizophrenic speech, a great problem in this area, but he has no proposal on what he is going to do about it. He debunks the idea of there being some kind of limit on bank general housing loans. We know why he has to do that: because the federal policy of his Party is to lift them, and it has consistently advocated the decontrolling of interest rates. When he was pinned down and asked what were his views, he ducked for cover and had nothing to say.

My colleague issued three or four statements before the Leader leapt into the arena and, from Alice Springs or somewhere, made some limp rejoinder that he might think about keeping on the controls or advocating them. I suggest that that is symptomatic of the Leader's whole approach in this area on every point. He then talks about the Housing Trust waiting list. He says that this list has increased: yes, it certainly has. It is a matter of great concern that it has increased, but it has increased against a background of postwar record construction of Housing Trust dwellings on a program conceived, executed and funded by this Government in association with the Commonwealth Government. In other words, rather than simply saying that there is a problem and that we must sit back and let market forces deal with it—let the devil take the hindmost: that is the sort of policy we have been getting from members opposite—we have actually done something about it, and we have pumped resources into the Housing Trust in order to ensure that it has a burgeoning, record breaking program.

The Leader of the Opposition says that for three years we have been misleading home buyers. I find that statement absolutely staggering against a background of a 1981-82 slump, the like of which we have not seen since the Great Depression—total misery and despair in the housing market, with people unable to be housed and people unable to sell houses because the values had slumped to their lowest. We had major problems affecting a key sector of our economy, workers being laid off and building companies going broke. It was in dire and diabolical straits. That was only three years ago—surely even the short-term memories of members opposite can encompass that span of time. We can contrast that with what has happened since we came to office. We announced that home and building construction would be central to our economic policy of rebuilding and redeveloping this economy, of instilling confidence in it and ensuring that jobs were created.

So, in both the public and private sectors we have seen record construction levels. It may well be that they are levelling out currently, but that is a good thing because we cannot, year after year, go to high records without creating some sort of further housing crisis. We have been very careful about how we try to fine tune the market place, but there is no question that in both the private and public sectors we have seen more resources, more energy and more activity put into housing than at any other time in the immediate postwar period. It has been accompanied by the Home Ownership Made Easy Scheme and all sorts of other assistance to low income groups who have had unprece-

dent opportunity to get into housing in the current situation.

The existing housing stock has seen values increasing and people getting better prices for their homes, if they have them. We have seen major projects such as the Golden Grove scheme—a private and public sector combined venture. To lecture us about housing is staggering and completely ignores the major contributions that we in that sector have made to the South Australian recovery. That brings me to the core of the debate. Why have we taken action and not done what the Opposition Leader would have us do, namely, twiddle our thumbs and say that it is out of our control? We have taken action because of the central role housing has played.

It has been part and parcel of economic confidence in this State. We do not want to see a hiccup in our economic development when we are poised to go on to a new plateau of activity. Those surveys and studies in the State Bank report referred to by the Leader of the Opposition make it clear that we can do that. We have the potential, but we can do it only if confidence is maintained in this economy, if the white-anting, the knocking and negativism of those opposite is rejected, and if the Government is seen to care and to do something.

So, we have taken action. First, for all South Australians in receipt of general loans from banks, we have advocated and maintained the ceiling of 13.5 per cent on interest rates. We have done that in representations to our federal colleagues, against the Opposition policy of getting rid of it, which would have hiked up the rates even further. So, there is protection in that sense.

For those who have taken general loans from the State Bank, a freeze has been announced and will be maintained. For those in the building societies we have taken the action that is the subject of debate, and it has been accepted and endorsed by all those 25 000 borrowers. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition tells them the truth about what he wants to do with their interest rates.

Finally, we have dealt with those cases of hardship. We have ensured that there are ways and means to allow people to stay in their homes, to extend their loans and to get assistance from the State. I am very proud indeed of our housing record, which is unparalleled by any Government since the war, and we intend to make sure that there is no hiccup in that, that the confidence is maintained, that people are able to stay in their houses, and that their houses will improve in value.

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

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Terry Hemmings doesn't—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): After hearing the Premier's contribution to this debate, one is not surprised that his Minister of Housing and Construction, who would be particularly concerned with this debate, confidently predicts his own demise and that of the Labor Government. Not only do we have unprecedented levels of interest rates in South Australia at the moment, but we have that unprecedented spectacle of a Minister saying to the House last week that the Government will be defeated. I must admit that he is more of a realist than I have given him credit for. The Premier seeks, in a very thin response to the Leader's remarks, to suggest that the Liberal Party sit back and do nothing. I remind the Premier of what the Liberal Party said when in government.

Mr Trainer: Nothing!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: 'Nothing', says the sage from the Whip's chair opposite. I remind him that the Liberal Party, in government, removed stamp duty for first

home buyers; to the end of August 22 200 home buyers were assisted. We removed land tax from the principal place of residence, and that helped every home buyer, including new home buyers, in South Australia. We increased the maximum loan from the State Bank from \$27 000 to \$33 000. We introduced a new low deposit rental purchase scheme. We also introduced a mortgage and rent relief scheme; and we were the first State in the nation to take up the assistance offered to subsidise this by the Commonwealth Government.

Moreover, we carried it further and introduced a 'home purchasers in crisis' scheme. It would be more profitable for the Premier if he were to listen a little more carefully to what the Leader said today in the positive approach that he advocated at the close of his speech, when he advocated action, but fair action, to assist all home buyers who were in difficulties, not just a selected few.

Let us get fact one established clearly: high interest rates across this nation and in South Australia are due entirely to the economic depredations of the Federal Labor Government and the State Labor Governments, particularly the State Labor Government in South Australia.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: 'Hollywood' sighs—a rather pained sigh, I might observe. But interest rates are at record levels in this nation—because we have record spending Governments, record deficit Governments, and record interest paying Governments. The average family must now pay \$20 a week extra (and on top of that \$8 a week extra in South Australia) to pay for the increased interest bill run up by the Federal Labor Government. The overseas borrowing debt has increased enormously and money is needed to pay the day-to-day expenses.

The loss of confidence and the financial capability of Labor Parties around this nation has led to an international lack of confidence in Australian currency and the necessity for Messrs Keating and Hawke to maintain an interest regime of this magnitude to try to prop up an appalling financial situation and an appalling fall in the value of the Australian dollar. That is fact one, and do not let anyone forget it: the high interest rate regime now at record levels around the nation is the direct result of Labor Party economic policies. So, do not let us be put off by the red herrings that the Premier draws across the trail.

The Premier has been very loud in his praise of the magnificent efforts of the State Bank—'the people's bank'. He has been hammering to death this business about deregulation. But, in fact, as the Leader has pointed out, the State Bank is not regulated, and building societies do not suffer the limit. The only sector of the housing industry which has this 13.5 per cent limit statutorily imposed is the trading banks—and they provide less than half the total number of housing loans.

Let us concentrate for a minute on the State Bank. The Premier has been loud in his praise of it. As I have said publicly, it has led the charge in this escalation of home loan interest rates not only in South Australia but around the nation. Of course, the State Bank is not regulated. It is all very well for the Premier to say that the State Bank has capped its interest rates: it raised them to record levels one week and capped them the next—very smart. Mr Marcus Clark took me to task, saying that some of the facts that I was putting to the public were not correct. I am referring to the bank which the Premier describes as 'the people's bank, which has done so much for the people of South Australia'.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I am knocking their policy, and I am quite proud to knock it, because they have led the charge around the nation—with the Premier's

support, mind you. Mr Marcus Clark suggested in the *Sunday Mail* that I did not have my facts straight. He then went on to laud the bank's lending policies. But quite obviously the trading banks have had to compete with this, and they have got around the ceiling limit by charging fees. It is all very well to set a 13.5 per cent ceiling, but the building societies are way above it. The State Bank is also way above it, and the sector that is regulated gets around that limit by charging fees. What a defence! As a result of the statement that I made publicly, I received a letter which I must read to the House. It referred to correspondence to the General Manager, Retail Banking, State Bank, and it is typical of the response that has been received. It stated:

I include copies of recent correspondence to the State Bank. My wife and I find that the State Bank has in fact conned us, even if unwittingly.

So, they were being charitable. It continued:

I hope you will continue to bring these matters up. I assure you that there are many people in the same position who welcome a politician talking about these matters, and I wish you all the best.

A letter addressed to the General Manager states:

Dear Sir,

My wife and I wish to protest most strongly—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, you can ask the bank to show you a copy, if you like. The letter continues: over your State Bank's misleading advertising after your merger last year.

The sage from Ascot Park is suggesting that this is a phoney letter. This letter went to the bank before it came to me, if the honourable member only knew it. It continues:

We applied for a home loan at the Woodville branch of the State Bank shortly after your advertising campaign had begun. The advertising told us your bank was offering fast home loans to anyone of credit worthiness and it was not necessary to even be a bank customer. We found out on applying the home loans were available quickly but however we would have to change over all our banking to the State Bank or no home loan. Of course we did not mind this at all as our present bank had a waiting period of six to nine months at that time.

Only recently media attention to home loans has brought to our attention the 13.5 per cent ceiling provided by the Government on home loans at banks. We were aware our rate had gone from the original 12¾ per cent to 13¾ per cent and now I have received your letter showing 14.5 per cent is to be charged.

The main point we wish to make is the home loan we received is now referred to as a market rate loan, apparently not within the normal home loan rate of 13.5 per cent. This we find to be quite a shock and of course is the reason for this letter.

When we applied for the home loan I asked many questions, one being what the interest rate was. I was told 12¾ per cent was the market rate. The term market rate to us meant the current interest rate being charged by the bank home loan market at the time. We were never made aware that this term meant otherwise. We were never told that the home loan we were entering into was inferior in quality and to be more costly to us than a normal bank home loan. I also refer you to copies of the letters from your bank where no mention is made of a market rate home loan as distinct from a home loan.

We must make it clear we were aware of the interest rate most probably would go up but only in terms of a normal home loan not what we now are to be charged, some \$68.60 a month more than when the loan started approximately 15 months ago.

Even the building societies are controlled in what they charge ...

Of course, they are not subject to the ceiling, but the Premier likes the people to think that they are. The letter continues:

You admit in your recent letter to us there is apparent confusion about the rate of interest you are charging. We are obviously not the only ones put in this position by the State Bank's misleading advertising and lack of information on what you were actually selling.

Let Mr Marcus Clark digest that. That is not Goldsworthy speaking: it is one of the people who have been conned, for 65 per cent of the home loan program is at these rates. The Premier is talking nonsense about the wonderful job the

bank has done when, as I said quite correctly, it is leading the charge with interest rates at record levels.

Interest rates on a loan of up to \$30 000 are 14.5 per cent for the State Bank and 14.5 per cent for building societies; from \$30 000 to \$40 000 (into which a large number of borrowers fall), 15 per cent for the State Bank and 14.75 per cent for building societies; from \$40 000 to \$50 000, 15 per cent for the State Bank and 15 per cent for building societies; from \$50 000 to \$75 000, 15.75 per cent for the State Bank and 15.5 per cent for building societies; and from \$75 000 to \$100 000, 16 per cent for the State Bank and 15.5 per cent for building societies. I have got my facts right.

Obviously, the State Bank has captured a great slice of the housing market by that aggressive advertising campaign in terms of the return it would give people who deposited with the bank, and by getting people, such as those who wrote the letter, to take out loans which are subject to this enormous escalation. What about people like this, who listened to the Premier in October last year, when he said that interest rates would fall? What about people like this who listened to the Premier in March this year, when he said that interest rates would fall? What about people who listened to the gurus in Canberra, the Premier's federal colleagues, when Mr Keating said during the election campaign and at the end of last year that interest rates would fall? Similar sentiments were expressed by Mr Hawke. Mr Hurford went even further and said that he expected interest rates to fall by 1 per cent.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: When was that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: At the end of last year. I have the press cuttings here, if anyone wants verification. What about all those people who went into the housing market, with all the optimistic talk from the financial advisers now running this State and country that interest rates would fall? They are in a pretty pickle. The Premier's answer is to say that we have not got a solution. Well, we have, as the Leader pointed out. It would not be this piecemeal vote buying bit that the Premier went in for a week or two ago, to his sorrow. What about—

Members interjecting

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that honourable members read the Leader's speech. I want to make one more point.

Members interjecting

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I read from that speech:

For those in circumstances where only Government assistance can prevent foreclosure and eviction, the criteria for existing support schemes should be extended . . . It should assess what the lending institutions themselves are able to do to alleviate the problems through an extension of the term of a . . . loan.

One realises, from the tone of their interjections, that members opposite are obviously disconcerted. Let them look at what their own Premier said in relation to this handout last week—that it was to prop up the housing boom, which is really the basis of the South Australian recovery. What sort of recovery is it if it is entirely dependent on the housing industry? However, new home owners do not get a concession or handout.

So, how on earth can this handout to this limited section of the market sustain a housing boom when they are already out there? It would surely be new borrowers to whom it was aimed, if this was designed to assist and to continue the housing boom. What an absurd phoney reason for the Premier to advance. The fact is that it will not help one jot to maintain the housing boom.

The Premier wants it all ways today: he says that the boom is over and we are in a decline. He admits himself, for another very good reason, that his explanation was phoney. There he was last week saying that it was to maintain the housing boom. He said, 'That is why we have done it and have given taxpayers funds'.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): It is amazing that the Opposition picks on a facetious comment that I made in the Estimates Committee because the member for Light was being made to look so foolish when he questioned me on housing matters. I thought I would give him a form of encouragement in an attempt to get him to lift his game. The statement that I made is now being seized upon by the Opposition as a major political statement, namely, that I am a realist and that I am accepting that this Labor Government will be defeated at the next election. How pathetic!

If that is the major thrust of the Opposition's urgency motion today, this Government has very little to worry about. In fact, it should be proud of its achievements, because time and time again in the Estimates Committee I could tell the member for Light and others who fade into insignificance exactly what this Government has done in its program over the past three years. Opposition members just sat slumped in their seats. I thought I had to give Bruce a bit of a lift, so I did. I am sorry if I encouraged the honourable member to think that he will be the next Minister of Housing, because he will be disappointed. Before I embark on what this Government has done to assist home buyers, those people in the private rental market—

The SPEAKER: Order! Could we transfer private conversations outside and get on with the business of the day.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Before I proceed, I will outline what this Government has done in regard to housing, not only for people in public tenancy and private rental, but also for those seeking housing assistance through our Home Ownership Made Easy Scheme and all the other schemes in our strategy. I will touch, first, on the question of deregulation. The Leader was quick to brush aside deregulation: he said it was a beat-up stunt. Let us go right through those matters.

Because of what Mr Howard was saying (and he was the only major politician who was putting pressure on the Federal Government to lift the ceiling rates) on Sunday night I felt it was about time that the Leader of the Opposition came clean in relation to his views. Six months ago we released a position paper in relation to opposing deregulation, and I placed that paper before the Housing Ministers Conference. Everybody agreed that we should set up a working party to look at the effects of deregulation on low income people. I felt that the Leader of the Opposition's colleagues in those ever-dwindling Liberal held States were prepared to accept the Bannon Government's policy on deregulation.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will get on to the congratulations. Perhaps the Leader should give his views. The Leader of the Opposition was very strangely quiet and refused to say whether or not he supported deregulation or whether the Bannon Government's attitude on deregulation was correct. In fact, I understand that he went to Ayers Rock so that nobody could find him, but some enterprising journalists from radio 5KA eventually tracked him down. It took them 20 minutes of badgering to find out where the Leader stood on deregulation. I congratulate 5KA on its persistence in pinning down the Leader, who after 20 minutes very reluctantly and belatedly said, 'Yes, I support the

retention of home interest rates. I am opposed to my federal leader.'

We have there a situation where Mr Howard is urging the Federal Government to deregulate, because he says that that is stopping funds from going into the home market. We have every major bank then seizing upon Mr Howard's statement. He comes here, does his Ronnie Corbett act and says, 'We should be lifting the ceiling', yet the State Leader of the Liberal Party, after reluctantly supporting the Bannon Government's initiatives, does not say a word. He does not go to him and say, 'Look, Mr Howard, I have just opposed your view on this—I am supporting the Bannon Government. I am saying that what the Bannon Government is doing on deregulation is the best possible thing and we should be supporting it,' but he actually brings Mr Howard to South Australia and urges him to continue his line of supporting deregulation.

That is the position of the Liberal Party in relation to housing. It is bereft of ideas, and has no answer to the problems. Now we have this rather pathetic motion asking the Premier to convene this meeting. Members opposite have also said a lot about their belonging to the Party that picked up the mortgage and rent relief program—they have said that it was a Liberal initiative and that we in Opposition canned it. If one looks at *Hansard* it can be seen exactly what we said when we criticised the Liberal Party picking up the mortgage and rent relief scheme. The Fraser Government offered that scheme to them and they picked it up and made an allocation.

However, our criticism stemmed from the fact that, once the Liberal Party accepted it, it did nothing about it. I think the offer was picked up by them some time late in July and, when we came to office, only 60 people in the whole of South Australia were receiving either rent relief or mortgage relief. The Hon. Murray Hill said, 'Yes, we are picking up the initiative,' but did nothing about it.

Look at the situation now. This State Government will spend \$10.3 million on rent and mortgage relief, and that is \$6.3 million over and above our dollar for dollar allocation. If that is not a commitment by a State Government to pick up rent relief or mortgage relief, I do not know what is. The Opposition said that it picked it up and that it was a Liberal initiative. Of course it picked it up, but only 60 people received any benefit. Seven thousand people are now recipients of rent relief measures and thousands of others have benefited since we introduced the program in 1982; 550 people are currently receiving mortgage relief, and we have allocated an additional \$1 million in this year's budget to pick up that program.

I will gloss over what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, because he did not say much at all. But, here is a Party that is criticising a caring Government for providing some form of relief to people who have existing mortgages with building societies. To listen to the Opposition, one would think that that was the only thing that we had ever done to assist people.

Is not the Leader aware of the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme? Is not the Leader aware of how we have locked that scheme into the First Home Owners Scheme? Is he not aware that that scheme has been continually updated so that we can bring in the lower to middle income people and give them housing assistance, starting as low as 5 per cent interest as with our latest revamp of the system? Is not the Leader aware of all that? If he is not, he does not deserve to be the Leader of the Opposition or to sit on the Treasury benches. No wonder the member for Davenport is so keen to take over the mantle of Liberal leadership, because the present incumbent consistently proves time and again in this House that he does not deserve to be the

Leader of the Opposition or to sit on this side of the Chamber.

We have actually got rid of the Leader's pathetic comments about what the Liberal Party did relating to rent and mortgage relief. We still have not found out what it will do about calling this meeting, but I am interested to see what it says in relation to that.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, let us have a look at what this State Government has done in relation to housing in its three years of office. They have been three vital and dynamic years as far as housing is concerned. My Premier has already said that we have built an unprecedented number of homes and that we have actually lifted the economy. It is my proud boast, as Minister of Housing and Construction, that there is not one building worker who wants a job in the State of South Australia who cannot get a job at the present time. In 1982, when we came to office, there was a disastrous slump in the building industry and thousands of people were out of work. Developers were sitting on land that was reduced to nothing in value, but we picked it up, and we are very proud of what we did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The fact that we have been so successful in relation to housing sticks in the craw of the Liberal Party. In addition, we decided to help those 25 000 people who, if they were not helped, could have been in a situation where they had to give up their homes. Because we made a caring decision, we get blasted by the Liberal Opposition. At no time do members opposite say exactly what they would have done. Let us look at what we have done. We have allocated funds for a record 9 100 public sector Housing Trust homes. Nine thousand people have obtained homes under the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme.

As I said before, 7 000 people are receiving rent relief, and over 550 families are receiving mortgage relief. Within the private and public sectors over 15 000 homes were commenced last year, and that is an all time record. Compare that figure with the miserable 7 200 involved under the previous Liberal Administration. No wonder members opposite are strangely quiet now: they are very quiet indeed. In fact, this State leads the Commonwealth (and we are very proud of this) in its building program, the Home Ownership Made Easier program and its rent and mortgage relief. Also, we are continually processing people after all the other States have stopped, and only those who are currently registered are receiving assistance interstate.

We are giving all those things and still leading the rest of the Commonwealth, in the private sector as well. We are criticised by the Liberal Party, yet we have given assistance to those people through building societies, and we announced on Saturday that we would revamp the Home Ownership Made Easy Scheme to bring in those outside the net. We have reduced the interest rates and increased the allowance for those with dependants. There is hardly one person in the low or middle income bracket who cannot go to the State Bank and get a concessional loan. Not one other State in the Commonwealth can say that, but we have done it. To the Liberal Party at the moment we are saying that it is carping, negative and does not like it because we have done it. We have introduced measures over three years and we will continue to do so in the next term in Government.

Members interjecting.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will list the kind of things that we have done and what we will continue to do. We have gained an assurance from the Prime Minister and the federal Treasurer that they will not deregulate home interest rates. I am pleased to see—and this is where I do congrat-

ulate the Leader of the Opposition for belatedly coming in and accepting that our policies are better than Mr Howard's—that there is now in place a State Bank freeze. We have not been criticised for that. It is obvious that the Liberal Party does not even recognise the difference between a loan at 13.5 per cent and one at the market interest rate. It conveniently forgets that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman's time has expired. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): If I were to respond to the Minister of Housing and Construction I would stand here silent from now until doomsday. The Premier today handed down a report by the South Australian Housing Trust for the period to 30 June 1985. That report has an appendix at the back which I seek to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

APPENDIX—NUMBER OF DWELLINGS COMPLETED, PURCHASED OR LEASED BY THE TRUST IN THE METROPOLITAN AND COUNTRY AREAS TO 30 JUNE 1985

Year ending 30 June	Detached Houses Completed			Attached Houses Completed			Flats Completed			Cottage Flats Completed			Houses Purchased	Houses Leased	Yearly	Cumulative	Rental Dwellings
	Metro	Cntry	Totals	Metro	Cntry	Total	Metro	Cntry	Total	Metro	Cntry	Total	Total	Total			
1938	—	—	—	84	—	84	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	84	84	84
1939	—	—	—	290	—	290	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	290	374	374
1940	—	—	—	244	—	244	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	244	618	618
1941	—	—	—	206	100	306	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	306	924	924
1942	—	—	—	138	66	204	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	204	1 128	1 128
1943	—	23	23	218	140	358	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	381	1 509	1 509
1944	—	1	1	210	142	352	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	353	1 862	1 862
1945	—	—	—	344	—	344	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	344	2 206	2 206
1946	9	3	12	276	20	296	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	388	2 514	2 497
1947	265	20	285	258	44	302	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	587	3 101	2 761
1948	446	56	502	458	56	514	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 016	4 117	3 275
1949	513	212	725	589	138	527	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 252	5 369	3 795
1950	795	394	1 189	445	148	593	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 782	7 151	4 454
1951	1 941	467	2 408	513	138	651	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 059	10 210	6 162
1952	1 900	448	2 348	660	110	770	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 118	13 238	7 629
1953	2 696	632	3 328	910	192	1 102	56	—	56	—	—	—	—	—	4 486	17 814	9 671
1954	2 101	369	2 470	778	215	993	92	—	92	—	—	—	—	—	3 555	21 369	12 513
1955	1 409	302	1 711	1 078	309	1 387	80	—	80	90	—	90	—	—	3 268	24 637	14 667
1956	1 213	453	1 668	1 128	306	1 434	36	—	36	100	—	100	—	—	3 238	27 875	16 135
1957	1 395	361	1 756	892	272	1 164	132	—	132	88	—	88	—	—	3 140	31 015	17 765
1958	1 462	325	1 767	720	300	1 020	161	—	161	64	—	64	—	—	3 032	34 047	19 012
1959	1 294	365	1 659	878	320	1 198	184	—	184	101	—	101	—	—	3 142	37 189	20 294
1960	1 295	451	1 746	688	434	1 122	167	—	167	139	—	139	—	—	3 174	40 363	21 551
1961	1 071	360	1 431	1 106	490	1 596	169	10	179	108	—	108	—	—	3 314	43 677	22 513
1962	1 011	427	1 438	1 166	408	1 574	120	—	120	113	5	118	—	—	3 250	46 927	23 592
1963	1 007	295	1 302	1 080	314	1 394	69	—	69	120	6	126	—	—	2 891	49 816	24 895
1964	1 515	265	1 780	728	214	942	55	—	55	81	—	81	—	—	2 858	52 676	25 916
1965	2 243	222	2 465	428	286	714	45	—	45	91	2	93	—	—	3 517	55 993	26 775
1966	2 060	406	2 466	162	426	588	53	—	53	140	—	140	—	—	3 247	59 240	27 514
1967	1 880	412	2 292	148	574	722	—	—	200	14	214	—	—	—	3 228	62 468	28 691
1968	1 104	415	1 519	264	481	745	17	—	17	82	12	94	—	—	2 375	64 843	29 891
1969	715	517	1 232	146	386	532	30	—	30	92	12	104	—	—	1 898	65 741	31 202
1970	771	528	1 299	57	246	308	45	—	45	53	12	65	—	—	1 712	68 453	31 869
1971	797	574	1 371	138	282	420	214	31	245	169	8	177	—	—	2 213	70 666	33 250
1972	816	580	1 396	166	332	498	68	—	68	231	8	239	—	—	2 201	72 867	34 253
1973	505	364	859	181	236	417	134	48	174	114	44	158	167	—	1 785	74 652	35 025
1974	507	305	812	111	170	281	75	67	142	86	18	104	428	—	1 767	76 419	35 387
1975	619	499	1 118	68	201	269	56	25	81	103	18	121	246	—	1 835	78 254	36 414
1976	860	646	1 506	359	271	630	84	—	84	38	18	36	284	—	2 560	80 814	37 471
1977	821	632	1 473	256	249	505	31	—	31	99	36	135	257	—	2 401	83 215	38 601
1978	1 285	466	1 752	57	64	121	250	14	168	172	27	199	274	—	2 514	85 729	39 757
1979	1 256	340	1 596	180	30	210	42	12	54	64	4	68	303	—	2 231	87 960	41 558
1980	707	231	938	62	58	120	61	—	61	239	53	292	442	6	1 859	89 819	42 763
1981	469	410	879	243	64	307	5	6	11	204	21	225	740	91	2 253	92 072	44 603
1982	363	346	709	128	39	167	9	25	34	227	83	310	526	13	1 758	93 831	46 263
1983	461	383	854	411	2	413	83	26	109	451	117	568	529	3	2 476	96 307	48 466
1984	545	417	962	507	42	549	15	—	15	577	208	785	531	1	2 843	99 150	50 914
1985	896	297	993	510	51	561	25	—	25	375	146	521	912	2	3 014	102 164	53 281
	42 819	15 251	58 070	20 467	9 165	29 853	2 563	260	2 823	4 611	872	3 683	5 639	116	102 164		

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer to the claim made by the Premier—who at least tried to address some aspects of the motion, although much of it contained more padding than one would find in a Galligan's mattress—that there had never been a better response in house building than that of his Government. I refer him to the period from 1951 to 1962 when, in each of those years, there was a better response for housing than over the past 12 months. I refer to the years 1966 to 1968 when there was also a better response than in the last year.

As to the figure of 3 014 homes—used by the Premier as the figure for last year—I refer him to the Estimates Committees last week wherein it was clearly placed on record that the claims being made by the Government are not accepted by the Auditor-General. In fact, the figure that the Government has claimed in its documents relative to the number of homes completed and put in stock is a fabrication.

The Premier can look at this table, and he will also find an acknowledgement by the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust that the figures used involve commencements and not the finished product. Nobody is deny-

ing that there have been a number of commencements, but they were not completed by the relevant date, despite claims to the contrary. The Leader of the Opposition's motion clearly shows up the failure of the present Government to adequately approach this important matter on behalf of the people it claims to represent.

Motion withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

That, pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927, the members of this House appointed to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works have leave to sit on that committee during sittings of the House this week.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That, pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972, the members of this House appointed to the Public Accounts Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

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

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mrs APPLEBY: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

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

Motion carried.

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

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

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In his annual report, tabled in this House after the presentation of the budget now before us, the Auditor-General commented on financial planning. He said that program performance budgeting has added a discipline to areas of need, but he added, 'Much more needs to be done'. The Opposition agrees. The proposed expenditure of all major departments, as outlined in this budget, is now in program form. But, that still gives this house only limited appreciation of the State's overall financial management. There are no projections before us about spending in the next and succeeding financial years, and how that spending will be funded. This question is particularly relevant given the spending spree on which this Government has embarked in the run-up to the election.

Since the beginning of August, this Government has made spending commitments which now exceed \$200 million. Some—but only a minor proportion of the total commitments—will begin to receive funding in this budget. Most are new spending commitments, the funding for which this House has no idea at present. The obvious answer is increased taxation in future years. But an election is imminent, so the Premier will attempt to fudge that question for as long as he can.

Taking up the Auditor-General's point that more needs to be done to improve financial management and planning, a Liberal Government will give the Treasury additional responsibilities. During our first year in office, Treasury will draw up a five-year financial plan. This plan will forecast revenues, determine spending limits and debt ceilings under specific functions, and estimate year-end budget results. The plan will be tied to economic projections and reflect the Government's goals and priorities in allocating financial resources to departments and authorities.

The plan will be reviewed annually and presented to Parliament with the budget, so that the Treasurer can outline to Parliament the effects of the annual estimates on the five-year plan. All legislative proposals of a financial nature will be accompanied by five-year projections of their

financial implications when they are presented to Parliament. This plan will provide Parliament and the public with the means to consider the Government's total plans and its underlying priorities. This is something which is clearly absent from the present Government's approach to financial management. It has adopted a scatter-gun approach, particularly over recent months.

The interest rates stunt was just the latest example. Taxpayers' funds have been put to use in a completely improper and irresponsible way, in a last desperate attempt to save the Government's political skin. The Government charges from one problem area to another, trying to put the lid on as the election approaches. But all the time, all that its actions show is that this Government lacks the ability and the willingness to make decisions in South Australia's long-term interests. Short-term political expediency and vote buying are the hallmarks of everything that this Government now does.

I illustrate the point by referring to the issues of the youth employment package, workers compensation, and electricity tariffs. This Government has had three years to come to grips with the problem of encouraging more employment opportunities for young South Australians. Now, within three months of an election, it produced a scheme that is long on the television advertising and other gimmicky promotion and short on tackling the problems that are at the core of high youth unemployment.

I have already revealed to the House just how much of a political exercise this is. The advertising brief that I revealed to the House completely exposed the Government's intentions. The Premier has attempted to hide the cost of this blatantly political exercise. He told his Estimates Committee that the budget for the YES project was \$150 000, which included, according to the Premier, not just media campaigning but press and television advertising, the production of brochures, education kits and the like.

But what are the facts? We got closer to them when the Minister of Education appeared before his Estimates Committee. Only 24 hours after the Premier had said that the cost of the program would be \$150 000, the Minister of Education revealed that the allocation was \$265 000—\$115 000 more than the figure given by the Premier. It is not surprising that the Premier has tried to play down this spending, because this scheme has not met with the response that the Government hoped for.

I understand that, after the first round of television and press advertising, only 300 telephone calls were received on the special hotline, and many of these callers were greeted with a recorded message advising them to contact their nearest CES office when that is what they had already been doing for months in their attempts to find a job. What a scheme! What a sell-out for young people!

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is trying to set the perception across the board without getting to the core of the problem and trying to help those young people. Fancy putting on a recorded message, 'Ring your local CES office!' What a disgrace that is to the performance of this Government! That can be contrasted with the Liberal Party's phone-in on youth unemployment earlier this year, when we received well over 400 calls following advertising of our initiative, which cost less than \$1000 compared with this Government's \$265 000 spent so far. The response to the Government's scheme from employers has been equally lukewarm. The South Australian Employers Federation revealed last Thursday that it had received little response from its members. The federation's Director, Mr Ralph Warren, said that the effectiveness of such schemes was limited because once the subsidy ended employers could not afford to pay young people full award rates. He also said that such schemes

would have no long-term benefits unless the issues of youth award wages and penalty rates also were addressed. Of course, this Government has not done that: it merely criticises anyone else who does.

The Liberal Party already has released a comprehensive youth employment policy which does address some of the hard options which the Government ignores. This Government believes that it can show sufficient concern by spending taxpayers' money on television advertising and other promotional devices that have been completely ineffective in coming to grips with the real problem.

Information obtained during the Estimates Committee also confirmed the completely misleading nature of further taxpayer funded advertising on workers compensation. Again, that is an issue the Government has ignored until an election has approached. Indeed, early in its term the Government legislated to increase workers compensation premiums for employers, as previous Labor Governments had done in the 1970s. Now, the Government admits that premiums are too high and are costing jobs, but it has failed to propose an acceptable solution.

What is becoming increasingly apparent is the rift between the Premier and his would-be Deputy (not the Deputy, but his would-be Deputy). The Premier told the Estimates Committees that the Government still intended to introduce legislation to implement its workers compensation policy during the present session of the Parliament. However, the Minister of Labour refused to give the same commitment to his Estimates Committee.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: He is if he is to get it through, and I do not think that the Government had any original intention to put it through before the election campaign, and that is the reason for the timing of the introduction of the white paper for public comment prior to the preparation of the legislation. The Government had no intention of its being processed by this Parliament before the election, and the member for Albert Park, who laughs, obviously believes that it was well a well coordinated plan by the Labor Party not to proceed down that track.

It is clear that the Minister of Labour is backing the unions in their opposition to key elements of the Government's policy on lump sum payments and common law. I will bet that the member for Hartley has not been too far behind in protecting the rights of Labor lawyers as they relate to the abolition of common law, and bringing that issue to a head in Caucus meetings.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is interesting that the honourable member has bought into the discussion. As my colleague says, 'He protesteth too much'. He is trying, like the Minister of Housing and Construction, to reconstruct the road after he has blown it up and travelled over it. All that he sought to do was to dig a bigger hole for himself.

Despite all the taxpayer-funded advertising and the Premier's statements claiming agreement between employers and the unions on the Government's policy, it is obvious that there is division within Cabinet as well as between the unions and employees about workers compensation reform. The Minister of Labour has tried to blame the insurance industry for the Government's difficulties, but what about the Government's own workers compensation fund, which has nothing to do with the insurance industry?

Last financial year, the Government's fund paid out almost \$29.3 million, but had premium income of only \$17.3 million: the payout almost doubled in 12 months. Workers compensation payouts to teachers have increased from \$1.7 million in 1982-83 to \$4.9 million last financial year. As we understand it, it is currently running at a rate of \$1 million per month in this financial year. It looks like being, at 30 June next year, a cost in the Education Department alone of some \$12 million.

In 1984-85 the Education Department's payouts were the highest of all Government departments. Next on the list was the Engineering and Water Supply Department, with a payout of \$4.6 million last financial year, a rise of almost \$2 million in 12 months. The Government has taken to blaming the insurance industry, but let it admit to the House what actuarial advice it has received about its own funds. Let it admit that the Government's past liabilities for injured employees are totally unfunded. Let it admit that the net effect of its own arrangements, and those that it now wants to force on everyone else, is that today's debt will be transferred onto tomorrow's taxpayers.

Workers compensation reform is long overdue. Eighteen months ago, the Liberal Party announced a comprehensive policy that will achieve a significant reduction in premiums. The Party has also consistently said that the Government's proposals for a monopoly to take over workers compensation would not be accepted and would, in the long term, significantly increase costs at the expense of job losses. We do not talk in our policy, I remind the member for Hartley, about the total abolition of common law claims. At least, the Liberal Party recognises the rights of the workers out there in its policy documentation, while achieving a very significant reduction in the cost of the premiums.

I know from personal experience that workers compensation has to be restructured because, if one has been in small business over the last decade or two, one knows what workers compensation premiums have been costing, that small businesses have their backs to the wall, and that escalation in cost such as workers compensation is costing many young South Australians jobs out there, now. This Parliament cannot let that issue go: it has to do something about workers compensation as an issue, and its cost. That is why we—the Liberal Party—18 months ago put down a policy, released it publicly, to the unions, to the business people and to the public at large. The policy recognises the needs for restructuring workers compensation, and in government we will implement that policy as a priority, to help small business and, more importantly, help young kids get jobs in South Australia.

Mr Groom: And all the premiums based on—

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member ought to have another read of the policy, if that is what he believes. He ought to have another look at the policy, and have it costed. If he does that, he will not be able to make blind and ill informed assessment from the back bench. The Government has ignored the warnings that it has been getting about its policy, and we are now back to square one. This is a responsibility that a Liberal Government, after the next election, will not shirk, as the present Government has done. Instead of devoting its efforts to misleading, taxpayer funded advertising about non existent agreements between employers and unions, a Liberal Government will give the highest priority to implementing a system which will significantly reduce premiums, without loading up future generations with the huge debts which the monopoly approach inevitably would produce.

It is interesting to consider the Victorian 'WorkPlan'. I think it is referred to as 'WorkCover' here—terribly original, just to change the last word. A guarantee was given by the Cain Government that all the people in the insurance industry who would lose their jobs because of the transfer of this cover to the Government monopoly would be taken up and absorbed by the Government. However, the fact is that the Cain Government has not picked up jobs for the hundreds of people who have been laid off in Victoria. I could name the insurance companies which have been to the Government and said, 'You promised to pick up these employees or pay redundancy fees'—but the Cain Government does not want to know, because it has been elected for a four-year parliamentary term. It has turned its back on another election promise.

That is why the opinion polls repeatedly show that the electorate is cynical and that people have had enough of the broken election promises of Labor politicians—people who promise the world and deliver nothing. People will not give this Administration another go at that.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Of course one of the great impacts in relation to interest rates is that this adds further pressure to the 55.2 per cent increase in taxes and charges that people have to pay. Interest rates have increased to the highest level in 50 years—and this is at a time when people are being asked to abide by a wages accord and a prices and incomes accord. Their disposable income has shrunk. People are asking why they should dip into their small savings to pay an ETSA bill or a water bill, and that if interest rates keep going up they do not know where they will be in 12 months.

People are concerned about not knowing where they will be financially in 12 months time. We have heard an announcement that in three weeks time the Federal Government will say how it will charge for its child-care centres throughout Australia. This will be a further impost that young people with have to pay. These people who now must rely on a second income to pay off their houses will have to pay more money because the Federal Government wants to pick up another \$30 million or thereabouts from charges relating to child-care centres. So much for this caring Labor Administration. This is really putting pressure on young married couples. Despite the protests that come from members opposite, I am sure that they understand the ramifications of this from correspondence to their electorate offices and from contact with people at their offices.

I turn now to the question of gas supply and prices. Members will recall that just over two years ago the Premier said that the problem of supply and price to the Sydney market would be resolved within a fortnight. Two years ago the Government maintained that it would fix this problem. Information that the Minister of Mines and Energy was prepared to put before the Estimates Committee last week showed clearly that little, if anything, has happened since then. It appears that the Government has made no approaches of any substance to AGL or the New South Wales Government about the Sydney gas contracts approved by the former Dunstan Government.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Not game to take them on.

Mr OLSEN: Of course they are not game to take it on. Premier Neville Wran has told the South Australian Premier what he can do in restructuring the AGL contracts. It also appears that the very bullish statements that the Government has made about the future security of gas supplies to South Australia have not been justified. Further, despite the Premier's promise about lower electricity tariffs, it is clear that the Electricity Trust is still completely in the dark about the price it will have to pay for gas next year. The Minister of Mines and Energy also revealed that gas supply and price negotiations were now being conducted by the Director-General of the Premier's Department, Mr Bruce Guerin. I suggest that that is puzzling because, ever since gas was discovered in the Cooper Basin more than 20 years ago, it has been the accepted role of the Department of Mines and Energy to negotiate matters such as this.

The fact that the head of the Premier's Department has now been brought into these negotiations suggests the Government has been having difficulty in meeting its earlier promises. This applies in particular to the price that the Electricity Trust will have to pay for natural gas in 1986. The Premier's promise to reduce tariffs is entirely contingent on a reduced price for natural gas, but this has not yet been negotiated.

The Premier must explain the basis of his commitment to lower electricity tariffs. If the Government is unable to

reach agreement on lower gas prices, does this mean that the Electricity Trust will have to go into further deficit next year to allow the Premier to keep his promise? The trust's accumulated deficit at the end of last financial year was \$4.75 million, and any further blow-out will put further pressure on tariffs. This Government's approach to gas supply and price—key issues affecting South Australia's economic future—has been typically expedient. It has failed to take a global approach.

The Government has failed to consider all the issues: the current supply contracts with New South Wales, as well as those for South Australia. As a result, South Australia has no certainty about the price it will pay for gas in 1986 or its supplies after 1987. This is a legacy of the contracts approved by the Dunstan Government which guaranteed supply to Sydney of our gas, before securing our own rights here in South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Does that put ETSA in line for a deficit?

Mr OLSEN: Unless the gas contract and the pricing arrangements are renegotiated, there is no way that the Electricity Trust can plan effectively for next year, and for its pricing structure next year. Further, in no way can it deliver the commitment to lower tariffs next year unless it is forced into further deficit. That simply means that the liability is deferred. The day of payment is deferred, but eventually future taxpayers must pick up the extended tab. Taxpayers in South Australia are currently paying some \$373 million interest on the State's overdraft, and I would suggest that enough is enough.

The budget brought down this year was described as a Bankcard budget—that is, one buys today, pays the interest today, and repays the debt later. That principle stands out clearly and concisely in relation to the budget papers and also the Auditor-General's Report tabled in this Parliament. Indeed, many facets of the budget have been reinforced by questions and answers to the Ministers and their advisers during the course of the Estimates Committees. I do not deny the great complexities involved with gas supply and price negotiations. They are involved matters: they are difficult and they are complex.

Mr Hamilton: It is two bob each way now.

Mr OLSEN: It is not two bob each way. The fact is that two years ago the Government said that it would fix up the matter in two weeks. However, to date, the situation has not been resolved. Two years ago the Opposition put down what it would do about the matter.

Mr Hamilton: And messed it up.

Mr OLSEN: I point out to the member for Albert Park that of course two years ago we were not in government. Some hard decisions must be taken, but so far the Government has avoided its responsibilities. The Government promised that South Australia had security of supply, but that is in doubt: that will depend on further assessments to be completed by mid-December. The Government has promised lower electricity tariffs, although the Electricity Trust does not know how much it will be paying for natural gas next year. These uncertainties are symptomatic of this Government's whole approach to economic management: the superficial approach to youth employment; the failure to reach agreement on workers compensation; and continuing uncertainty over gas supply and price.

Many others can be added to them: the continuing collapse of employment in our key manufacturing and rural industries (some 14 000 people lost jobs in the manufacturing industry and some 2 100 people lost jobs in our rural industries during the past two years); higher and higher levels of Government spending, putting pressure on individuals and industry for higher taxes and charges (up by 55.2 per cent at a time when the State's indebtedness has

increased by billions of dollars); the lowest rate of growth in employment of any State since the election of this Government (when more people are unemployed today than there were three years ago when the Government came to power); higher unemployment during that time, despite the spending of some \$100 million on job creation schemes in the interim; the lowest rate of growth in population of any State or Territory; and the highest rate of inflation of any capital city last financial year.

The Government has had its chance. It has not delivered in those key areas to which I referred. It has governed during three years of opportunity provided by the international economic recovery, the end of the 1982-83 drought, and the continuing wage restraint initiated by the former Federal Liberal coalition in the wages pause, followed and picked up by the prices and incomes accord. However, all the key indicators show that South Australia has not progressed as it should have under this Government during this time.

Rather, individual South Australians are worse off, with higher taxes and charges, higher prices, and much higher interest rates. All the stunts in this budget will not hide the facts. The economy will be a key issue in the coming election. The Liberal Party will present an action plan that will get big government out of the lives of South Australians and get South Australia back on the economic rails; it will give small business a chance to compete, grow and create job opportunities—a chance to contribute to our economy.

That is the capacity that the Liberal Party has. That is the basis of the policies that we have announced over the past six months. They are in stark contrast to the policies implemented by this Administration during the past three years. There is a difference—a clear discernible difference—between the Labor Government and the Liberal Party at this time. There will be a clear choice to the electorate. That clear choice will mean that the Liberal Party will step back out of the hip pocket of the average South Australian and give them a fair go.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Members will recall the problems surrounding the Mudginberri meatworks, in the Northern Territory, following a dispute approximately six months ago. Undoubtedly, honourable members on both sides of the House will recall and acknowledge the enormous amount of litigation that flowed from the employee/union dispute. More especially, I draw to the attention of members of the House my question to the Premier on 18 August this year requesting that he and his Government use all the offices at their disposal to assist in resolving this issue.

Prior to my raising that question we here in South Australia had been directly affected by the flow-on (or so-called sympathy strike action) that was proceeding at Storemen and Packers Union employee level, at Transport Workers Union level, and in our State-owned and operated abattoir at SAMCOR. In response to my question, I remind the House that the Premier said:

I do not pretend to have any close knowledge of the details of this case. I will refer the matter to the Minister of Labour for report.

Like many other occasions where undertakings have been given by this Government in this House, we find that so far there has been no report. It is only a couple of months ago, but on 18 September (about a month after my raising the subject initially) our Leader, the Deputy Leader and the member for Torrens all drew to the attention of this House their concern, and the concern of the public generally, about the impact of this unreasonable, indeed illegal, strike action that was being promoted by the AMIEU officials, in partic-

ular. As I indicated earlier, this strike action was supported by a number of other unions in sympathy.

Again as a result of the subject being raised in this House, the Premier, in all fairness, admitted that he had little understanding of it. Whilst answering the question as it related to the impact on the Tatiara Meat Company, in the South-East, he clearly demonstrated that he did not really understand what the subject was all about, let alone understand one of the very basic factors associated with it: that is, that the flow-on strike action by transport workers at airports, seaports and other loading terminals and the like, and by storemen and packers in a snowball effect in South Australia and beyond into other States of Australia, were all connected with the original strike action taken on behalf of the union movement and employees at Mudginberri some six months ago.

However, in admitting his lack of understanding, the Premier conveyed to the House his appreciation of the concern that we, as a Parliament, should have for the situation developing around us, bearing in mind that it was one of the most significant industrial disruptions experienced in this country for a number of years—and it is not dead yet; indeed, it is still very much alive. Further strike action is planned in this State, in Western Australia and on the eastern seaboard in the weeks to come.

This issue is not over, nor is it even close to being over, as appears from reports we have received. However, despite the lack of knowledge that the Premier admits to having (or in this case not having), he gave further undertakings to investigate the matter and to report back to the House. However, to the Leader, the Deputy Leader, the member for Torrens and the Parliament as a whole, the Premier's undertaking on that occasion has not been upheld. In this instance members on this side of the Chamber can only presume that he is not fair dinkum or truthful about the statements he makes in this place. I am satisfied that he is neither truthful in this instance, nor is he conscious or, indeed, conscientious, about the concern that we have for the rural sector and the impact on primary producers of Australia generally, or on those in South Australia in particular.

Again and again, the Premier shows his lack of feeling, understanding and concern for that section of the community. As we fully understand on this side of the Chamber, the agricultural and pastoral regions of this State are not areas where the ALP Government has, over the years, enjoyed any great level of political support. Indeed, it is not likely that it will do so in the foreseeable future. However, that does not alter the fact, in my view, that a Premier is responsible for the welfare of the people of this State, whether they be from the rural or metropolitan sector.

I again remind and request the Premier to pay the level of attention to this issue that he undertook to deliver, and provide us with a report of the findings, if yet determined, by the Minister of Agriculture in another place, and identify the position of the State Government in relation to this subject. More especially, I call on the Premier to take the sort of action that we requested of him some two months ago in good faith, without political bias, and without any motive other than to get this shocking issue resolved.

We find that in the meantime, as a result of the disruption to which I have referred, we have lost some \$7 million in Australia, including, of course, the lost export sales from Mudginberri, which was about \$3 million, the cost of abattoir and waterside strikes and freight bans until the end of September, at which time the losses were assessed. However, worse still and certainly more difficult to measure, is the loss of credibility associated with our activities in this country and as seen by our importing customers on the other side of the world.

We are never able to measure that, but I assure honourable members that the message is very clear. In fact, it has been reported recently that we are described as a bunch of lunatics in Australia, behaving like a banana republic: indeed, we do not know on which side our bread is buttered. We have made such a mess of our export of essential items—in this case meat—and have attracted such a bad name around the world because of our union disruption at airport and seaboard terminals, in particular, that we are no longer trusted. We have been hanging on to the Japanese market by our fingertips, and it has almost run away from us altogether. We are not reliable as producers and shippers of our produce to those customers.

A number of buyers from those countries have indicated their grave concern about the Australian lack of reliability. They say that it is horrendous and, as I said before, that we cannot be trusted to deliver. It is not as though we are the only country in the world that produces the products about which I am speaking—in this case meat, whether in carcass or live form. There are hundreds, if not thousands or millions, of tonnes of meat stacked up in freezers and chillers around the world creating an oversupply situation at the moment.

We are competing simply for a slice of this trade. We have captured the trade, not only in Japan or a few isolated countries in the European region, but also in the Middle East—in the Arab countries. Again, when mentioning that region of custom that we have secured, it relates not only to live sheep but also to the carcase trade. A couple of years ago we secured a very lucrative market in the Middle East: in the middle of Saudi Arabia at Riyadh, we captured significant orders for carcase meat.

What happened? As a result of this same type of strike action, we mucked up the delivery by running into bans and industrial disruptions at airport level, and the meat had to be dumped because it could not take off from our own dispatch point here in Adelaide. That is absolutely hideous. In that context, we call on the Government in South Australia at the moment to take some appropriate and firm action in relation to the union movement so that the semblance of trade to which we still cling can be salvaged and so that our name generally around the world as an exporter of primary produce can be restored.

I turn now to yet another area of concern—not that I blame the parties involved in these negotiations. However, it is true that recently New Zealanders have lifted a ban on the export of live sheep to the Middle East. Over the years they have been requested to consider exporting live sheep to that region. Over the past 10 to 15 years we have gradually secured there a market for Australian grown sheep with something like \$7 million a year, most of which are exported out of the southern States and, more particularly, from South Australia.

During that period the New Zealand Government and grower organisations in that country have sought to concentrate on the export of their meat in carcass and cut down form. However, they have been requested to reconsider their policy in that country. Only a week or so ago they tipped out the previous ban on live sheep exports and entered that market. I can understand why Arab communities and representatives like Elders IXL (Australia) have participated in that negotiation and have ultimately secured the trade.

This reflects on our credibility as Australian producers and exporters. We are not trusted, we are not reliable, and not only are we losing business from our own production but also our own marketplace is being eroded by that neighbouring country of New Zealand. It was easy for the Sheepmeat Council of Australia Executive Director (Mr Richard Moxon) to jump up and down, as he did last week, and say that New Zealand's latest effort would have a very big

impact on Australian producers and for him to kick Elders IXL in the guts for participating in this trade activity. However, one cannot blame the exporting country.

I join with other rational people in the community and accept that one cannot blame Elders or any other agent, whether or not they be primarily based in Australia, for seeking trade and, more especially, trade with people who can be trusted. What a serious and ridiculous state of affairs when on the other side of the world our neighbouring countrymen—New Zealanders—are trusted and reliable, and are seen to deliver the goods, yet our own people here in Australia fall into the category previously described.

If that market to the Middle East is successful in gathering its livestock from New Zealand—particularly in the form of hoggets and lamb livestock—then our live sheep trade from Australia will be in very serious jeopardy. In this country we have recognised the reasonable request—not so much the constant demands—of the AMIEU over the years and have concentrated our live sheep movements to those of aged sheep (more particularly aged wethers) at meal or at the end of their economic wool producing life. As a result of gearing up our rural management to a point where we get the condition on those sheep to around 60 or 65 pounds dressed weight, they go to a market where they are still accepted. However, they are not accepted with the same sort of welcome as are sheep from Turkey and various other nearby European countries. Yet, they are accepted in the Middle East region as still being edible, when they are not so considered at home.

The domestic market cannot and will not absorb them, but we have now reached the stage where, as a result of action undertaken by the union movement, we could even lose that trade. If those Arab communities around Kuwait, Jordan, Tunis, or farther up the coast in Algeria and beyond to Morocco, or down south to Saudi Arabia, get a taste of the younger sheep, the hoggets, especially those of an English breed from New Zealand, where will the trade go? It will go to New Zealand, and it will be at the expense of Australia.

I return to my original point and use this opportunity to call on the Premier either to get his Minister's backside in that other place into gear to pay appropriate attention to this subject, or to himself treat the subject with the importance that it deserves and instruct his own officers within the Premier's Department to take the action that we have called upon him to take. It is not a matter of interfering with a national or federal award; it is not a matter of interfering with the jurisdiction of conciliation and arbitration, the UTLC or other federal authorities. Rather, it is a matter that is directly associated with the welfare of South Australians and, in particular, those South Australians who are involved in the paddock, at sheep and meat production level, in the abattoirs, at the loading points and generally with the processing of meat between the paddock and the plate. I urge the Premier to act and to do so promptly.

A local matter has been brought to my attention only today. I have not done a great deal of homework on it, but, for and on behalf of the South Coast Christian School located at Yankalilla Road, Victor Harbor, I ask the Minister of Education, in his capacity as Minister responsible for non-government school registration, to investigate the actions of the board in refusing to extend registration to secondary year levels at that school this year. I refer to correspondence from the board to the Principal of the South Coast Christian School dated 10 September 1985. Initially the board identified correspondence that contained its decision not to extend registration as requested. The Acting Registrar of the time went on to state:

On 20 December 1984 your school initiated an appeal against this decision of the board. The matter is proceeding, as you are

aware. It now appears that a decision will not be available before 10 February 1986 at the earliest.

It is well known to the board that your school has continued to offer instruction at year 8 level during 1985 despite board's refusal to register your school for secondary classes. This was confirmed by you at a meeting of board on 30 July last.

The writer, Mr Harrington, goes on to state:

Should the court disallow your appeal against the board's decision not to register your school for secondary classes, the board cannot countenance your school continuing to conduct secondary classes in 1986.

The next paragraph is the one that causes me greatest concern. Mr Harrington stated:

Board decided at its last meeting that if your school continues to operate secondary year levels in 1986 without board approval, it will initiate an inquiry under the provisions of the Education Act which may lead to the cancellation of the school's registration.

I take it from that paragraph that it poses the threat that, in the absence of registration of the secondary element of that school's function in proceeding with the secondary education as alleged, the primary school functions of that establishment are threatened with deregistration and/or refusal of registration.

It is the tenor of that threat that disturbs me most, and it is that aspect of the directive correspondence from the Registration Board that I ask the Minister of Education, at his earliest convenience, to investigate and report on. Generally speaking, from local level information, it is my understanding that the school referred to is respectable and that it has complied with the core levels of curriculum that are required of non-government schools. I understand also that the school employs reputable staff, some if not all being from ex-government school teacher level, whether they have come to the school before retiring from the profession, or after retiring from Government schools.

I understand that every reasonable effort is being made to provide a service to the students in question. Obviously, the parents of the children who attend that school are happy with the facilities, the level of education that it provides, and the attitude, conduct and surroundings of the school, otherwise they would not send their children to the school. Generally speaking, it would appear perhaps to be a lack of communication and understanding at one level or another. It appears from the correspondence that has been forwarded to me today (and there is a bundle of it) that there exists a dispute which, it seems, will not be resolved satisfactorily. In that respect, I ask the Minister to look at this matter promptly, get to the bottom of the problem and, if possible, in that high growth area of the State, allow that facility to continue in its own right and so relieve the demands placed on education establishments in that South Coast region.

At Mount Compass, Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, Goolwa, Yankalilla and right throughout the Fleurieu Peninsula, including Willunga, we have a significant growth factor, and I believe that, if non-government schools and church oriented establishments are set up satisfactorily, they should be encouraged in their activities rather than discouraged, or indeed threatened, as has been alleged and would appear to be the case in this instance.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In noting the reports of the Estimates Committees, I wish to comment on a few of the debates. Before doing so, I would like to commend the member for Alexandra in relation to his comments on and assessment of the live sheep trade and the meat industry in general. I do not believe that many people in South Australia fully understand or appreciate the worth to this State of the meat industry and, in particular, the live sheep trade.

I would like to re-emphasise the fact that, when that live sheep trade to the Middle East was established, we were not supplying one tonne of processed meat to that area. As a

result of the live sheep trade there has been a subsequent build up of development of a processed meat industry within that area to an extent where I understand that the tonnage of processed meat going to those Middle East countries is now greater than the tonnage of live sheep leaving this country.

I think it is fair to say that, had we not persisted with the live sheep trade to those countries, the meat industry within this State and within Australia would have suffered a loss of trade of many thousands of tonnes of processed goods. It has been one of those examples where the Middle East countries have said, 'All right, if you want us to take processed meat, you have to supply us with live sheep. If you do not supply us with live sheep, we will take our package of trade elsewhere.' That has been the long and short of it, and it is imperative that this State persist with the development of the live sheep trade, because out of it can only come good, not only for the meat industry but for meat industry employees down the line.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The member for Alexandra indicates that, if the metropolitan industry is continually interrupted as it has been over recent months, our reputation as reliable suppliers will be non-existent and, obviously, they will look to more reliable suppliers in other parts of the world. When we see our near neighbour of New Zealand now re-entering the live sheep trade, where they have literally thousands of tonnes of excellent frozen lamb to dispose of, we can see ourselves in considerable trouble unless we (meaning our employees) in this country do the right thing.

I wish to comment on parts of the debate in the Estimates Committees, but, first and foremost, I wish to comment on the Government's announcement prior to the budget debate of the lifting of the 10 per cent excess on ETSA in seven district councils in the northern part of Eyre Peninsula. It has been said in this place many times—principally by the member for Eyre, who was then the member representing those areas—that it was an unjust and unfair imposition upon those councils.

We all know that this matter has a history dating back to the early 1960s, or even late 1950s, whereby it was part of a contractual arrangement with the Government of the day that, in order to take over and provide a reliable electricity supply, those areas had to impose upon themselves (and subsequently have the arrangement ratified by Government) an additional 10 per cent upon the normal requirements or supply rates of electricity. That has continued for almost two decades, and the situation is intolerable. It has meant that we have two classes of citizens in this State, with those in the more outback regions, although they were supplied by the same power source of electricity, being charged a different rate. That was discrimination against those persons living in the more remote areas. From then up to the present time, the distribution of the power supply has been carried out by the district councils themselves. In reality, those district councils have been acquiring power in bulk and then carrying out all of the bookwork whilst charging and collecting tariffs from the users. That has meant that, within each of those district councils, a workforce has been engaged on a local basis to service the power industry within those areas.

As a result of considerable lobbying from the member for Eyre, other members and myself, the Government has indicated that it will look towards the abolition of that 10 per cent surcharge. In so doing, it has asked for an agreement between the councils concerned and has requested that there be a rationalisation within the depots. I understand that currently negotiations are under way between the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the district councils concerned to work out a program of phasing out the 10 per cent

surcharge in order to get all citizens of this State back to an equal tariff basis.

The position, as I understand it currently, is that the Government has given an undertaking that there will be no reduction in services to the people concerned and that there will be no loss of jobs. There is some concern by the councils, however, that the request for a rationalisation of depots may mean a transfer of jobs from one town to another. In most instances the staff involved in servicing the power outlets have involved five or six employees, and the wages that go into those small communities from those five or six employees are rather significant.

There would be a considerable loss of money circulating in those small communities if the depots were rationalised and only one or two major depots were established across the northern part of Eyre Peninsula. The transition stage is the important part now and, whilst councils are agreeing in principle to the abolition of the 10 per cent surcharge, there is the problem to consider of involving the mechanics of the transfer across to or the takeover by ETSA.

I was pleased to note in the Estimates Committee an indication by the Minister of Mines and Energy that it was his belief that such a transition period could take some four to five years before the takeover would be completed. I was reassured by those comments because I would not like to see this scheme falter or see the councils and employees who have been formerly engaged on the electricity supply network disadvantaged because of this. The overall basic principle is whether we accept the abolition of the 10 per cent tariff, which is obviously the ultimate aim of every council in the area. I hope that with good sense and management this will be achieved to the best advantage of all concerned.

The other issue raised on two or three occasions during the Estimates Committees was that of the Lincoln Cove development, which we all know is considered to be one of the major undertakings in this State (indeed, I firmly believe that that is the case). We understood that the Government was going to start the physical construction in late September. However, we were to learn that the tenders that came in following the public calling of such were in fact above expectation. This has meant a hold-up and has meant that the Government has had to make up its mind where it stands on the issue—whether it is going to proceed at the higher tender level, cut back the project somewhere along the line or abandon it altogether.

I am pleased that the response from the Government thus far has indeed been very positive and that it is likely that the project will proceed along lines similar to those originally planned. I can appreciate the Government's nervousness about this project because, every time a project of any kind overruns, it is likely to be attacked from many quarters. When that occurs, obviously there is concern in the Government camp. In this case the Government has indicated that it is willing to reconsider the matter. Indeed, the Premier has said that he would like to ensure that every aspect of the project has been thoroughly examined and, more particularly, re-examined to see that the expenditure is justified.

I trust that the estimate given in the Estimates Committee by the Minister of Marine can be complied with. I note that he said that there is no intention of the Government pulling out of the project, that the go ahead has been given, that the department is responsible and that work is proceeding. The Minister went on to make a number of other points in relation to the method of construction: in fact, whether it was going to be dredged or dry excavated or developed by some other means. If the intention was to dry excavate, it is a pity that the coffer dams did not go up earlier, as a considerable amount of water will have to be

pumped out. However, that is a relatively minor problem, and I feel certain that, immediately the go ahead is given, construction can get under way with the absolute minimum of disturbance.

If the Minister's timing of mid-October can be complied with, obviously it is only a matter of a week or a fortnight before we can hope that some positive announcement will be made and that the successful tenderer, whoever that might be—and I believe that it is supposed to be a South Australian tenderer—is given the go-ahead to start the construction work. I am pleased to note a number of minor contracts related to this project which will enable significant employment of local people. All I can say is that the more of this we have the better, because we have a large unemployment problem in the area, which is exacerbated through the lack of alternative employment opportunities in nearby towns.

Living on the peninsula, unemployed persons in our area do not have the ability to travel to Adelaide or other nearby cities or towns to take up work opportunities. Because of this relative isolation, the unemployment problem is exacerbated, and to that end we hope and trust that this project will give us some considerable relief.

I mentioned the meat industry earlier. I was very pleased to be part of an opening ceremony for the new LEMCO (Lower Eyre Meat Company) meatworks in Port Lincoln, which was devised out of necessity, as the SAMCOR operation was closed down. Necessity is indeed the mother of invention, and in this case the necessity arose from the closure of SAMCOR, while the invention was the development of LEMCO, which is a small abattoir, established with the capacity to kill 1 000 sheep per week, or the equivalent in units of pigs and cattle.

It will serve a very useful purpose in that it will be able to provide the killing facilities for the consumer market on Lower Eyre Peninsula; it will provide for some limited local kill requirements ('local kill' meaning meat killed for consumption within Australia). It does not have the ability to provide for export markets, which involve double meat inspections, and so forth.

One full-time meat inspector will be on the premises. On the killing floor there will be two slaughtermen, with an overall employment of 10 full-time employees. If it can be maintained at that level—and I believe that it can be—a profitable enterprise can be achieved and, more particularly, it can be sustained on a 12-month basis, because the capacity of the works is far under the likely production of the area. So, we have some relatively good news in that regard.

The other very important point, which seldom gets any praise, is that these works have the capacity to cater for all the by-product requirements, not only of the works themselves but also of the butchers and of the fish factories. I note the Minister for Environment and Planning in the House at the moment: he would be very pleased about that, because what is done with the many hundreds of tonnes of fish by-products that need to be disposed of in some way is of considerable concern. When the rendering plant was inoperative, that tonnage of waste products had to be buried—in some cases in the scrub; in some cases I do not think that anyone knew where they were being buried, but they had to be disposed of somewhere. At least, we now have a proper rendering plant, a quality product being produced in fish meal, meat and blood and bone meal, and the whole of the community is benefiting from it.

I am very pleased to say that with the new meatworks, although situated adjacent to the site of the old SAMCOR works, no by-products flow into the sea. No drainage from the works, other than the stormwater drainage from outside, goes to the sea at all. All the waste—the hose down, the wash-down waters, the blood, etc.—is extracted, processed

and then pumped out for irrigation purposes. There is no contamination of these as a result of the meatworks, and that in itself is worthy of comment.

Another issue that I raise in this House has come to my attention more forcibly of late, although I have raised it in years gone by: that is, the need for decompression facilities for our divers on Eyre Peninsula. The abalone diving industry, which has been established for a long period, has been a very lucrative industry, but it is now under some pressure, principally because of the lack of stock in shallow waters. Because the industry has been relatively lucrative over the years, licences to enter it have become very expensive, and it is known that they have changed hands at some \$220 000, or in that vicinity. I believe it has dropped a little of late, but that price has been at some cost to the welfare of the divers themselves.

I am concerned that it will be only a matter of time before we have a fatality within that industry. The pressures are such that, with the fish in shallow waters being fished out, the divers are going into deeper waters and staying for longer periods than are normally safe in order to maintain payments and the income within the industry. If a diver acquires a licence for, say, \$200 000, obviously he has a bank manager who requires regular payments. For that reason, the divers go into deep waters, diving longer hours than they should normally, and as a result place their health at risk.

We sometimes read in the press—and it seems to attract wide publicity—about decompression sickness (or recompression sickness—a number of names can be used for it), where a diver has to be transferred to Adelaide because of the bends. I regret to say that that occurrence has been wider than is publicised, and that is of some concern to me. Recently, Dr Carl Edmonds—regrettably, I do not have his qualifications here—who has carried out an examination of the area and of the divers, looking at the need for treatment facilities to be provided on Eyre Peninsula, has startled me, and probably many others, by saying that there have been something like 341 instances of decompression sickness, of which only 12 were reported. Those divers are placing themselves at considerable risk.

I have previously requested the Government, as I believe other members of Parliament have, to have a decompression facility placed on Eyre Peninsula. If anything, there is a greater need on Eyre Peninsula than in other areas of the State, as there are more divers in that area and the waters they operate in are considerably deeper. I was talking to some South-Eastern divers only recently, and they were jokingly saying that one of their biggest problems is the wear on their flippers from hitting the bottom because in many places they are in only two metres of water. However, in many cases divers working off Eyre Peninsula operate at 70, 80 and sometimes 90 feet, and, obviously, problems associated with the industry are greater at that sort of depth.

I put it to the Government that there is a very compelling cause for the establishment of a recompression chamber on Eyre Peninsula. It is not feasible to bring a diver with the bends to Adelaide. Such a course is better than nothing at all, but in cases where a recovery has been ordered it has taken eight hours and sometimes 10 hours to get a diver into a recompression chamber. Eight or 10 hours to someone with the bends could be fatal—fortunately, a death has not occurred, but there have been serious cases, and the safety of divers must be a paramount concern.

If a recompression chamber was placed in Port Lincoln it would alleviate the need for divers to be carried in an air ambulance. One must realise that, if a person is suffering from decompression sickness, altitude can only aggravate the problem. This means that the pilot of the plane must take unnecessary risks in flying as close to sea level as

possible in order to prevent aggravation of decompression sickness. I call on the Government to do everything it possibly can to establish a recompression chamber in Port Lincoln as soon as is humanly possible.

Another hazard of diving is that many divers experience bone necrosis. Many divers are now experiencing this ailment because of long time diving. Many divers did not realise that these health problems could occur. Several former divers now have artificial joints in the hips, and in a couple of cases in the knees. This is all because of the bone necrosis that develops from weightlessness over prolonged periods in the water. This is a condition very similar to that experienced by astronauts who spend long periods in space in weightless conditions. The traumas and medical conditions associated with diving are of concern to those in the industry. I trust that the Government will recognise these problems, for this is a public health matter and it is something that must be addressed.

I have been talking almost exclusively from an abalone diver's point of view: however, many divers engaged in other activities are involved, and I refer to the underwater diving schools, recreational divers, scuba club divers, and so on. The number of divers who operate at considerable depths is much greater than the few that I have mentioned within the abalone industry.

I want to raise only one other issue at this time, although I had a couple of others matters that I wanted to raise. I refer to the over-width load permits. I think the member for Davenport raised this matter in relation to height permits. I think that that problem has now been resolved. Previously, it was an offence for a triple decker sheep crate or a double decker cattle crate to be more than 4.3 metres in height. If such a crate was arranged in a road train configuration, technically it was allowed to a height of 4.6 metres, but as soon as the back trailer was dropped off the height was reduced to 4.3 metres. It was an utterly ludicrous situation, and I do not think that anyone in their right mind could have tolerated that sort of bureaucracy.

The situation with wide load permits now is that contractors with large dozers, for example, which must be carried on a low loader from job to job (and such dozers might have blades three or four metres in width), must apply for a permit every three months. I understand that in many cases if transporting anything wider the permit must be arranged on the day of travel. In the past a person was able to have a 12 month period, with the requirement that the equipment not be carried on the road at night but only during certain hours.

That arrangement has now been taken away from these operators. The present arrangement is utterly ludicrous. If one wishes to shift a large bulk bin or half a house (not the 20 foot wide ones, but the 14 or 15 foot wide loads), one must get a permit on the day of actual operation. Obviously, by the time the permission is obtained, the job could have been completed.

The other point is that in many cases a person must apply for a permit in person, which means driving to Port Lincoln or Adelaide. To require a person to come from Ceduna or Thevenard, for example, for that purpose, to pick up a wide load permit for a certain time seems to me to be bordering on the ridiculous. I hope that the Government and the Minister of Transport can consider this matter and provide some reasonable remedy to this situation. No-one is suggesting that laws be blatantly abused, but surely it would be practical to allow transport operators to acquire a permit without unnecessary hindrance, so that they can carry out their normal duties.

I raise this point particularly from the point of view of a dam sinking contractor whose dozer has a 10 foot 6 inch blade, which means that he must apply on a fairly regular

basis for a permit to transport his dozer from job to job. Previously he was able to apply for a 12 month permit, and was able to operate under those conditions without hindrance, provided that he had the required flags on the blade or the outer extremities and provided that he operated within daylight hours. With those comments, I support the motion for noting the Committee's report.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I rise on this occasion to review the report of the Committees to the House and to pick up some of the matters alluded to either by me or other members in some detail or maybe just in passing during the course of the proceedings of the Committees. In the process, I want to further explain the relevance of these matters to the concerns that I have as a member of Parliament.

At the outset, let me underline what the member for Alexandra was talking about and the supportive remarks made by the member for Flinders on the same matter. The live sheep export trade from this State, and indeed this country, to the Middle East has enabled us to find a market for sheep, in the face of falling farm incomes and difficulties in knowing what to do with these animals once they have reached the end of their economic lives.

Of course, at a time when the AMIEU and other militant groups within the community supporting its stance first opposed live sheep exports the example was thrown in our teeth of the New Zealand Government, which was exporting to the Middle East a significant quantity of frozen, already killed, mutton and lamb carcasses, particularly lamb. Prior to that point, New Zealand had exported live sheep as well as carcase meat. That example was thrown in our teeth, as primary producers and sheep farmers in this country, by the opponents to the live sheep industry, who maintained that, if New Zealand could do it so could we. I throw it back in their teeth now.

New Zealand obviously realises that it cannot do it and that there is a lucrative market available to it in the Middle East for live sheep, and it has entered the live sheep trade again with a vengeance. Unless we become more reliable suppliers than we have been, we will lose a substantial part, if not all, of our market to the Middle East. We are not the most significant suppliers even now—not that New Zealand has very much to do with that. Most of the sheep purchased by Middle East buyers do not come from this part of the world. Indeed, they are fat tail sheep from countries nearby.

It has been very important to South Australian farmers to enjoy this trade, and they should be entitled to continue to enjoy it. I can see no good reason why that should not be so. Presently, there is a shift in emphasis on the animals which Middle Eastern buyers are seeking, and which we have in abundance. They are now looking for entire ram lambs. So, instead of castrating the lambs at the time of marking them, if we are to maximise the income that we derive from the export of each of those animals, we should simply let them grow to hogget size entire and, at the time we are preparing them for shipment, chemically vasectomise them. By that means there is no risk of those animals being used in breeding programs.

That remark is relevant only in the context of what some people regard as a risk to our supremacy in the world wool industry, where it might be possible to get merino rams from such a source and, thereby, take over from Australia. I doubt very much whether that would ever happen. It certainly has not happened with other species of agricultural animals from other countries when those countries have allowed the sale of their stud stock to any prospective buyer. The highest bidder gets the animal of their choice. Wherever that has happened in other parts of the world, such as with beef from Scotland, France or Italy, the position that they have enjoyed in the world market for the article for which

they have become renowned has not been reduced one jot. I do not see any risk to the Australian wool industry by allowing the development of a live sheep trade using entire animals. It would be to our advantage to supply what the customer needs.

I now draw attention to what I consider to be some very disquieting information that came to my attention recently. The House should know, as I understand it, that the South Australian Grants Commission is about to have the formula by which it determines grants to local government bodies rearranged. In the rearrangement of the formula I understand that the disability component will be changed. Presently, the way in which that component is calculated ensures that about 75 per cent of councils (in number) obtain some disability component in their grant allocation.

These councils have included all the large (in area) and small (in population) rural councils. They are an identical kind of local government body that I am referring to; for instance, the District Council of Browns Well and the District Council of Karoonda East Murray. Those district council areas do not have a large population, but the areas for which they have responsibility are huge by comparison with metropolitan or other urban district councils or corporations, in particular. Because of the large area for which these councils have responsibility, they find that they have long distances of roads that they must meet the expense of maintaining.

Alone, they are unable to do that from the rate revenue base at their disposal. To expect them to do so would be simply to destroy the viability of those councils and businesses, particularly farming, conducted in those areas. That would be absolutely devastating for South Australia and Australia. The consequence of it would be to reduce the amount of income that this country derives from exports produced in those localities. Those roads are used not only by local ratepayers but also by people commuting across the district council areas. The money which they need and which they are justifiably entitled to receive from other than ratepayer sources must be sufficient to ensure that those roads can be maintained.

Even under the present formula that is not so. The huge network of hundreds of thousands of kilometres of roads throughout this State is presently deteriorating at a rate far greater than the capacity of the revenue available for its maintenance to sustain it. That is why I view, with considerable disquiet, the proposal to rearrange the formula by which the South Australian Grants Commission allocates the funds from its lump sum that it gives to local government.

In this new formula, instead of the fashion in which I have described the disability component being determined, I understand that it will be determined more on the basis of population than on the basis of area. Consequently, the large corporations and other local government bodies (large in terms of population) will get an increase in the *per capita* amount of money they receive. Clearly, it is intended that someone else will have to go without.

That proposal means that the large district council areas that I represent, small in population, will be the district councils and local government bodies that have to go without. That will mean that the road network that they have to maintain will simply fall to pieces. I believe that the proposals to rearrange the formula of the South Australian Grants Commission are a deliberate attempt by the conspiratorial left wing elements in the bureaucracy to redirect resources away from the wealth generating industries of rural Australia towards the social caring programs that are being developed in Mickey Mouse fashion in and for local government.

They are not being developed by local government itself, they are being developed in a sneaky way by the influence of State and Federal Governments handing out small dol-

lops of money to get the programs commenced and establish staff and expectation in the minds of the population, in the communities served by those local government bodies. Then the State and Federal Governments intend to cut off the funds, in my sincere belief. That will leave the local government bodies to continue the programs at their own expense. The Governments will tell those local government bodies, I am sure, that the funds will be made available to them from the Grants Commission. I think that is crook. I think the deceit should stop and the Minister should come clean and tell the House whether or not there is any investigation of a rearrangement of the formula, why the investigation is under way and, if there is to be a rearrangement of the formula, on what criteria it will occur.

Certainly, the criteria by which the investigation is being conducted at present need to be made public to this House and to the community of South Australia at large. I worry about its implications, because I see something happening about which this sovereign Parliament knows nothing. I would not mind betting that the Minister himself is probably ignorant of the way in which it is happening and of the motives behind it.

I now turn to another matter. During the debate on the estimates relating to the Department of Marine and Harbors, I and other Committee members found it necessary to move a motion of censure against the Minister for his failure to exercise his statutory and constitutional responsibilities. They were overlooked by the Minister, and I use that word because I think it is probably kinder to him. I guess he was ignorant (or, if not ignorant, he chose to ignore those responsibilities) in relation to the spill of heavy metals at Gillman, which caused something of a stir here in South Australia late in the week before last.

During the course of that debate, I challenged the Minister, indeed, I asserted that the relevant professional officers of the South Australian Health Commission had not been consulted by the Minister of Marine, who had the statutory responsibility, in this matter. Nor were they consulted by the Deputy Premier (who is also Minister for Environment and Planning and Minister responsible for State Emergency Services), Dr Hopgood.

I was told by the member for Albert Park that I was mistaken; he then misled the Committee. He told the Committee that Mr Gordon Robinson—the gentleman in charge of health surveyors—had been consulted. That is not true. Mr Gordon Robinson was not consulted and did not attend the site meeting when the member for Albert Park asserted he did. Of course, Mr Gordon Robinson was not the appropriate employee in the Health Commission. A professional officer in the Health Commission should have been consulted. In my opinion, the person who should have been consulted was the head of the Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch, because under the auspices of that branch responsibilities are clearly delineated in the sections of industrial hygiene, occupational health and radiation control. The third one does not matter in this instance; it is irrelevant. However, the first two most certainly do. The professional officer of the Health Commission in the Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch is responsible for industrial hygiene and industrial health.

Had that person been consulted, I am quite sure that a good deal of the kerfuffle and concern which arose over that spill could have been averted. The Minister and all Government Ministers then in Cabinet were derelict in, if not ignorant of, their duty in failing to consult the only expert opinion available in the South Australian Public Service on how to deal with chemicals like that.

The pretension of members of the State Emergency Services to be competent to make judgments about how to deal

with such hazards arises only out of their belief that they can pick up and read an encyclopaedia, know how to interpret what it contains, and then apply its contents to the problem at hand. For anyone to presume that they can become competent simply by reading an encyclopaedia amazes me. It is even more amazing that the Government itself chose to accept advice on that basis.

I now turn to another matter which is of considerable concern to the people whom I represent and which was alluded to by members of the Estimates Committees during the course of the scrutiny of the vote. Country shows, conducted by agricultural show societies in rural communities, have been and still are a substantial part of the way of life in those communities. They are an important annual event in the communities in which they are held.

The real value of these shows is much greater in sociological, cultural and educational terms than any other single event that I can think of in the calendar of any community in South Australia. Not just hundreds or thousands but tens of thousands of hours of work go into the preparation of exhibits for those shows by the people who put them there. As a consequence of their efforts in participating as exhibitors in the shows, they put up a display of arts, crafts, skills and other aspects of rural life and culture for their fellow citizens to look at, to muse over and to learn from.

So, it involves not only the people who attend the show on the day and join in the occasion having the chance to talk to large numbers of residents from near and far about the problems that confront them and the good things that are happening, but also the fact that those shows keep skills, crafts and other things alive in rural communities by encouraging excellence—something of which we do too little these days.

However, to simply provide those shows with a meagre handout collectively of less than \$100 000 is, to my mind, to berate their significance and importance in the overall fabric of life in South Australia. I could be trite and say that those shows keep people off the streets, but I will not do so. I know that what I am saying in this respect will be well received by those who belong to the communities or who have ever lived in communities which have shows, because, until one has lived there, attended and participated in show preparations, one would never understand.

Everyone from the age of six years—or even younger in some cases—to the age of 96 can and does participate or exhibit in the craft section, one of the homemaking skill sections, in exhibits of animals and participation in arena competitions of one kind or another, or in the exhibition of vegetables, fruits, flowers and other things such as knitting, preserving fruit, and making bread and other commodities that fall into the category of life support crafts.

All those activities go to ensure that the fabric of life is sustained. I think that they make a far more substantial contribution to the welfare of tomorrow than other subsidised Government activities. Such shows ought therefore to be encouraged and allowed to proliferate within the metropolitan area. It would be far more beneficial for district corporations, and more particularly community organisations in urban situations, to organise and be subsidised for such shows than providing the Mickey Mouse programs on which we seem to be spending millions of dollars to try to solve the problems of idleness and boredom that are created when people have nothing to do. I believe that a substantial number of people in urban situations could be encouraged by an equivalent expenditure on the development of this kind of activity in their communities, namely, shows and exhibitions of crafts, arts and so on, than would be encouraged by an equivalent amount of expenditure on the many other things upon which we tend to spend it, and it would be of far greater benefit.

Let me turn now to another problem to which I alluded during the course of the Estimates Committees debate. I was a member of the Estimates Committee that examined the vote for recreation and sport. Whilst I could have raised this matter in a number of other committees, I was not a member of them and therefore was not able to do so. The matter to which I refer is noise. I related my concern about the noise that is made by boats, motor bikes, and other off-road vehicles. It could equally refer to noise made by lawnmowers and pop concerts. I am not so much referring to the nuisance value of the noise, although that is bad enough: I am more particularly concerned about the consequences of subjecting the human ear to the high noise levels which invariably and inevitably results in permanent damage to hearing.

It is almost a painless damage. Anybody who has suffered the damage (and I am one such person) will know what I am talking about. Such noise disrupts the lives of many other people, and will also cause considerable damage to the hearing of those people who make it, unless they wear ear muffs. They should know that, as a consequence of their albeit ignorantly irresponsible behaviour, they could end up like me with a significant loss of hearing in either or both ears.

Let me turn to the effects of their activities on others. Noise from unmuffled motors on boats on the river, unmuffled motor bikes in the immediate vicinity of residents, inappropriately or unmuffled lawnmowers and unmuffled off-road vehicles can be very distressing to somebody who is suffering from an illness. Indeed, it can be distressing to somebody who is not suffering any illness whatever and can cause them not only loss of sleep but also an increase in stress levels. It is quite thoughtless, unreasonable and unnecessary. I hope that the Government can find a way of ensuring that the people who make such noise are informed of the damage it will cause them and the discomfort their selfishness or lack of insight causes other people.

I now wish to turn to another matter of grave concern, and it relates to the community at Murray Bridge, namely, the proposal to build the Mobilong gaol near Murray Bridge. Unless we can do better in our Department of Correctional Services than we have to date, and unless we can expect a more reasonable commitment from the men who act as security officers in that department, then the concern that has been expressed to me over recent days about the capacity of the department to secure prisoners within the prison will not abate.

In today's *News* there is a report relating to the escape from the Adelaide Gaol last night of two men, one of whom is very dangerous. It is not so much that the most dangerous of these men, Graham Barrett, is ever likely to be incarcerated in the Mobilong prison, but, rather, the fact that security officers at the Adelaide Gaol allowed the events of last night and early this morning to occur is astonishing in the extreme. We have merely to look at what they did. They used a weight-lifting bar to bash a hole through their 50 cm thick cell wall. The article, written by Tom Menzies, states:

They then used a pole of several joined timber garden stakes to hoist a grappling hook to the top of a six metre perimeter wall. They must have used that bar to literally bash half a metre of stone out of the wall in order to make that hole. Does the Minister believe that was done in the dead of night and that nobody heard or was capable of hearing the noise? It would not have been done within a matter of minutes. A half a metre of stone wall is not easily shifted. Their escape was discovered only because a change in direction of a security camera was noticed in the prison security headquarters, and then a prison officer went to investigate it. I am really amazed and astonished that something like that can happen in the way it did and go unnoticed until some-

one observed that a security camera's direction had been changed.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, and then, as now, I reflect on the security officers. They are the people who are responsible and who are being paid good money, but they are ignoring their responsibilities.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): For the first time I found that the Estimates Committees delivered what I believe was their proper role, particularly on the committee in which I was involved, namely, that relating to the health line. In the past we have had great difficulty obtaining information from the Minister. Whether that was because the Minister felt he was under threat, or that he wanted to teach the Opposition a lesson, I do not know. But, as I have always believed (and I was an advocate of the Estimates Committees system), the Estimates Committees are there as part of the process of open government. The system was established to enable the Opposition and/or any member of Parliament to seek any relevant information from the Minister, who is assisted by his advisers.

On this occasion, I found that the cooperation we received was most helpful. We did not dillydally on the committee, but, rather, asked relevant questions, and the Minister provided us with very worthwhile information. Of course, how accurate that information is will be subject to further scrutiny. But, at least we got somewhere in relation to the health budget.

I was rather disappointed that the Minister of Tourism was a little over cautious. Admittedly it was her first occasion as a Minister before the Estimates Committee. We dealt at some length with tourism. We then went onto local government and only had about 10 minutes on youth affairs, which was disappointing. I would have liked to spend some time on youth affairs so that we could develop the attitude of the Government and the Minister as to what is proposed in that area, as she is the major coordinator of the Government's youth policy. I said to the Minister, and still believe to some degree, that it is wrong to discriminate and place any one section of the community under a separate portfolio. I do not believe in any discrimination whatsoever and, therefore, whether one is a youth or aged, irrespective of race, colour or anything else, everybody should be considered as an Australian citizen and as equals.

If we want to use the opportunity to emphasise a policy in a particular area, that is up to the Government of the day. Everybody should be given an equal opportunity. It is a pity we could not develop further the attitude of the Government on youth affairs. Opportunities exist for youth employment. Agencies have to be created; whether they be Government funded, partially Government sponsored or Government encouraged, it does not matter. However, we should be setting up agencies that will go out and find the jobs and then assess the young people before placing them in employment. I believe it works. We have proved that in the area of the disabled it does work.

The Epilepsy Association has had a training and placement service operating for two years and we have placed 50 people with epilepsy in full-time and worthwhile employment out of the 70 participants in the 16-week training course. If we can do it with epileptics—one of the toughest disabilities in which to educate the public and create a better understanding in the community—we can do it with other disabilities. In certain industries it is difficult to convince the workers, let alone the management, that a person with epilepsy should be treated no differently. We have to be realistic, as in some areas the employment of people with

epilepsy is impossible. So, the field does narrow to some degree. It has been a successful program, of which I have spoken before in this place.

Many of the 70 participants have never had any work experience whatsoever. To give them the opportunity of a two week trial with an employer has led almost instantly to obtaining a job. Certainly, by the time they have had their second two-week work experience program, those who have any chance of obtaining employment are readily employed. That program works well. It is an intensive program and deals with community attitudes, individual's health, deportment, presentation, preparation for job interviews and preparation for accepting the normal disciplines one would find in employment. That is what the young people of today sadly lack. I believe they need that little bit of encouragement and help to push them on when they are being interviewed or give that little bit of extra confidence so that, if somebody does give them the opportunity to work, they can do so knowing that they will succeed in what they want to do.

Unfortunately, too often young people are criticised because of their dress, manner or attitude, but they simply are not given the opportunity to understand or appreciate what is really required of them, and that is where the whole system falls down. If we are going to be serious about youth unemployment or unemployment in general, we have to set up—costly as it may be—the opportunity to prepare these people for work.

I had a tragic case recently of a young man who came to my office. He has not worked for 10 years, and most of that time he has spent in prison for minor offences. He cannot settle down or behave. Finally, I was able to get him a job through one of the local council's CEP projects, and he worked extremely well. Unfortunately, he decided to have a day off because he had a hangover after the weekend. He blew his chances and lost his job. We may be able to get him reinstated. He did not understand that a person just does not ring his employer and say that he has a hangover and will not be in. The employer did not appreciate it, although I think he was a bit tough. It is difficult to get this young chap into the work force and to get him to settle down. He is at the stage where that can be achieved, but if we do not succeed now I am afraid he will be a permanent resident of one of our institutions under the Department of Correctional Services. That would be a tragic loss of a worthwhile human being.

I am very keen to see the Government not talk any more about what it is going to do but, rather, take action. I also want to see the Federal Government act as I have suggested under the YES program. As I said to the Committee, the opportunity exists to create immediately 400 jobs in the hairdressing profession. Hairdressers are looking for young people, not at slave wages or anything like that, to do the basics for the first 12 months such as shampooing, preparation of a client, assisting the hairdressers, and so on. It gives young people 12 months work experience on proper wages before deciding whether or not they will take on hairdressing as a profession. It would be 12 months good and extremely valuable work experience in meeting people and dealing with the public before settling down to a trade.

There are currently many vacancies for hairdressers, and I cannot understand why the unions, the Government and the Department of Labour cannot get together and accept this proposal that I understand has been put to the Premier by one of my constituents—a proposal to create 400 jobs. It is no mean idea to come up with such a worthwhile and beneficial program. The ball is fairly and squarely at the Premier's feet in relation to doing something about the suggestion. There are, from time to time, good sound suggestions coming from business people and concerned citi-

zens in the community, and the Government cannot discriminate if it is going to do something for young people.

Whilst the Minister was being questioned as Minister of Local Government, I was disappointed that we did not spend more time on that portfolio. I was disappointed that she did not take seriously the suggestion that we ought to have some type of parliamentary Public Accounts Committee for local government. There needs to be a body or group to which ratepayers can go, for example, to say that their local council is spending \$1 million on a development or a project such as in Moseley Square at Glenelg and that, when it starts paying the accounts, it finds it has overrun the budget. What was originally created on a sketch plan often turns out to be something entirely different. When a council pays \$300 for litter bins, questions are asked. Anybody who has had any dealings with the average local government authority knows that one is sometimes given as much information as the council wants to release and that the less information it can divulge the better.

It is a pretty game politician or ratepayer who will stand up at length and demand the information: it is not readily passed on to the public. I can cite this case of Moseley Street, Glenelg, which is a waste of ratepayers' money—over \$1 million! I would still like to know who is getting the benefit of selling these little bricks for the brick paving around the place: Glenelg is being covered with them.

It is about time that some questions were asked. We should be able to go to an independent group of people who are set up by the regions within local government or through the Local Government Association in conjunction with the State Government and who will get the information for the ratepayers. After all, it is ratepayers' money as well as taxpayers' money. There has to be a greater accountability for this money that is expended on some of these projects. I am not convinced that in the beachfront areas these paving blocks are a better proposition than is bitumen. Bitumen will last longer in the seaside areas than bricks and certainly concrete will. Those sorts of things should be looked at.

Certainly, some local government areas are being weighed down with large loan borrowings and heavy interest repayments. The real test will come for some local government authorities in the next 12 months, particularly at the end of this financial year, when, unfortunately, they start to experience some very high interest rates, which affect everybody right across the board, in every sector.

I was very interested to see some information that has come today to the Parliament: *Facts Bulletin*, Winter 1985, a publication of the Institute of Public Affairs, has an article, 'Real Interest Rates at Record Levels'. I quote from it because it is most appropriate:

Real interest rates in Australia are now at their highest level for at least a century. Real interest rates are calculated by adjusting the nominal rate of interest (as stated by banks, building societies, etc.) for inflation.

For instance, if prices rise in a year by 5 per cent a nominal rate of 10 per cent becomes real rate of 5 per cent. This takes account of the effect of inflation on the real value of the interest obligation and the capital repayment.

	Bank Interest On Housing Loan %	Inflation %	Real Interest %
1960.....	5.0	2.5	2.4
1970.....	7.3	3.2	4.0
1980.....	9.9	10.2	-0.3

The 1980 year appears to be the key in it: if one was borrowing money for investment purposes one was doing well in 1980. Then we saw the rise. In 1982, bank interest on housing loans was 13.5 per cent; inflation, 10.4 per cent; the real interest was 2.8 per cent. Then we come to the

disaster period, as we are leaping up now: in 1984 bank interest on housing loans dropped to 11.5 per cent; inflation was 6.9 per cent, and the real interest was 4.3 per cent.

Interest rates were staying high. Inflation was coming down, but the benefit was not being felt by the average householder. On 30 June 1985 interest rates were 12 per cent; inflation, 4.3 per cent; the real interest was 7.4 per cent. That is where the impact is starting to hurt because people are now really reeling under this terrible impost of interest rates which, in some cases, are 13.5 per cent on the open market and could be higher. With inflation much lower, the real interest rate is climbing. That is where, with the value of the dollar, the average wage earner will really feel the impact, unless Governments and the Parliaments do something about it and act pretty quickly. They will have to act pretty quickly because the next six months is crucial. Money gets very tight from March to May of each year. Then interest rates seem to go up again until there is a general easing of funds by about August or September. I cannot see that occurring at present until the Commonwealth Government does something beneficial concerning taxation rates.

So, the timing of the tax package by the Commonwealth Government for this time next year is crucial if the economy of this country is to remain on a reasonably even keel, but there will be a lot of hardship from now until the tax benefits are given to the wage earners because the average wage earners can get no other relief from extremely high interest rates unless they come down, and there does not appear to be any way that interest rate will come down at present.

That was highlighted in our own budget documents, in the strong borrowing by the State Financing Authority on behalf of Government and statutory authorities. While statutory authorities and the State Government keep borrowing as heavily as they are, the pressure that is being put on interest rates will continue. While State and Commonwealth Governments keep taxing people at the level at which they do to meet the high cost of government, less money is circulating within the community.

If the average worker does not have a reasonable amount of money to spend, we start feeling the impact in the general retailing market, which, in turn affects the whole economy. South Australia is poised for a reasonably good period by virtue of the influx of visitors who will be brought to the State for the Grand Prix. That will generate, and indeed has generated, a lot of movement of money. People are spending: one can see it in the retail areas, in the general uplift of confidence in the marketing of souvenirs and of general products in anticipation of an influx of visitors.

In other words, Christmas retail trading is coming earlier this year because of the Grand Prix. It will be up to the marketers and the retail trade to try to keep the interest going right through until Christmas. We should see a significant shift of funds in that respect. Then, with the State's celebrating its 150th anniversary, many Australian championships and sporting events and the Festival of Arts, there is a wide and varied program for the next 12 months. Therefore, this again should generate a considerable amount of income and a spreading of income.

So, it is in the Government's interest to keep its sticky little fingers off the people's money, but we have already heard and seen the announcements being made by the Government in relation to what it proposes for the electors in the next six months or so. I am concerned that we have been asked to debate and examine a budget: we have looked at the documents, and there is no guarantee that what we have received is an honest and true statement of the State finances. It is not a true and honest statement of what would or could occur as at the end of June 1986.

I have every indication and belief, as my colleagues do, that if all the promises were met that are being currently made the State budget would blow out by tens of millions of dollars. That is the absolute height of the deception, when the Government brings down a document and cannot guarantee that it will balance.

Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to raise any issues in the education debate, but I have a constituent who is concerned at the standard of English language in courses that are available to migrants, particularly Vietnamese migrants, in this country. She wrote to me, and said this:

I am enclosing for you further information about the sale of an English language kit to [a Vietnamese immigrant]. Two kits published by Linguaphone Institute were sold to [this gentleman] and his neighbour by a door to door salesman early this year. The kit contains four audiotapes, a book of lessons and two vocabulary booklets. The cost per kit was \$216. I am drawing this to your attention because:

1. The cost is extremely high for what is provided.
2. The lessons on tape are too fast for early learners of English. The [the migrants] are unable to use them by themselves.
3. The lesson content is British and the subject matter is seemingly inappropriate for newly arrived refugees, e.g. how to organise a formal dinner party.
4. There are plenty of more suitable tapes available at such centres as the Migrant Education Centre Library Renaissance Centre, Adelaide.

I have contacted Consumer Affairs and they inform me that they are unable to take any action as the Linguaphone Institute has acted within appropriate regulations.

My major concern is that recently arrived migrants are exploited by companies who play upon the migrants' desperate wish to learn English by selling them products that appear to aid them but really are prohibitively expensive and inappropriate. [The migrant] is unemployed and yet he paid \$216 because he thought that he and his wife could speed up their mastery of English. They are currently attending lessons at the Indo-Chinese Women's Association. There are many other vulnerable migrants in this situation, and I seek to prevent their further exploitation.

I think that that is quite appropriate. The Indo-Chinese are keen and willing to work. They want to quickly establish themselves in their new country, and the key to that of course is a command of the English language, at whatever level one desires. Of course they want to be able to communicate, and they are doing anything to be able to quickly establish themselves in this respect.

However, we find that door to door salesmen have quickly pounced on the opportunity to sell these programs costing some \$216, offering the buyer the opportunity to extend payments over three monthly periods so that he can afford them. This is a very expensive way of taking English lessons which, as my constituent pointed out, are quite inappropriate because, for example, there is no point in having tapes on which the English is spoken too fast or tapes dealing with a formal dinner party.

Basically the migrants require knowledge of day to day questions and answers, to assist them in gaining employment, to be able to communicate while they are in employment, to obtain worthwhile accommodation, and to know how to use our public transport, and so on. The Indo-Chinese are being ripped off. There seems to be a lack of communication between various organisations as to where people can obtain the most beneficial education classes which would not cost them anything.

I hope that the Minister of Education and his department will respond to this plea made by my constituent to ensure that somehow, in conjunction with the Department of Immigration, the State Government department responsible for ethnic affairs can communicate to all these people through all forms of the media details of English classes that are available through a wide range of schools, education departments and authorities within South Australia, and that they would be well advised to take up these courses at no cost to them and to be taught the English that is necessary for

them to survive and give them a chance to quickly adjust and settle in.

It is a long haul for some of these people. They have suffered very badly from the effects of wars which may have been continuing in their country for many decades. Some of them have had to come via refugee camps, suffering atrocious conditions, health and otherwise. When they finally come here, as with all refugees and migrants who have come to this country, it is a long haul before they are finally settled into suitable living accommodation, with the whole family united, if possible. In some instances that is not possible, but at least some members of the family can establish themselves and start to assist one another. We have seen with Italian, Greek, and Anglo-Saxon migrants in the past that they are prepared to come here and work very hard six or seven days a week, sometimes to the detriment of the health. We have seen them battle to obtain a reasonable command of English, and in days gone by with very little help from Government authorities.

We now have the opportunity to help migrants. We have the systems, methods and programs to assist these people. We should do all we can to help the Indo-Chinese to quickly settle into the community. We should not place them in a vulnerable situation where, for instance, they have to pay \$216 to buy some tapes, believing that they will learn English far more quickly, especially when the tapes are quite inappropriate. It is a pity that I was not able to be part of the Committee that examined the Education Department lines. I had hoped to debate this matter with the Minister. As I have said, I hope that he picks up this matter and that it is followed through.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The main area in which I was involved in the Committees was recreation and sport, and I want to show how the promises made by the Minister are out of line with the budget lines. This is *apropos* to the comment made earlier today by the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that some \$200 million worth of promises made in the past two or three months have not been recognised, and are all outside the budget lines. The member for Henley Beach is laughing about that, but I suppose that if we are in an election mode, we can expect all these sorts of things to occur. I suppose it is not surprising that a Government in trouble does this sort of thing, but it is being quite dishonest to the people of South Australia.

Mr Lewis: They are buying votes.

Mr INGERSON: It is obvious that they are buying votes. I want to illustrate to the House how some of the figures given by the Minister do not hold water.

Mr Ferguson: What is your policy?

Mr INGERSON: If the honourable member can listen for long enough, he might hear that. In relation to the reorganisation of the Department of Recreation and Sport we had a general discussion with and questioning of the Minister, who stated that more people were employed in the department. However, that is not really so because the department has been reorganised; people have been taken from outside and they have been put back in to the department in number only. That is an incredible statement. During the Estimates Committees we went around in circles when looking at the numbers of people currently employed by the department.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The classic fudge.

Mr INGERSON: I have been prompted that it is the classic fudge. In the Minister's preliminary speech I noted with interest his difficulty in explaining why the operating costs for 1985-86 were \$1.32 million when during 1984-85 they were \$445 000—an increase of \$874 000: that while we had that increase it was not really an increase because the

department had to be reorganised. The Minister explained that during 1984-85 the department operated at a much lower level than it should have, and that it was budgeted to spend an extra \$874 000 (or a 196 per cent increase over the previous year), but that really that was not an increase.

One can see from that explanation why sports and recreation associations believe that we are building up a huge department that is ploughing the money into supporting and growing itself, rather than putting those extra dollars into the community for sport and recreation. The Minister clearly said that the \$1.6 million extra being spent this year was the overall increase for the department. Of that \$1.6 million, only \$600 000 will go to the community; the other \$1 million will stay in the department to help build a bigger and, according to the Minister, a far more effective department.

I question that, because I do not believe that we need a department that is increasing in numbers to support the recreation and sports fields. I believe that we have an excellent structure, with excellent volunteers and employed people running sports and recreation bodies very effectively. We now have a department, I believe, being set up to duplicate a lot of that effort, work and goodwill that the volunteers and employed people are carrying out for those sports and recreation bodies.

Mr Becker: Is it the way it is done in Victoria?

Mr INGERSON: I think it is; it may be just a follow-on from the Victorian scheme. We now have a massive increase in funds going to the department, with only a third of that increase going to sports associations. As we all know, sports associations are finding it more difficult every week to make available administration money and money for children, in particular, to go on State and interstate trips.

Another extraordinary area we discussed with the Minister was the purchase of the computer, which will cost some \$400 000, with operating costs budgeted this year at \$341 000. It is incredible that those two figures are almost the same. I hope that, in further questioning of the Minister, we will be able to find out why there is this massive cost for running the computer.

Mr Becker: It costs \$1 million to give out \$600 000; and \$400 000 to give out \$341 000?

Mr INGERSON: As I am prompted by the member for Hanson, we have the incredible situation of the operating and purchase costs of the computer being similar in the one year. It is incredible that the Department of Recreation and Sport should be budgeting to spend so much on computer operating costs. I am also concerned about the Minister's explaining that \$4.8 million was to be spent on capital works in the recreation and sports area this next financial year. However, during the past two or three months the Minister has announced the development of the Glenelg hockey, small bore rifle, etc. complex for \$4.4 million; the expenditure of \$1 million at the Olympic Sports Field; the completion of the Aquatic Centre at \$2.75 million; local facility capital expenditure of the order of \$890 000; and \$300 000 to be spent on the planning of the velodrome—a total of some \$8.7 million. On a line that has \$4.8 million to be allocated, where is the extra \$4.3 million coming from?

Interestingly, the Minister said that that will be budgeted for next year. That means that we have promises now of \$4.8 million that will take us through until the end of June, and extra promises of over \$4.3 million for next year. Whoever is then in government will be in the position of not being able to introduce new capital works before the end of 1985-86. That is a most incredible situation in a department as small as the Department of Recreation and Sport.

Mr Becker: He has it down for the 1986-87 budget.

Mr INGERSON: Again, I am prompted by the member for Hanson; the Minister has announced during 1985-86 the program budget for 1986-87. I suppose that one could explain that by saying that we are in an election mode and that the Government of the day can tell fibs and do anything it likes, because really the public does not believe it in any case. The only problem is that, once one makes a commitment to sports, recreation or any other facility, whoever takes over as the next Government either has to accept that commitment or refuse it. I believe that it is totally irresponsible for the Government to be making this sort of commitment—more than 100 per cent over its line—purely and simply for election purposes.

During the Estimates Committees we also discussed with the Minister the problem of the greyhound racing industry. On Sunday night I had the privilege of attending a special meeting at Angle Park where some 300 owners, trainers and visitors complained about the closing of the Strathalbyn raceway and the potential closure of the Port Pirie racetrack. Two very clear resolutions were passed at a very emotional and heated meeting.

The first was a recommendation that the two clubs continue for as long as possible and attempt to obtain sufficient assistance from the Greyhound Racing Control Board or, indirectly, from the Adelaide Raceway. Secondly, a recommendation was made that, if the Greyhound Racing Control Board had not made a decision within the next 20 days, the trainers and owners should withhold their nominations for the Angle Park meeting on 26 October. For such resolutions to be passed, one needs to ask oneself: what is the problem with the racing industry? Interestingly, even though all members of Parliament were sent letters, no-one from the Government was there at this special meeting of some 300 disgruntled people from the greyhound industry.

Mr Hamilton: That's not true.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that it is true. It was interesting that they did not turn up, but, if I am incorrect, I stand to be corrected. However, I understand that all members of Parliament were invited to attend, yet only one member appeared. No-one else turned up at the meeting of such a large group of people concerned about the greyhound industry.

What caused the problem is very clear: the greyhound industry is in trouble purely and simply because the Minister has had before him now for some 18 months a request to do something about distribution of moneys from the TAB. In the past three years the Minister has been requested many times to make a very simple decision. Unfortunately, that has not occurred.

Because of the lack of money available to the Greyhound Control Board from distribution from the TAB, tracks like Strathalbyn and Port Pirie may inevitably be closed in future unless a fairly urgent decision is made. I was asked to make some comments at the meeting, and I set out the position of the Liberal Party. I said that within three months we would, in consultation with the three codes, make a decision in relation to the distribution of TAB moneys. That would be our commitment when we were elected. I am concerned that the greyhound racing industry is in that position because of the indecision of the Minister concerned.

We also talked during the Estimates Committee about the problem of grants to recreational and sporting bodies. We told the Minister that there was general concern and confusion about the new development plan issued by the department. The Minister made some rather incredible statements: he had heard of no problems or concerns from any sporting or recreational body. Obviously, the Minister does not go around talking to recreational and sporting bodies, because in the last three or four months at almost

every function I have attended I have heard people express concern, for several reasons, about this new development plan.

Generally, there is an overall reduction in grants; significant delay in answering letters to the department; considerable delay in the actual payment of money once communication has been set up; a massive duplication of effort, in that many associations have been required to submit a three year development plan, then, within a month or so, they have been requested to submit another development plan and, shortly after that, they have been requested to put in an amended development plan.

It is incredible that the Minister should say that that has not occurred, because it has happened on eight or 10 occasions of which I am aware. It seems that it is bureaucratic bunkum. We have a department that is unable to set clear simple rules for the associations making these applications: there is dilly dallying within the department in which decisions need to be made rapidly.

The other problem relates to a reduction in grants. If one says to an organisation, 'We want you to appoint a professional administrator to help your organisation because we believe that is the best way to go', and, at the end of the first year, one says, 'We believe that your administrator is probably a good one, but we will give you less money next year because we believe that you have to self fund', it is a totally wrong method of funding professional administrative staff. That area needs massive reorganisation.

On a lighter note, it is interesting that the Minister is to announce a sports lottery for the third time in six months. I hope that it is a little more successful than the last two have been and that we do not have another gimmicky system. I hope that we have a sports lottery with some logic and that it works. The concept put forward by the Minister is excellent and is one way in which community money, via taxation, in effect, can be directly put back into sport and recreation.

We also talked about the new hockey complex and small bore rifle complex at Glenelg. That was one area in which we were unable to question the Minister, due to lack of time. I have been advised that right in the middle of the oval at which the main stadium is to be erected is a series of main sewerage trunk lines. I hope that the cost of shifting those trunk lines will not be so great that this project is put off for too long, because there is no question that there is a need for a hockey stadium to be built as soon as possible in this State. We need to develop new headquarters for weightlifting and the small bore rifle people.

During discussion about the small bore rifle association, the problem of safety was mentioned. The Minister was a little flippant in his answer: he considered that we were flippant in asking the question. However, it is an area of concern which, as I said during the Estimate Committee, needs to be looked at further to ensure that there is no major problem with small bore rifle shooting at Glenelg.

How can he spend \$8 400 000 with a budget line of \$4 800 000? One questions how soon the hockey complex will be opened. Let us hope that we do not have another aquatic centre. We told everyone for 18 months that it would be opened the next month. We hope to get an answer fairly soon from the Minister about when this project will begin and when we expect it to be opened. There is no doubt that people associated with hockey hope that the stadium will be open for use in the next hockey season.

During the Estimates Committee we also talked about distribution of money from the TAB. It is staggering that after some two or three years the three racing codes are no better off than they were three years ago; they do not know what their future distribution is likely to be. It is very difficult for any organisation—be it a sporting or recrea-

tional body or a business—when it does not know what its future income is likely to be, or at least does not know within reasonable bounds what sort of income it will get from a particular source. Potential problems in the racing industry and those that currently exist in the trotting and greyhound areas are there purely and simply because the Minister has not taken the opportunity to make a positive decision in the last three years.

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

Mr INGERSON: The area that concerns me relates to small lotteries. During the Estimates Committee hearing there was a very brief discussion with the Minister regarding the problem areas relating to that matter. We questioned the Minister on the methods used in selling small lottery tickets and the need to have a more rigid control over the bonusing of tickets in that area. He gave us an assurance that his department, through the Racing and Gaming Division, was making a thorough and continuous investigation of this area. I am not satisfied that the Minister's comments were as much to the point as we had hoped, because there has been a lot of questioning about the need to tighten up the whole area of small lottery control. We hope in the near future that we will see some legislation from the Minister that will tighten up the distribution of tickets.

Another area of concern that we discussed very briefly were the problems at 5AA. Since the Estimates Committees we have seen massive resignations from 5AA that have highlighted the concerns that we expressed during the Estimates Committees. It is to be hoped that, with this restructuring, this is the end of the road in relation to sackings or retrenchments and that, through different management, the 5AA radio station can get back on its feet and become a very viable station within the radio network.

The problems related to the purchase of the two country radio stations was not dealt with in great detail during the Estimates Committees, and we hope that the Minister will soon be able to advise us what is happening in that area. We were happy to note that the decision of the Betting Control Board to limit to 70 years the age of retirement of bookmakers has been deferred. I believe, as do the majority of bookmakers, that is a very satisfactory situation.

We were concerned about the final estimated cost of the Aquatic Centre, but it seems that we are now coming to the end of that sorry saga and that we have a final price of approximately \$8.25 million. On Sunday, as most people know, this centre will be opened after all the extended openings about which we have been told in the past 12 months. It is a tragedy that some \$4.2 million over and above the original budget has had to be spent in getting to this final figure for the Aquatic Centre. I raise again the comment of the Auditor-General that, for the second time in two years, the difference between the running cost and what the Government will have to pick up still has not been finalised in any agreement form. We have the situation that probably not until next year's budget will we actually find out what the true running cost of this centre will be. I understand that we have been informed that any costs over \$100 000 will be picked up by the State Government.

The other area concerned problems at the Olympic Sports Field between the Amateur Athletics Association and the State Government. This shemuzzle will continue for at least the next couple of months, and I am quite sure that some very enlightening and important facts will come out over the next two or three weeks. The other Committee in which I was involved dealt with the labour line, its major area of discussion being workers compensation. It is a pity that over the last 12 months the Government has not been able to bring before Parliament new legislation to enable the cost of workers compensation to be radically reduced. We under-

stand that difficult negotiations are still under way between the union movement, the employers and the Government. For the sake of small business in particular, it is urgent that this area be cleared up as soon as possible.

No question exists that workers compensation over the last 10 years has involved a very significant increased cost for small business, subsequently affecting employment, in particular, youth employment. That area needs urgent remedy by legislation, and I would have hoped that the Government would be able to bring forward the legislation more quickly than it has done. Another area of concern is the use of statutory authorities—an issue that we on this side would oppose. Both union and employer bodies are concerned about statutory authorities and the ongoing cost.

The other Committee with which I had the privilege of being associated considered the Premier's lines. It was interesting to note the significant amount of debate on interest debt. No question exists that the amount of money borrowed by Government has a significant effect on the amount of money available in the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Last night in Mount Gambier I attended a meeting convened by the South-East Dairy Farmers Association at which the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association President, Mr Aub Kretschmer, and the Secretary, Mr David Higbed, were also present. The Presidents of the two associations addressed the public meeting, which was very well attended by dairymen in the South-East, regarding the possibility of implementing an improved augmentation scheme. 'Augmentation' is not really an acceptable word in the South-East these days. The meeting preferred to refer to the subject matter as an improved equalisation scheme.

The two Presidents put their various viewpoints. The South-East association ultimately pointed out to the attending dairy farmers that it had requested a figure of around \$2.16 million from the South Australian Dairy Association as a form of compensation for the South-East not retailing its milk in Adelaide. On the other hand, the President of the South Australian association came up with a figure of \$1.69 million as the ceiling to which it was prepared to go. That left an approximate amount of \$4 200 as the difference between the request and the offer. There were subsequent addresses during the course of the evening, but the only really relevant matter is that the meeting decided, by unanimous resolution, that in view of there being no further compromise in sight it regarded the negotiations from that point yesterday evening as having completely broken down.

The resolution was that the Minister should now be asked to intervene, to adjudicate on the matter and to come up with what he regarded as a fair sum. The assumption on the part of the South-East Dairyfarmers Association was that the Minister would intervene and decide on a figure somewhat above the \$1.69 million offered by the South Australian Dairyfarmers Association.

I simply ask this evening that the Minister now act quickly, because there was a high degree of cynicism evident at the meeting yesterday evening, for the following reason: prior to the last election the Minister claims that it was Australian Labor Party policy to approve the augmentation scheme for the dairyfarmers in the South-East. He has had that policy for three years and has been very much like the reluctant bride: he was pledged three years ago and the South-East dairyfarmers still have not got him to the altar.

During questioning in the recent Estimates Committees the Minister of Agriculture repeatedly said that when he was finally convinced that negotiations had broken down between the two associations he would implement Labor

Party policy and introduce legislation. During questioning by the shadow Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Ted Chapman), the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr Blevins) said that legislation had not been drafted and that, when it was necessary (that is, when he was convinced that it was necessary—and I think that he repeated it, saying 'Do I have to tell the honourable member four times?'), it would be drafted by the Parliamentary Counsel, who he understood normally were responsible for such matters.

There have been repeated suggestions in the South-East that legislation had already been drafted, claims that I denied because I tended to believe the Minister, especially since he had made his own statements in the House, and Ministers who tell fibs to their colleagues are almost invariably asked to resign. But, last night at the meeting, a telex was produced by the Australian Labor Party sub-branch from the Minister, saying that legislation had been drafted. This was contrary to the information that we had here in the House only a few days ago.

If the Minister is telling us one thing and telexing another, obviously he has something to answer for. If legislation is drafted, it is a direct threat to the South Australian Dairyfarmers Association; if it is not drafted, negotiations are still on a gentlemanly plane. I ask the Minister to make clear to Parliament exactly what he has done. If he has drafted legislation, for which Act has he drawn up legislation? Is it the Metropolitan Milk Board legislation? Is it the dairy legislation, or is it one of several other associated Acts that could impinge on the rights of dairyfarmers in the South-East? If the Minister had already had legislation drafted, as he telexed the meeting last night, how did he know the outcome of the meeting? I certainly did not, and I was hopeful, as were many others, that an agreement would be reached between the South Australian and South-East Dairyfarmers Associations at that meeting last night, but a happy resolution to the problem was not reached and the Minister was asked to intervene.

It would be very interesting if the Minister could tell the House precisely to which Bill he has already drafted an amendment and how exactly he proposed to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion before the meeting last night had even arrived at its conclusions—a very interesting question!

This is a very interesting question which I am sure the Minister will be able to answer in the fullness of time. But meanwhile, it would appear that the House was misled during questioning in the Estimates Committees. Under the circumstances, I challenge the Minister at least to arbitrate as to a satisfactory figure and to introduce immediately whatever legislation might be necessary so that the matter can be put through the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council before the next election—rather than have this matter hanging on for the fourth year, as almost like a new year's resolution: made in 1982, not used, and still available in 1986.

If that is how the Minister works in relation to election promises and commitments, it is not very satisfactory. The Minister should bring legislation into the House; it should be put through, thereby fulfilling a promise made three years ago to people in the South-East area. If the Minister does not do so, it will be incumbent on the Opposition to fulfil that commitment made to the South-East dairymen at the meeting last night.

I am pleased that the Minister of Education is in the House this evening, as I want to refer to problems confronting the Allendale East Area School. These are not massive problems, but they are worthy of mention here this evening. First, I am very pleased that the School Loans Advisory Committee has indicated to the Allendale East Area School its approval for the construction of a quite substantial gymnasium. The Minister will recall that I contacted him some

weeks ago (he acknowledged receipt of the letter), suggesting that a large gymnasium would be more appropriate than a scaled down one, if not only because the Allendale East Area School is the southernmost school in South Australia. It stands in the track of the inclement westerlies which occur throughout the long winter period, when the children and staff need to be indoors, simply because they cannot play and conduct sports and recreation periods outside during those rough winter days.

Apart from that, there is a fairly substantial rural population—which I believe is now expanding because the soldier settlers are retiring and their youngsters and others are taking up the former soldier settlers' properties and are now having families. I believe that the school will begin to grow again. Its numbers are as low as they have been for quite some time. Therefore, there is a potentially substantial recreational use of the gymnasium by the people of the district. I believe that the numbers that will use it will grow, too.

I am informed that the matter now rests with the Minister, who must now give his final approval (and it must be given Cabinet approval) before construction can proceed. I am very pleased that the matter has gone as far as the SLAC Committee having put it on the Minister's desk with an 'Okay'. I do not expect the Minister to respond this evening, but I draw to his attention that we are awaiting a response from him in writing—a favourable one, I hope.

I was invited to the Allendale Area School, as I have been invited to a number of others in the South-East in my annual pilgrimage to check on repair and maintenance. This is something I did when the Liberals were in government, too. The Allendale Area School is over 30 years old. One problem there is of quite substantial proportion. The drainage and sewage from the school goes into the quadrangle behind the school, where children play constantly during recess and lunchtimes. The septic system and soakage pits are in the centre of the yard. Over the years the pipes leading into those pits have become damaged and buckled. Further, the pits themselves have probably outlived their useful life, and create overflow problems.

Not only that; the pipes themselves block and several times a year for the past few years the local Public Buildings Department has been called out to effect repairs. When the pipes block, toilet paper and effluent overflow into the schoolyard. I was there last Friday week in the morning and noticed that there were still in the quadrangle where children are constantly playing remnants of toilet paper that had become compressed on the pavement during the dry few weeks we have just had. Within two hours of my leaving the school the problem again erupted, and effluent and sewage were all over the playground.

The school and school council are self-conscious about making demands on the Minister for the simple reason that they appreciate that there is an acute shortage of maintenance money not only in the South-East but across the State. They have been told that, and it is self-evident. However, in this case they asked me whether I would intercede because the problem is a health hazard and, although it may mean that they jump the queue and are placed on the top of the list for an urgent repair to the septic and sewerage system, nevertheless, I believe that health problems are of paramount importance. Therefore, I will be in touch with the Minister in the near future requesting some accelerated help for the Allendale East Area School. It may be that other things proposed for the school will slip down the list; I do not know. Certainly, the whole toilet system needs an overhaul.

Recently I visited Port Augusta at the request of a number of Aboriginal people who wished to discuss a number of problems that had been publicised in the local press and in the northern region edition of the *Advertiser* during the past

several months. The discussions were quiet and very interesting, and I was impressed by the sincerity of the people with whom I conversed. They were certainly not militant people, but were very disturbed. One of the matters that was brought to my notice was the current situation at Davenport Aboriginal community reserve. The coordinator, a gentleman by the name of Mr Laurie Kinnear, is currently under suspension. The matters of salaries and compensation are, I believe, currently before the Industrial Court and, therefore, I do not propose to canvass them in the House. I regard them as *sub judice* and in far better hands than mine for resolution.

However, Mr Kinnear and two of his clerical staff (who are also under suspension, or maybe termination—I am not quite sure of the situation today) have been the subject of what they regard as scurrilous rumours. There have been allegations that they had been misappropriating funds at the Davenport reserve. They feel that quite a lot of people in the community are looking down on them for allegedly having done such things, although they vehemently deny that there has been any misappropriation of funds.

I consider them to be sincere and honest people in so far as you would hardly expect anyone with something to hide to invite you along to talk to them and then ask for a judicial inquiry to be held into the whole matter so that their names could be cleared as quickly as possible. Obviously, that would be the last thing that anyone with anything to hide would ask for.

I believe that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in South Australia and the federal Minister, who has responsibility through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and the State Minister of Health, who administers the health side of life at Davenport, should be interested and active enough to instigate an investigation into the background of this matter.

It is most unfortunate to have people who seem to have been doing a very good job in looking after the people at Davenport sitting on the sidelines. I draw members' attention to another unusual feature of this matter. The coordinator of the Davenport Community Council, in a letter dated 6 August 1984 to the accountant of ACAP Incorporated at Port Augusta, said:

Dear Sir,

On checking through the 1983-84 budgets in order to assess areas of over/under expenditure it has been noted the salary in relation to the position of Administrator, AMS has been increased as from pay period ended 30 May 1984.

Inquiries with the pay clerk at the accountancy cell confirmed the position had been upgraded from A01 to A02 and although advice was received from the pay clerk that she had written instructions to increase the salary level, these instructions could not be found at the time of my inquiry on Friday 3 August 1984.

As you are aware, any changes in negotiated salaries are subject to approval by the funding body (in this instance DAA). Also, this appears to be yet another instance where the employer and body held responsible, viz. Davenport Community Council, has not been consulted. Your comments, together with copies of any correspondence authorising this increase would be appreciated without delay.

There is also a letter from the area officer at Port Augusta (Charles H. Spence), with carbon copies to the Administrator of the Port Augusta District Aboriginal Health Service (D. Vorst); the Chairman of the Davenport Community Council (B. Nunn); and the Chairperson of the Port Augusta Davenport Aboriginal Health Service. The letter is addressed to the accountant of the Aboriginal Community Affairs panel, and it states:

As you are aware, salary increases (on DAA funded positions) should not be paid until written approval has been received from DAA. Draft estimates are not considered written approval and particularly in this case where Mr Vorst's salary was increased even prior to the 1984-85 financial year.

In your letter to the Chairman, Davenport Council, dated 9 August 1984, you point out that written authority of any sort was not received by yourself or ACAP accounting cell.

Our file indicates that no reply has been received from Davenport Council on this matter and in order to resolve this position and comply with DAA regulations, you are requested to return Mr Vorst's salary to the approved rate and further advise Mr Vorst that unauthorised overpaid salaries must be repaid.

Should Mr Vorst subsequently seek an increase in salary, recommendation must come first from his employer (i.e. PADAHS), to DAA for approval. Telephone calls are not to be accepted as sufficient authority.

I am led to believe that the overpaid salary in question may not yet have been reimbursed. I would like the Ministers—particularly the Minister of Health who will expend some several hundred thousand dollars on this health service during the current budget—to investigate the matter and check into the background, because it is significant that it was Mr Kinnear who pointed out the discrepancy. Mr Kinnear has been suspended: I am not quite sure why. I would like to know definitely that there is no victimisation in this matter.

In the audited report of the Davenport Community Council Incorporated Aboriginal Medical Service for the year ended 30 June 1984 by accountants at Port Augusta (Abbott and Beer) there is another interesting comment at page 4. I suppose as Governors in Victoria are under investigation, we might as well have a look at one or two other things. In this audited report the auditors say:

We detected a number of instances where travel allowance was paid to an employee of the medical service, but for which travel an account was later received from the Flinders Lodge Motel in Adelaide, apparently for the same travel as covered by the allowance paid.

The accounts rendered by the motel included charges for accommodation, breakfast and dinner, telephone calls and drinks. Travel allowance is specifically provided to meet the costs of accommodation, meals, incidentals, etc. for the period an employee is away from a usual place of employment, and reply to our request for explanation of which appeared to be an overclaiming of travel expenses was that the allowance received by the employee was used for expenses of vehicle travel and telephone calls. It is our opinion that claims for vehicle or telephone expenditures incurred on behalf of an employer should be the matter of a separate claim.

A number of instances where it appears that excessive payments have been received are noted hereunder:

Date	Travel Allowance	Motel Payment
1.6.84	159.25	137.00
6.6.84	96.55	57.50
16.8.84	103.85	94.90
18.9.84	140.80	99.70
25.9.84	374.95	91.20

On page 5, the audit report continues under the heading 'Salaries':

We noted in the interim health committee minutes of a meeting held 16 February 1984 that approval was granted to pay the Acting Administrator as a casual employee whilst he was on secondment from port Augusta Woma Society Incorporated. Usually, casual rates are higher than normal salary rates and are intended to compensate for the employee not receiving payment for annual leave, sick leave and public holidays but we note payments were also made for public holidays on 20, 23 and 25 April 1984.

We find the circumstances unusual where an officer of an organisation engaged for three months duration would be paid as a casual as in our opinion casual employment is not intended to cover such a situation. Our check of payroll details revealed that the Administrator of the health service was receiving a salary higher than that approved by the funding body, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

The approved salary, stated in the services' budget was \$19 306 per annum, and this was revised—

a substantial revision—

to \$24 359, according to a letter forwarded to the Chairperson of Davenport Community Council Incorporated by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs area officer in November 1983. The actual salary paid to the Administrator is listed below:

	\$ p.a.
Woma Program Director (prior to secondment)	
14.2.84	25 424

Acting Administrator—Interim Health Board 15.2.84-24.5.84 \$ p.a.
32 941

(Refer to previous where paid as casual)

*Administrator—Port Augusta Davenport Aboriginal Health Service 25.5.84-16.9.84 30 414

*(Salary level that of Administrative Officer Grade II)

In our attempt to establish the authority that allowed the Administrative Officer to be receiving a salary at the level of Administrative Officer Grade II we entered into discussions with officers of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the Medical Service Administrator, the Davenport Community Council Coordinator, and the accountant of the Aboriginal Community Affairs Panel. It would appear from those discussions that the Department of Aboriginal Affairs agreed in principle with a proposal to raise the administrator's salary from AO1 to AO2 provided that there were savings in the 1983/84 budget and providing that a submission put forward to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs was approved.

It appears that there is more to this situation than meets the eye. I do not think that the matter has been properly investigated, or that there has been any censure of the party or parties concerned other than the apparent suspension of the coordinator of Davenport Aboriginal Reserve. Whether or not they are connected, I cannot ascertain. I do not have sufficient documents to go through the entire matter. Obviously I would not have access to those, but I do have sufficient documents here for me to feel extremely concerned about the way the matter is being administered.

While I was at Port Augusta there were also allegations that there may be nepotism in appointments to the Aboriginal Health Service, which currently receives hundreds of thousands of State and federal dollars and which has a massive staff when compared with the normal health service.

For those reasons, I ask the Ministers concerned to ascertain whether positions that are well paid within the Pikawiyi Health Service are advertised or whether appointments are made by some person or persons in senior administrative positions without the usual channels being followed.

It is important to the Aboriginal people in the area because it was at their request that I was asked, first, to accept these documents from them, to peruse them and subsequently to contact the State and Federal Ministers concerned to ascertain whether things were proceeding as they should. The Aboriginal people themselves are not entirely happy at having the very costly health service imposed upon them when the largest proportion of Aborigines in Port Augusta are currently consulting with normal medical practitioners already established within the town and are also being refused services by Pikawiyi, unless they divert the whole of their medical care back to the Pikawiyi Health Service.

In other words, if they go to Port Augusta and subsequently need to go to Adelaide, Pikawiyi says that they cannot have an ambulance funded by its service unless the patient has been attending a Pikawiyi doctor. A strange form of discrimination is being practised by the administration at Pikawiyi. This matter must be investigated, and I request the cooperation in this address to the House from at least the State Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Minister of Health, to both of whom I will be addressing these *Hansard* pulls and a personally written request.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want this evening to raise a number of issues relating to persons or organisations centred within my electorate who have suffered through a lack of funding for claims being provided for what I regard as legitimate purposes. The first matter I have already raised in Parliament, and I note that the Minister of Education, who is now present, was present previously when I last raised the matter of persons who have suffered whiplash.

I was extremely concerned to note in the budget that was recently brought down that absolutely no provision was made for any assistance to a group that has set itself up to provide very real support for persons in the community

who have suffered this injury. As the House is aware, whiplash occurs all too frequently as a result of motor vehicle accidents, especially rear-end collisions. Whiplash is an injury of the neck and usually results because of one vehicle running into the rear of another vehicle. The impact causes a person's head to be whipped back suddenly and, quickly thereafter, the head goes forward, the end result being a serious injury.

Unfortunately, one of the most serious aspects of this injury is that it is very difficult for a physician to determine the full extent of an injury that has occurred. This is one of the real difficulties confronting people who suffer from whiplash. As has been pointed out to me by constituents who are actively involved in the Whiplash Association, a real difficulty that they find is that doctors do not fully understand either the physical nature of the injury that people suffer or the effect that it has on them psychologically and in their family life.

I guess it falls very much into the same category as the injuries that occur through frequent repetitive use, such as tenosynovitis, and so on, that are now becoming more prevalent. Certainly in the industry in which I was involved, back injury was an all too common occurrence. I know from discussions with persons who suffered from this type of injury that they have very real difficulty in convincing medical authorities that the injury is real. This causes a very large degree of frustration.

When one of my constituents took this matter to the media and received considerable publicity, she was immediately inundated with not just tens or dozens but hundreds of telephone calls and letters from persons who had suffered similar injury and who had also suffered a trauma similar to that which my constituent has been forced to bear. She therefore determined that she would try to set up an association (which, incidentally, has now been incorporated) that would attempt to provide the support that persons suffering from whiplash so desperately need. The type of support that they were trying to provide was support following the accident—if you like, moral support, somebody to stand alongside these people and say, 'Yes, I have been there, done that. I know exactly how you feel. Your problems are exactly the same as mine.' This support would provide, if you like, a shoulder for one to cry on, as well as an organisation to try to coordinate assistance for the sufferers of this injury.

My constituent soon found that, because of the very large response to the publicity that she had received and because of the very hard work that she had undertaken, the task was absolutely beyond her. She had neither the time nor the resources to handle the problems on her own. She had no office and no typewriter. The only telephone she had was her own. She had no secretarial assistance, and found that she was becoming involved in hours and hours of work because of the contact that was being made with her by persons who had suffered from whiplash injuries.

Because of this, my constituent wrote to both the Federal and State Health Ministers and their departmental officers to determine whether some form of assistance could be provided. To cut a very long story short, after she wrote letter after letter and made phone call after phone call, what she got from the Federal Minister of Health was the total runaround and virtually the reply, 'tut tut, yes; I realise how hard it is, but there is really nothing I can do. You had better take this up with the State Minister of Health because it really is from his area that any assistance should be provided.' So, my constituent went to the State Minister of Health and, again, there were many letters, phone calls with the Minister's office and officers, the end result being that she was getting nowhere fast. I stress that this was through no fault of her own. A more conscientious person I do not

think I have ever met. She really has devoted a tremendous amount of her life and time in trying to obtain governmental support for the victims of whiplash.

In the end, my constituent became so frustrated that she came to my office and brought with her a case full of correspondence and notes relating to the work that she had been doing and the attempts that she had been making to try to get assistance. She said, 'Can you please take this up on our behalf?' I said, 'I am only too happy to do that.' I wrote to the Minister of Health, with whom I also had considerable correspondence. The end result was expressions of sympathy but the sort of answer that we have come to expect from this Government—unless, of course, they can see a lot of votes in it. Then there is no difficulty in coming up with money. We have merely to look at what we have seen this Government do in relation to housing interest when it thought that it had better buy some votes.

We can see what the Government did in regard to the Modbury Hospital: the Government thought that it had to buy votes in the north-eastern suburbs. Other action has been taken in the past few weeks when suddenly it dawned on this Government that, because of its irresponsibility over the past three years, it was certain of being defeated in the coming State election. If an issue has votes attached, this Government has no trouble in coming up with hundreds of millions of dollars, and over the past few months large sums have been handed out for what the Government thinks will be vote-catching schemes. In a situation like this it obviously does not see any votes. The replies that my constituent, her organisation and I have received from the Minister can only be described as a glorious runaround.

I had considerable correspondence but I was getting nowhere, so I wrote to the Minister on behalf of my constituent to arrange a time for discussion between the Minister and a deputation regarding the problems being experienced. What was the result? The Minister was a bit busy at that time but he was quite happy for us to come in and meet with one of his senior officers. So we did that. I wish to state here and now that I have never introduced a deputation to anyone that had done its homework better than this group of people. They were able to present to the very senior officer considerable detail as to the extent of the problem in South Australia and the need for Government support in the form of an office, staff or funding. As I said, a really detailed submission was made.

If my constituent had not been made of sterner stuff, she probably would have thrown her hands in the air after we left that meeting and said, 'You can't beat the system!' because all that came from that meeting was a request for those people to go away and do further research and come up with more figures. It was a typical piece of bureaucratic nonsense that we have become so used to when someone does not want to do something—and I refer to the Health Commission.

My constituent and her organisation went away and prepared extremely detailed figures as requested. They submitted their application requesting 'Can we please have financial assistance and/or an office, secretarial assistance, a typewriter, and telephone?' because the work that my constituent was required to do was far too much for any one person to handle. A submission was made, but my constituent was bitterly disappointed to receive a response from the Minister's office stating that he was sorry but no office space could be made available. I have a copy of the letter to the Whiplash Association regarding the submission: it states:

You raise the possibility of obtaining Government accommodation. I regret to advise that it is unlikely that there would be suitable accommodation available.

I know that that is nonsense, because I know of Government offices that are vacant. However, the association was

told that Government accommodation was not available. It was further stated:

To facilitate the assessment of your application for funding, I would appreciate it if you could advise me of your alternative arrangements for accommodation, the equipment needed and the rental payable.

As my constituent pointed out, how on earth could they possibly go ahead and try to determine how much office space would cost when they had been given no indication as to whether or how much funding would be made available? It is the old catch 22 situation. These people were applying for funding assistance so they could set up an office but they were told, 'We can't give you an office, but if you let us know how much money you need we will let you know whether we will give you the money.' These people were getting an incredible runaround. As my constituent pointed out, they could not give the Minister's office this sort of information because, obviously, their need would have to be shaped very much by the level of assistance available.

After further contact with the Minister's office, my constituent came to the conclusion that obviously no facilities would be made available to enable them to set up their own self-help organisation, which is what they wanted to do. My constituent then thought that, if the Government would not provide the money to set up a self-help organisation to provide the support which so many in the community need, perhaps it would allocate an officer within the Health Commission to provide the sort of support that is presently provided by the Whiplash Association. Such a suggestion was then put to the Minister's office but those concerned were told that none of the submissions provided actually asked for that so that they would have to prepare another submission asking for an officer within the Health Commission to provide that sort of help.

Again, we come up against the big blank wall. Every time that the Minister's office was obviously embarrassed, they would say, 'The strength of the case is irrefutable, and there is no way in which we can argue with the facts and statistics that have been put before us, so we will send them away and tell them to prepare another submission.'

The Health Commission also said that the Premier's Department should have a copy of the submission because they might be able to provide assistance. However, when contact was made with the Premier's Department, after the forwarding of the submission should have occurred, it appeared that the Health Commission had not sent a copy of the submission as promised. The Premier's Department then said it was not their concern and referred it back to the Minister of Health. That is the stage that the matter is at now.

Every door that these people have tried to open has been slammed shut: their correspondence has met with negative response; their requested meeting with the Minister did not eventuate—they were fobbed off to an officer; the meeting with the officer which I attended only resulted in their being told to go away and come up with another submission. After making another submission they were told they could not have what they wanted. The group then put up another suggestion as to how help could be provided, only to be told that they would have to prepare another submission. This situation has been going on for well over a year. Is it any wonder that my constituent and the people associated with the Whiplash Association are frustrated to the point where they are almost tearing their hair out?

My constituent is still trying to provide assistance to other sufferers, but, as I can see from the volume of correspondence and the telephone calls that she has received, it is impossible for one woman to handle it all. However, this Government is saying, 'We wash our hands of it. We realise that there

are thousands of people out there suffering from this problem, but we are not going to lift a finger to help.' I think it is disgraceful, and I raise this matter again in the Parliament in the hope that the Minister of Health will provide the physical and financial assistance that this very worthy organisation is seeking.

I now turn to another matter which again relates to the Government's insensitivity. As members would know, there is a program to develop the Torrens River into a linear park. Whenever any new development such as this occurs, some people will be disadvantaged. I have constituents who are severely disadvantaged by the development of the Torrens linear park. My constituents acknowledge that, for the greater good of residents of the north-eastern suburbs, the linear park should proceed. Let me place that firmly on the record. The constituents who own land in the area that is designated to be developed as a linear park fully accept the wisdom of the decision to develop this park and the necessity for such a park to proceed.

However, they are really getting the runaround from this Government. Three or four years ago, when the previous Government was in power, the linear park became a reality. However, the development of that park has proceeded extremely slowly, and the land that my constituents own is land which has been made virtually useless and worthless because of this Government's decision. My constituents were originally told, 'We need this land for a linear park. We will buy it from you.' My constituents said, 'Fine, that is excellent. Let us sit down and negotiate a price.'

This Government has been in power for almost three years now and in all that time my constituents have been negotiating with various Government officers over the commitment that was given to buy that land from them, but to this date the Government still has not purchased it. It has said, 'You cannot use that land for this, that or the other. You cannot sell it to any private buyer; you cannot subdivide it and you cannot use it,' but of course every year my constituents receive fairly substantial land tax bills from the South Australian Government, which has said, 'You cannot use that land. We are going to buy it, but in the meantime while you cannot use it and you own it, we still want our pound of flesh, namely, we want you to pay land tax.'

My constituents have suffered at the hands of the Labor Government in a number of ways. Originally, they owned 612 acres. When the hills face zone was developed, almost 600 acres was taken from them and they were left with 17 acres. So, the first thing that happened was that what was previously a viable area in which to graze, to operate market gardens, and so on, was suddenly cut back to 17 acres. I ask members of this House: how much primary production can be undertaken on 17 acres? I think they would agree that the answer is, 'Not very much.'

My constituents said, 'We used to graze sheep and do market gardening. Obviously, with the area of land that we have left, we would have an income that would be totally unsatisfactory.' They then determined that they would like to develop a poultry farm on the 17 acres. That decision showed initiative, but when they went to the Government for approval to develop a poultry farm, they were refused the request on the grounds that capital investment would be required for the building of poultry sheds, feeders, bins, and so on, and the Government said, 'If you put capital development on that land, it is going to cost us more to buy it from you when we do buy it; therefore, we say to you that you cannot go into poultry production.'

My constituents cannot use it for poultry production, so they are left with 17 acres of land which is virtually useless and which should have been purchased three years ago, but the Government has not purchased it. Even though the Government has said, 'We do want that land. We are going

to develop a linear park' (goodness knows when), my constituents are left with a small piece of land which they own and which they cannot sell, subdivide, or use for primary production. So they say to the Government, 'For goodness sake, why should we have to pay land tax on land which is worthless to us?', but that question fell on deaf ears.

I have taken this matter up on behalf of my constituents and in fact I wrote to the Premier on 4 April 1985. I received a reply dated 15 April 1985 that informed me that he had received my letter, and that this matter was receiving attention, and that a reply would be sent as soon as possible. After numerous phone call follow-ups, as we were getting absolutely nowhere, and after letters to remind the Premier that I had written to him on this problem and that he had told me we would be getting an answer, I received a further letter on 1 July—after I had made many contacts with the Premier's office—again acknowledging my further follow-up letter and stating:

These matters are receiving urgent consideration and replies will be sent as soon as possible.

We still heard nothing and again, after contact on 26 July, we made another phone call to the Premier's office and were assured that an answer would be forwarded to us on 15 August: 15 August came and still no reply. I have not as yet received a reply from the Premier.

I pointed out the whole background and asked him, under the circumstances, to both waive the land tax and to hurry up and purchase the land from my constituent. What happened then? My constituent received this letter from the Premier:

Thank you for your further letter of 1 July 1985, concerning exemption from land tax. To qualify for the exemption from land tax given to primary producers, two conditions must be satisfied:

- the land must be used for primary production;
- the principal business of the owner of the land must be primary production.

I ask members of this House how on earth 17 acres can be used for primary production when the only really viable form of return could be a poultry farm, which has been refused and, secondly, when the principal business of the owner of the land must be primary production: How on earth on 17 acres could he earn his income from such a small piece of land which the Government will not let him use, anyway. The Premier stated:

I note that there has been a great deal of correspondence on this matter and that a great deal of time and effort has gone into investigating your claim for an exemption. I am satisfied that your claim cannot be sustained. Once again, I suggest you take up with the Commissioner as soon as possible the manner in which payment of arrears of land tax may be settled.

The Premier showed no understanding! In previous cases, whenever I have taken up with the Premier issues in relation to land tax, I have been given an assurance that, while the matter is subject to investigation, and while the member has not been advised as to the result of his representations, no action would be taken to in any way force the payment of the land tax under query. In fact, I have three other examples where, when I have raised queries on behalf of my constituents in relation to land tax, I have been assured that the constituent need not pay while the matter is being investigated.

So, I thought that that was the norm. However, in this case, having still not received a reply from the Premier, as far as I was aware the matter was still being investigated. Yet, last night at 7.45 p.m. my constituent, who is in his late 70s, had delivered to him a summons demanding payment of \$2 863.53 for land tax, plus \$38 costs for handling of the summons. So, we have a Premier whom I have approached on behalf of a constituent who owns land that the Government says it wants to buy but has not yet bought, land which he is prohibited from using, land which is

subject to a query from a member of Parliament to which no response has yet been received, and yet, my constituent, in his late 70s, received a summons at 7.45 p.m. Further, before the summons was delivered, a phone call was made to my constituent asking how to get to his place to deliver the summons! The constituent told the gentleman how to get to his place, but asked him not to come at night, yet that was the outcome. At 7.45 that night the person rolled up to deliver the summons, which leaves my constituent with only six days to file an affidavit.

I will look at the history of it. This 17 acres, according to the notice that my constituent received, has a site value of \$85 000, but the taxable value is \$123 250. My constituent, an elderly gentleman, left with land that cannot be used, at the Government's direction, has been faced with a bill that he has been querying. There are arrears because this matter has been under consideration for years, so the result is that of that \$2 900 odd only \$1 000 is current; the balance is arrears. The point is that my constituent has a very legitimate point to make in that he has been required to hold land that he cannot use or sell, at the Government's request.

The Government wants the land for the development of the linear park, but it has not bought it. The Government wants everything. It refuses my constituent the right to use the land as he wants to or to sell it. So, for the benefit of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs, here I have an elderly gentleman being forced to pay land tax on land which is owned by him but on which he is severely constrained and which the Government will eventually buy.

It has acknowledged that: it has said that it will eventually buy the land. For three years it has told him that it will buy that land. I ask the Premier: why has that land not been bought? Why is my constituent under these circumstances required to pay his land tax? Why have my representations not been replied to? Why, in this instance, despite the non-response from the Premier to my representations, has action been taken against my constituent when this matter is subject to the so-called urgent inquiries referred to in the correspondence? This matter requires the Premier's urgent attention and I ask for that.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I will raise some points and explain my deep concern over the attitudes of the emergency services and the services that have come into play since then towards the spill of the copper chromium arsenate, which happened two weeks ago on Thursday night. I protest in the strongest possible manner about the disposal of the polluted liquid into the Port River and the environment.

My interest in marine pollution is not new: I have raised the matter on several occasions since coming into this Parliament—first in 1980—but the problem is worsening and there does not seem to be any answer or action undertaken by either Government that we have had since I have been here. The other night, even a Minister, on the news, said that the experts differ about the problems that come up on marine pollution and, in particular, on the way to deal with this spill.

This indecision has caused great concern in our community. The member for Price is aware, as I am, of a concerned group of residents in Port Adelaide that has been formed. I have had no contact with the group as yet, except by phone, but I understand that it will continue and expand.

The way in which I will make the case that I feel strongly about is by reference to articles in magazines. The first one—I will use their words and not mine, so it is not my making the case but the obviously well qualified person—is in the magazine *Search*, volume 12, number 8, August 1981. The article is by Pat Harbison of the Centre for

Environmental Studies in the University of Adelaide. I have spoken to people in the environmental field and I believe that she is well respected. This article certainly puts the case. The heading is 'The Case for the Protection of Mangrove Swamps: Geochemical Considerations', and it states:

The pattern of sedimentation in the mangrove habitat, the high content of organic debris, and the associated flora and fauna, may all contribute to a unique potential for the accumulation of metallic wastes, and the redistribution of these wastes in the marine environment. This potential should be considered in assessing the suitability of the mangrove swamps for industrial development. It may also provide an important rationale for the conservation of the mangrove habitat. While the productivity and shelter of the mangrove community is obviously of great importance to marine and intertidal ecology, a further reason for the protection of mangroves from industrial development has not yet been considered. This is the possibility that the mangrove swamp has a unique potential for accumulating industrial metal wastes, and for redistributing these wastes, with enhanced impact, in the marine environment.

If this is so, the industrial developments on or near mangrove shorelines may lead to the local accumulation of waste materials, and provide a long-term source of contamination for the marine habitat as these materials are remobilised in the future. The impact of industrial metal wastes on the mangrove habitat has not yet been investigated in South Australia—

this article was written in 1981 and as far as I am aware nothing has been done since then—

but it is possible to examine, from a geochemical aspect, the correlation between the sedimentary characteristics of the mangrove habitat and the factors which are known to influence the accumulation of heavy metals at the sediment/water interface.

The nature of industrial wastes in South Australian gulf waters: The term 'wastes' covers a wide variety of discharged materials, including heated water released by power stations, the treated effluents from sewage works, dusts from stock-piled metal concentrates, wash water from smelting works and organic residues from abattoirs. The most significant inputs to Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf probably come from Torrens Island (heated water), Bolivar (treated effluents), Port Pirie (lead and zinc smelters), Port Augusta (hot water and seepage from fly ash) and Whyalla (steelworks discharges). With the exception of Whyalla, all of these effluents are discharged into the tidal channels of extensive mangrove communities. At Whyalla, coke quenching water and other steelworks discharges are released into the southern end of False Bay, adjacent to mangroves fringing the shoreline.

A significant feature of all these discharges, apart from the heated water, is the content of heavy metals.

I refer members to the incident involving the discharge of heavy metals into the Port River, the matter being dealt with at present. The article continues:

Even the treated water from Bolivar shows marked elevations in the content of mercury, cadmium, and copper at some periods of the year (Kinnaird Hill *et al.*, 1975). There is no documented reason for these periodic high levels of metals in the water, but the contribution to the dissolved load could have significant effects on accumulated levels in the shallow-water marine sediments.

Heated water and brine wastes, while not necessarily containing metal compounds, can have a synergistic—

which I believe means a compounding effect—

effect on the toxicity of available metals, and could be significant in water where metallic wastes are already present.

Storm-water discharges from urban areas can contribute metals in the absence of industry. Comparative studies of industrial and storm-water discharges in Sweden, where low-salinity waters in the Gulf of Finland, the South Bothnian Sea, and the Baltic are severely polluted by lead, suggest that most of the lead entering coastal waters is derived from storm water, and must originate from the use of lead additives in petrol.

Sediments taken from the vicinity of Port Pirie show high concentrations of lead, zinc and cadmium, due to the input of wastes from the smelting works, which concentrate lead and zinc sulphide ores... Heavy metals do not, like cyanides, produce immediately obvious 'fish kills' unless discharged in very large quantities, but because of their accumulation and transformation in the sediments may have an insidious and very long-term effect on the ecology of gulf waters.

This is the point I wish to make about the Port River discharge: I believe that it is true that there will not be any dead fish in the water, as I think the solution has been

watered down. However, one must be concerned about the accumulation of these metals over the years. There is an accumulated build-up of metals from waste discharged into the gulf and the estuaries of the rivers, and that concerns me. The article continues:

The influence of mangrove sediments on the geochemical reactions of metals: Mangrove seedlings become established in sheltered, shallow, low energy environments, where the finest sediment fraction accumulates. This fraction contains high proportions of clay minerals which, because of their fine grain size, present a very large surface area for the adsorption of heavy metals... The degree of adsorption or release of metals from fine particulates is highly pH-dependent.

The term 'pH' is the difference between acid and alkali. I believe that the scale goes from 0 to 14, with seven being neutral (acid below and alkaline above). These waters are very highly alkaline because of the continual discharge from the ICI and other plants into the river.

A large area of LeFevre Peninsula is reclaimed land made up of residue from ICI, which is leeching into the river. Along the river there are other plants (a chemical works and an old acid plant) leeching into the river and altering the pH level of the water. The article continues:

Generally, small increases in pH (from 5.2 to 6.5 in the case of lead), are sufficient to cause almost total adsorption of the metal ions, while a similar lowering of pH redistributes the metals in solution.

Changes in the pH of the water covering the mud surface in the mangrove swamp are strongly influenced by the photosynthetic activity of algal films. Readings taken in shallow water covering intertidal mudflats at Port Gawler during 1979-1980 showed sufficient elevation at midday to cause adsorption of otherwise soluble compounds on to particulate matter. The range of pH recorded, as well as that for salinity and temperature, is given in Table 1.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table.

Leave granted.

		Undisturbed sediment surface		Disturbed surface
		Night	Day	
Temperature (°C)	High	20°	36°	29°
	Low	15°	15°	12°
pH	High	8.4	9.8	8.1
	Low	7.5	7.5	6.5
Salinity (‰)	High	47	58.5	53
	Low	34	19(rain)	29

TABLE 2

Metal content (nitric-acid soluble metal, representing upper limit of industrial input) of relatively unpolluted intertidal sediments at Port Gawler. All samples collected within 0.5 km radius of Pt. G.1.

Sample (top 10cm)	Sediment type	Intertidal level	Surface cover	Organic carbon (%)	Zinc (ppm)	Copper (ppm)	Chromium (ppm)
Pt. G.1	soft grey mud	mid-littoral	algae & seedling mangroves	15	28	12	24
Pt.G.2	compact sand	upper littoral	bare	5	8	0	5
Pt.G.3	soft black mud	mid-littoral	dense mangroves	19	47	14	28
Pt.G.3S	soft grey mud	mid-littoral	dense mangroves	21	39	15	26
Pt.G.4	soft grey mud	mid-littoral	young trees	19	29	14	27
Pt.G.4S	grey silt	mid-littoral	seedlings	12	27	12	37
Pt.G.4M	black mud	mid-littoral	seedlings	19	43	21	44
Pt.G.6	yellow sand	upper littoral	bare	5	15	4	8
Pt.G.9	coarse sand	lower littoral	bare	2	2	4	8

Note: 'Organic carbon (%)' is an approximation, obtained from weight loss on ignition at 500°C. The values for fine-grained sediments would be enhanced by water lost from clays.

Mr PETERSON: The article continues:

The concentration of metals in sediment samples collected during the present study (Table 2) suggests that the natural physical and chemical characteristics of mangrove swamps do favour the accumulation of heavy metals in sediment. The effect of the wide fluctuations in pH, salinity and temperature, as well as the exposure of disturbed anoxic sediments, on the remobilisation of metals is currently being investigated.

H ₂ S (mg/l)	High >5mg/l Low <5mg/l	Undisturbed sediment surface	Disturbed surface
		Night	Day
		0	0.5mg/l

TABLE 1

Range of temperature, pH, salinity and hydrogen sulphide recorded in surface water among mangroves in Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf, January 1979-January 1980.

Mr PETERSON: The article continues:

Midday readings were consistently as high as pH 9.8. Dull or dark conditions, or the presence of rotting seaweed, reduced the pH below 7.

The large tidal amplitude associated with the mangrove shoreline in the shallow northern gulf waters results in the exposure of enormous areas of intertidal mudflats at low tide. During daylight hours in summer the mud surface becomes very hot, so that when it is covered by shallow water at high tide the water temperature can be as high as 36°C. This could contribute to the mobilisation of metals at the sediment/water interface, and also enhance the effect on marine organisms.

The wide intertidal flats are also exposed to extremes of salinity, particularly with the heavy summer rains characteristic of the northern gulf regions. In one hour the salinity of shallow surface pools can be reduced from 50 to 20 per cent. Changes in salinity also affect the solubility of metals held in sediments.

This illustrates the constant build up of heavy metals and poisons in the environment. The article continues:

The most notorious features of mangrove mud, the black colour and strong 'sulphide' smell, are probably most relevant to its potential as a sink for heavy metals. Anoxic conditions are associated with the bacterial degradation of the large quantity of organic detritus in the sediments, and persist where surface sediments, usually bound by a gelatinous algal film, are undisturbed. The reduction of sulphates by 'sulphur' bacteria in the anoxic layer produces H₂S, which can be detected at the surface when sediments are disturbed, or when the anoxic layer extends closer to the surface during the night (Table 1). These conditions favour the precipitation of metals as sulphides, relatively insoluble forms which are not usually available to the biota unless the surface crust is broken, and the black muds exposed to air.

Microbial action could also be responsible for the conversion of some metals to a highly toxic methylated form... The microbial methylation of both lead and mercury can occur in sediments, and is accelerated by the availability of organic carbon. Optimal temperatures in the 15-20°C range are similar to those found in the mangrove habitat, while the high organic carbon content of mangrove muds provides ideal conditions for microbial activity.

I seek leave to have a purely statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Among the organisms found in the mangrove community are juvenile forms of commercial fish species, representing the seasonal recruitment to populations in the wider marine environment. Recent research has demonstrated the greater vulnerability of juvenile organisms to toxic metals.

Ahsanullah and Arnott (1978) found that larval forms of the crab *Paragrapsus quadridentatus* were 29 times more sensitive to cadmium than adults, and 9 times more sensitive to zinc. Other studies showed larvae of the shrimp *Crangon crangon* to be 89

times more sensitive to copper than adults, and 570 times more sensitive to mercury. The release of metals from mangrove mud could thus endanger young stages of commercial fish species which shelter in tidal channels, or feed over the mudflats at high tide.

At the back of the island, within half a mile of the outfall of this spill, is a marine and fishing reserve which is recognised as a breeding ground for small fish. The mangrove environment is also recognised as a breeding ground for small fish. There is the mollusc and fish feeding birdlife throughout the area. Inflows of this material contribute to a total and ongoing problem. The article continues:

Many fish and molluscs found in the mangrove swamps are detritus feeders, and like most animals, have an initial digestive tract pH of less than 5. Metals which remain absorbed on food particles within the normal diurnal pH range of surface water, pH 7-9, would be released to solution early in the digestive process.

Organisms living in the surface mud are food items for larger fish or wading birds. These worms, molluscs, and small crabs may be directly affected by toxic metals in solution, or they may accumulate metals to very high body concentrations, which then become available to predators.

Again, that is feeding on through the food chain. The article continues:

Filter feeding organisms, such as small oysters, mussels and barnacles which shelter among or attach to pneumatophores, are capable of high levels of metal concentration.

I refer briefly to another report, 'Marine reserves in South Australia: proposals for some future directions', by Dr Ottaway, Mr I. B. Oak, Dr M. I. Bossley and R. B. Gardiner, printed in 1980. I believe that Dr Ottaway is a marine biologist. I read from page 12, as follows:

Some of the shellfish taken from St Vincents Gulf contain gut and mantle levels of heavy metal cadmium about 3-12 times more concentrated than the maximum level permitted in shellfish for human consumption by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (1980).

The metals are removed from circulating body fluids by amoebocytes and enclosed in vesicles, where they may form granules, but do not affect the organism. These molluscs are food for larger fish, such as the black bream, which enters tidal channels to feed at high tide. Mercury concentrations in fish from the Derwent Estuary were shown to be directly related to their position in the food chain, higher order carnivores containing much greater concentrations of mercury than herbivores.

A similar amplification is possible through food chains based on the detritus in mangrove swamps. Organisms sheltering in the mangrove swamps may be more vulnerable to toxic metals when physical parameters fluctuate. The shallow water and low tides expose fauna to sudden changes in salinity with heavy rains, and to high water temperatures in summer. The toxicity of cadmium to the estuarine crab was found to be much greater at lowered salinity, or raised temperature, or both, while similar effects are reported for other crustaceans. Estuarine crustaceans remain hyperosmotic at low salinities by the active uptake of ions through the gills.

This process could increase the uptake of toxic ions, to the detriment of the organism. Similarly, the greater metabolic activity at higher temperatures would increase the uptake of toxic ions. Thus the natural variations in pH, temperature, and salinity, which may facilitate the release of metals from the mangrove mud, could also have a synergistic effect on their toxicity to marine organisms.

Mangrove swamps: a sink and a source?

In summary: In South Australia, major industrial developments have been sited in or near mangrove swamps. The present recognition of the need to conserve these tidal swamps is based on their unique ecology, their contribution to the maintenance of fish populations, and their function in stabilising the coastline. So far, the effect of heavy metal wastes on the mangrove community has not been considered.

S. Roper's 1976 discussion of potential threats to the ecology of tidal swamps concludes that the wide variety of industrial inputs makes an assessment of their impact on the mangroves impracticable. However, the sedimentary characteristics of the mangrove swamp suggest that it must inevitably become a sink for metallic wastes. The impact of this sedimentary source, once accumulated, could then be enhanced in the wider marine environment by chemical remobilisation, through food chains, or by mortality among juvenile classes of fish populations. Such redistribution could continue to affect the near-shore marine environment for many years after industrial inputs ceased.

That industrial input means any pollutant, or source of pollutant. The article continues:

If further studies confirm the potential of mangrove swamps to accumulate and disseminate heavy metals, the importance of protection should be indisputable on these grounds alone. However desirable the preservation of tidal swamps for their unique ecology, the potential of the mangrove sediments to accumulate possibly toxic wastes should be paramount in assessing the suitability of the site for industrial development. The features which make the mangroves ecologically valuable to the gulf fisheries are also the features which confer their potential to slowly release polluting materials to the marine environment. If industry must have coastal access, deep-water rocky sites may be less vulnerable, and have less potential to act as a long-term source of pollutants, than the mangrove swamps of Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf.

The point about these pollutants is that we have this glaring example: we can see it, read about it and know about it.

I will look now at some other examples of pollution which have happened over the years and which we have done nothing about. I have here the South Australian Waste Management Commission Report 'Comprehensive Waste Management Plan for Metropolitan Adelaide', which was printed in September 1982. It defined three depots for the disposal of liquid and prescribed waste: one was at Waterloo Corner and was owned and operated by G. Bosisto; the Adelaide City Council had a solid waste disposal depot at Wingfield; and there was a depot at Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works.

I have a two page list of what was dumped on these sites. I will pick out a few to show the heavy metals that are identified, and the acids and alkalis that are acting on the marine environment. It gives a list of the prescribed waste, but I will be selective. They are as follows: acids and acid solutions; alkali and alkaline earth metals; alkalies and alkaline solutions; ammoniacal solutions; caustic soda or sodium hydroxide; lime slurries; soda ash or sodium carbonate; sodium sulphide solutions; antimony; arsenic compounds; cadmium compounds; lead compounds; manganese compounds; mercury and compounds; chlorine; chlorinated organic materials; chromium compounds; chromates; chromic acid; copper compounds; cyanides; poisons (any material which would require to be labelled under schedules 1-7 of the poisons regulations; timber preservatives; and zinc compounds. All of those compounds were able to be put into the liquid waste dumps.

All of those dumps were in areas where there was a very high salt watertable. Wingfield is basically a swamp, and we are dumping this gear back into the salt water table, which takes it back out to sea. This material leaks through and goes out to sea. In the same report of July 1981 it says that the South Australian Waste Management Commission has compiled a master list of approximately 2 300 companies that had liquids that had to be dumped. They are not all ongoing dangerous materials but 2 300 companies are involved.

The report states that some answers received from these liquids producers indicated that many of them just lowered the concentration of the pollutants and put them down the sewers. The report indicates that because there is little community pressure—out of sight out of mind—people were not concerned about liquid wastes. That is not true anymore—we need to be concerned. Liquid wastes and their resultant problems will be in our marine environment because that is where they end up—down the drain—in the water table and out to sea. They will be out of sight. If it was a park and we poisoned all the trees in the a park in the hills everyone in the State would be worried and would say how terrible it was, but instead we are killing the marine environment, but no one can see.

Sea grasses have gone; there has been a die off of mangroves—all these things are well known and well documented. They have been going on for years but nothing has been

done. I have referred to the document showing that cadmium in sea food is high. Scallops have gone; cockles have died back. At Outer Harbor it is hard to find a cockle, and previously there were tons there, as I am sure any member who has fished will know. They are all going slowly. Indeed, there was an abalone bed on the other side of the gulf but that too has died off and gone. Prawn fishermen have expressed concern that the mangroves on the low coast to the north, where there is a prawn nursery, may have problems. Prawn catches are going down. Nothing has happened—we are doing nothing. There is no review.

Coming back to the Port River and the pollutants there, I said there were several well known sources, yet their impact has never been assessed. On top of the sources that I have already referred to, I received today *Environment and Conservation News No. 19*, a publication which I normally get and which I assume all members get, and it refers to the spill of copper chromium arsenate. It goes on to highlight the other pollutants of which we do not take any notice. I assume the publication is correct; it has put it in print and it has to stand by it. It states:

Seven of the 'dirty dozen' chemicals being focussed upon in an international campaign readily available in retail stores. They are lindane, chlordane/heptachlor, dieldrin, DBCP (dibromochloropropane), DDT (dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane), PCP (2-3-4-5-6-Pentachlorophenol) and 2-4-5-T (used in agent orange). These are found in products available for lawn insects, garden insects, and/spider/cockroach removers, wood preservatives—

here we go again—

and blackberry killers. Many are manufactured or packaged in South Australia. Some lawn fertilisers contain lindane, which not only kills earthworms, but has produced cancerous tumours in test animals, spontaneous abortion, liver and kidney disorders, and serious blood disorders. Reports that many of these dangerous chemicals are being 'phased out' are confounded by the fact that this began in 1966—nearly 20 years ago!

All of the time this gear is running into our river and the sea. Just in the vicinity of where they are letting this contamination out working back from the Bolivar outlet—no one knows-what comes out there. They say the water is drinkable when they process it and put it out, but who knows what is in it? At Bolivar there is a liquid waste disposal dam.

Who knows what is coming out of there? We all believe that some manufacturers and factories put their pollutants down the drain—out of sight; out of mind. Coming back along the river, there is the ICI factory. The Harbors Board dredge sank a couple of years ago near the outlet of the ICI plant. The outpour from that plant was so strong that it burnt the skin of the divers who were trying to recover the dredge. That is an alkaline outpour, and in that same plant they make chlorine. I am talking only about the pH factor in the pollution. It is an old acid plant. I do not know what comes out of there—nobody knows.

In the Port itself, there is the chemical works. Where this drain runs now used to be a rubbish dump. The drain runs over the top of it. I know that all sorts of marine wastes were dumped there for many years. I believe that the contaminants in the water in that drain would not reach any standard. But what has happened? We have a precipitation of the poisons that have been put in there down to the lower levels which cannot be allowed out into the river. They will settle down into the mud and slime in that drain. The area is marshy and criss-crossed with channels and creeks and that will seep through and get out unless something is done about the residue.

The mud cannot be left there without treatment. Somehow those poisons must be neutralised in the slime in the bottom of that gutter. If that is not done, a problem will build up. Eventually it will be taken out in the winter rains. The drain is part of the north-western drainage system,

which, I think covers your own council area, Sir. It is all part of the one system.

That water comes through the industrial area; it picks up pollutants and contaminants along the way and empties out into the North Arm. From there it goes around the back into the mangroves and the marine environment breeding area. Who knows what the future is? Nobody does. The Minister said there is dispute amongst the experts. They do not agree as to what should be done. My suggestion is to take the safest possible way. Do not let any of it out; look after it and get rid of it. Do not let it out to the sea. We will all pay the price in years to come if that is not done. If it is not us, our children or their children will pay the price. In various parts of the world today they are paying the price for what they did not do 20 or 50 years ago. We cannot afford to do that and we should not do it.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In opening my remarks, I would like to refer to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and its budget. I should particularly like to refer to the lines on the maintenance of national parks. It is my concern and that of a lot of metropolitan residents that the Windy Point lookout is a totally neglected area of the Adelaide Hills. We are concerned because, with the approach of the Grand Prix, literally tens of thousands of potential visitors will travel around Adelaide, and the first thing a lot of them will do will be to head up to Windy Point to have a vantage look at the city of Adelaide.

It is a wonderful place from which to see Adelaide, be it during the day or at night: one gets a magnificent panorama of the Adelaide Plains. It is one which we will be encouraging the visitors to attend. I am sure that every tour promoter at some time or another will suggest to their customers that they should go up to Windy Point and have a look at the city of Adelaide. If one goes interstate, perhaps to Perth, one goes to the Anzac lookout, from which one gets a wonderful panoramic view of the city of Perth.

The place where I was standing was immaculately kept. There were natural gardens and well made paths. It was well maintained, and it was a pleasure to be there. The same applies in other capital cities. During the dinner adjournment, I took some time to have a look at Windy Point, and the condition to which that piece of National Parks and Wildlife Service territory has degenerated is outrageous. It is desolate and unkempt. The condition of the scrub, which is strewn with rubbish, has to be seen to be believed. The pathways are partially overgrown with weeds that, in some cases, stand almost one metre high. Obviously, there has been no attempt, possibly for years, to clean the paths. Only where pedestrians have walked over the years are the paths clear. The only good thing I can say about the Windy Point lookout is that the toilets were clean, and that is thanks to the member for Coles, who some months ago galvanised activity.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Do you mean activity by the private entrepreneur who is responsible? Is that what you are telling us? There is a private operator.

Mr OSWALD: The toilets were clean, and that is one plus—but that is the only plus.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to cease interjecting.

Mr OSWALD: I do not mind the Minister's interjecting, Sir. What he said was quite valid. That was the only good point. Who will accept responsibility for cleaning up Windy Point for the tens of thousands of visitors who will arrive in the next few weeks? The Department of Tourism is sympathetic to the problem, but no money has been allocated in its budget to clean up Windy Point. The Mitcham council is also sympathetic, but it says that it is the respon-

sibility of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The service says, 'Yes, we accept responsibility for the place. It is our place'. There is a National Parks and Wildlife sign at Windy Point. However, the service apologises for the state of the area but says that it does not have any money to do anything about it. If the service does not have the money, who has?

Windy Point is the major sightseeing spot from which visitors can see the panorama of Adelaide, but it is littered with rubbish, and that is an absolute disgrace to the State. The paths are overgrown; there is a desolate look about the place. It must be tidied up, and I refer the matter to the House for consideration.

During the Estimates Committees I had the pleasure of leading the Opposition in examining the tourism lines. I thank the Minister for the way in which she replied. We received valuable information. However, some points should be made, and I refer first to the money allocated for the marketing of the State. The Minister and I disagreed on this matter. We found that this year the money allocated for the marketing of the State equalled the allocation for last year plus about 10 per cent. That seems to be the way in which Treasury operates, rather than striking a suitable budget according to the potential of the market. When we examined further, we found that the media inflation rate was used, and that is quite different to the CPI, varying between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. It is the figure by which the cost of advertising in the print and electronic media is escalating yearly.

If one considers the State's advertising budget for promoting South Australia interstate, applies last year's allocation plus 10 per cent (and the Minister claimed that there had been an increase in the budget), and considers also a 10 per cent to 15 per cent media inflation rate, one finds that there has been a net loss for the allocation to promote the State. The Opposition pointed out this loss, but the Government disagreed. If members read the transcript of the Estimates Committee that examined the tourism lines, they would find that what I have said is borne out. Under 'Issues and Trends' the yellow book at page 19 states:

Regional tourist associations are continuing to become more professional and increasingly aware of their roles. As such they are proving to be of increasing value to the Department of Tourism and the industry. A higher level of activity within the Adelaide region is evident and should be supported.

Further down the page, under 'Major Resource Variations—1984-85, 1985-86' it says that there has been no significant variation in the resources allocated, which is quite the opposite to their predicted trends where they say that there is a high level of activity. I believe it makes a mockery of all those motherhood statements we heard through the lines. Under 'Issues/trends' (page 9 of the yellow book), referring to the 'strategic planning and policy formulation for tourism development', it says:

Over the last three years the total number of nights spent by visitors in South Australia has remained fairly constant.

This is an indictment of the Government and looking at the negative growth in the advertising budget this year one wonders how dinkum the Government is in promoting tourism. We see the Government admitting that there has been virtually no rise in the number of nights spent by visitors to South Australia, and then it brings in a negative growth budget in the area of promotion. Again, under 'Issues/trends', it is stated:

Several factors that are likely to influence the future outlook for tourism in South Australia over the next few years include: the price of petrol, devaluation of the Australian dollar, major events and developments undertaken in South Australia and Federal Government tax reform proposals.

It is all very well to include those issues as reasons for justifying the fact that the nights spent by visitors in South

Australia should remain fairly constant, but what about the penalty rates, the high workers compensation, the high cost of electricity, and the land taxes and licence fees that the entertainment and tourist industry has to contend with?

These are all considerations which also affect the cost of accommodation and should be borne in mind by the Government. What is the Government going to do about it? There is nothing in the budget papers about how it will bring relief from these crippling imposts that the industry is having to contend with. All in all, however, the examination of the tourist lines was productive, and I thank the Minister for the way in which she approached her answers.

I now move on to the health portfolio and a line of questioning which I led in the area of computers in the South Australian Health Commission. As an individual member of the House, for some time I have been trying to determine how much money has been unnecessarily wasted in computer system developments by the South Australian Health Commission and other hospitals. In the 1985 Auditor-General's Report, at page 13, under 'Health Commission' it states:

During the year an audit examination was undertaken of computing development in the commission and at the three major health units. A report of that examination is also contained in the section of this report referred to above. I am concerned by four matters arising out of that examination:

the development over three years of a stores and inventory control system (operating for one hospital only) at a cost in excess of \$1 million;

the expenditure of \$430 000 on two systems which have not proceeded to implementation;

an approval process which is slow and time consuming; which on occasions can take in excess of 12 months to authorise proposals submitted by health units—without any significant variation to the original proposal;

the lack of accountability with respect to the development of some projects.

The Auditor-General concludes:

While the Commission's revised computing policy may overcome some of those deficiencies, it does not address the present time consuming approval process. That process, which can be wasteful of resources, seems to have been accepted as an inevitable part of the overall management process.

I put those questions to the Minister of Health on the basis that I felt it fair that the South Australian Health Commission should be given an opportunity to rebut those particular areas of concern, because most members here would, I think, agree that historically we have all gone to the Auditor-General's Report and virtually treated it as the Bible. Members always have been very quick to stand up and say, 'If the Auditor-General says something, then it must be correct', so on the strength of that I put those four areas of concern to the Minister. I told the Minister that I was concerned about four matters arising out of the examination, and the second point referred to the expenditure of about \$430 000 on two systems which have not proceeded to implementation. I said:

Will the Minister give details of these two systems, their individual losses to the State in dollar terms, and what they have been replaced with?

I will not read the whole reply, because members themselves can do that. I will quote excerpts, although I am not quoting selectively, because members can go to the full text if they wish. The first reply came from Mr Blight, the specialist, whom the Minister asked to reply, as follows:

As far as I can ascertain from the Auditor-General's Department, the two systems were a medium hospital patient management system, for which a figure of \$340 000 was quoted, and a common fixed assets system for which a figure of \$94 000 was quoted. The medium hospital patient management system was developed for the Hillcrest Hospital; it is a system providing the patient master index and admissions transfer separation functions. The development of this work was commenced by the Health Commission under the auspices of the Systems Review Board, which at that time was a board comprising senior hospital

and Health Commission staff and was responsible for the allocation of computing resources.

The patient master index software developed by the commission was conditionally accepted by the hospital in September 1983, and the commission's computer division continued work on the system until April 1984. This work had been undertaken in conjunction with Burroughs Limited, as the system was targeted for the commission's Burroughs computer. In April 1984, the hospital entered into a cooperative arrangement with Burroughs at Frankston Hospital in Victoria to complete the admissions component. The patient master index has been in production at Hillcrest hospital since April 1985 and the admissions component was due to go into production at the end of September.

This is the sentence I want noted:

When I last inquired about the system two weeks ago—

that, is only three weeks from today—

staff training was progressing well and the implementation was on target.

But the Auditor-General says that it did not proceed to implementation. Further on, I again referred to the \$430 000 Hillcrest computer, and Mr Blight replied:

The software for the asset system—

there is a double answer here—

is resident on the commission's computer.

It is still there. Mr Blight further states:

As far as the funds expended on the Hillcrest system, that system has clearly proceeded to implementation and the expenditure made as part of that project has achieved its purpose.

Once again, the Auditor-General says that it did not proceed to implementation. The dilemma of an honourable member in the Chamber who tries to intelligently analyse information given to us is such that we do not know whom to believe. Do we believe the Auditor-General's Report which quite unequivocally says one thing and is based on information provided by experts within the Auditor-General's department who have done research and come up with the conclusion, or do we believe the explanation given by Mr Blight? When honourable members read the whole detail they will realise that Mr Blight's explanation is plausible and follows a logical sequence of events.

There has to be something wrong with the system when the Government of the day employs alleged experts in two areas, namely, the Auditor-General's department and the Health Commission, and both come up with entirely different results. These experts we employ can say a system has or has not been implemented. It is unacceptable that experts should report to Parliament on a matter as important as that and come up with two quite different conclusions.

I now refer to three other dot points, the first relating to the development over three years of the stores and inventory control system at a cost in excess of \$1 million. The Auditor-General's concern was replied to by Professor Andrews, the Chairman of the Health Commission, who stated:

The specific matters raised by the Auditor-General are quite legitimate in the way the Auditor-General looks at these types of issues in terms of costs and outcomes.

He further states:

The Auditor-General did not take into account the fact that the system also encompasses a very significant pharmacy function.

He continues on that line and further states:

The cost in excess of \$1 million was not just for the development of a system, which is what the Auditor-General's report regrettably seemed to imply.

Later, he states:

In effect, we suggest that in this case the Auditor-General's review was rather superficial, not taking into account the full extent of the system nor of the matters covered by the cost of \$1 million that he mentioned.

If that is correct it is absolutely outrageous. How on earth can honourable members in this House have faith in one department—in this case an independent auditor—whose staff are pulled apart by the Chairman of the Health Commission? Both experts put up a plausible argument. We, as

members of this House, representing the people of South Australia, take advice from one or the other. In this case, whom do we believe?

The third dot point referred to an approved process which is slow and time consuming and which on occasions can take in excess of 12 months to authorise proposals submitted by health units without any significant variation to the proposal. In reply Professor Andrews stated:

I refer to the slow approval process which was time consuming and, as the Auditor-General pointed out, 'on occasions can take in excess of 12 months to authorise proposals submitted by health units'.

He continues:

It was recognised then that the approval processes were slow and time consuming, and it was recommended by the Alexander report, which was presented some two years ago, that the Health Commission had indeed made significant improvements.

The Auditor-General would have had access to that also. Professor Andrews continues:

In essence we are saying that there have been significant changes that were not able to be taken account of in the Auditor-General's review. Some of the elements are outside our control, but we have moved to improve significantly the rate at which decisions are made within the Health Commission's management improvement program for this financial year.

The Auditor-General thinks not, but Professor Andrews thinks so. Again, on the third example, how are we as members of Parliament meant to know which advice to take in this case?

On the fourth point of lack of accountability with respect to the development of some projects, Professor Andrews' reply includes the following:

Here we found some difficulty in responding directly to the Auditor-General because it was a rather broad and ill-defined statement. . . . Our view is that while the Auditor-General quite properly reported on matters that concerned him, taking account of the costs and achievements in the computing area, when one looks at those issues in a broader light, and that is indeed what Bellamy did—

that refers to the Bellamy Report, elsewhere—

one has to argue that, in a developing area like computer applications, certain risks are to be taken and investment has to be made to achieve any positive result. In the light of those acceptable risks and the achievements that have been made in computing, we believe that any imputation made, if you like, in the Auditor-General's Report that in some way we are deficient in the provision of computing services in this State is indeed quite false.

I rest my case in some degree on that final statement. We have Professor Andrews from the Health Commission being understandably defensive, but in his defence he points out the shallowness of the Auditor-General's inquiry, and he did it with some enthusiasm. I will certainly put these questions to the Auditor-General himself on Thursday when he comes before the Public Accounts Committee, and I will ask him to give a considered reply. It is extremely difficult to answer such questions. I commenced my speech tonight by saying that, as an individual member of the House, I set out on an exercise to find out for myself how much public money has been unnecessarily wasted in computer system development in the Health Commission.

The evidence put to us by official departments, by the official State auditor and by the South Australian Health Commission has left me right back at base one, at the commencement of my inquiry, because of the way in which the most senior people in both those departments have now drawn themselves out in conflict with each other.

The Public Accounts Committee will report back to the House on the final result of the Auditor-General's response, and I am sure that honourable members who are interested in the activities of the Auditor-General's department and in how in the past we have used it as a source of authority in debate will be most interested to see what the Auditor-

General's response is to the detailed replies that the Minister of Health and the Chairman of the Health Commission gave me during the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Estimates Committees were again a learning experience which was revealing in a number of significant areas. I had the good fortune to be part of four Committees. The first was with the Premier, where we rarely got an answer—plenty of fudge, but rarely an answer! The second was the Minister of Local Government where, to her credit in the recent acquiring of that portfolio, the Minister along with her staff provided some very useful information. The third was with the Minister of Housing and Construction, who sought to teach a new economic philosophy, which does not stand up—and I will come to that more in the very near future. The last related to the Services and Supply Department, now in the hands of the Minister of Transport. In the relatively brief time that was available it was a learning experience not only for me but for the Minister.

For example, the Minister learnt of recent Government activities which have brought about the development of 'in-house' services by some Government departments. They are putting into positions officers who are not necessarily qualified for the work that they are undertaking and who also are not required to meet all the restrictions that apply to people working professionally in these fields.

Briefly, I asked the Minister to explain the position in relation to pest exterminators. Representations to me over some time have indicated that pest exterminators in the field are somewhat concerned about the number of client Government departments no longer using their services and that these departments are using existing staff on the payroll to undertake pest extermination activities, using drugs and materials which can be quite toxic and in relation to which there are stringent handling and storage specifications.

A tradesperson using these chemicals must comply with Health Commission regulations and also with provisions in relation to registration from the Department of Agriculture. They must fulfil certain requirements in relation to handling and expertise. This also relates to the manner in which the work will be undertaken so that there will be no danger to human, animal or bird life, or contamination of foodstuffs. This applies not only to pets but also to feral animals. For example, a vagrant cat, not part of a household, could be endangered by the indiscriminate use of various drugs.

During the Estimates Committee examining the Department of Services and Supply lines, the Director of the Chemistry Division indicated to the Committee that his department was concerned about the proliferation of 'in-service' chemistry sections or laboratories being set up by a number of Government departments. He pointed out that, where his officers had the required expertise and knew the dangers associated with the use of acids and other materials, he was quite certain that a number of the 'in-house' operators of these laboratories were not aware of the dangers or not so restricted by the standard restrictions in the handling of these materials. He pointed out that this practice was dangerous not only for the people operating in such circumstances but also for others nearby or handling materials coming from these laboratories.

As I have said, I believe that that was a learning experience for the Minister. I hope that on behalf of the Government he will investigate this matter, having due regard to

the dangers involved. The Government must recognise that a lack of adequate restrictions on the people handling these dangerous materials presents a risk to the health not only of those people but also that of people nearby. The Government emphasises the importance of occupational health and safety, but this situation is not consistent with that viewpoint. The Government can not and should not allow a situation to arise where its employees are placed in jeopardy, at the same time as they expect the professional operator to fulfil a series of quite important criteria.

I have mentioned the vigour with which the new Minister approached the local government area. There was a worthwhile exchange of information. The Minister clearly indicated to the Committee that her officers had advised her—and that she accepted—that waste management in any council area be carried out in the most economic and effective way possible.

Effectiveness in waste management control by inner city councils means transferring loads from smaller vehicles into larger vehicles before the material is taken to a general waste management dump or other facility. We were able to demonstrate to the Minister—and she acknowledged—that it was probably a political decision that caused the Minister for Environment and Planning to interfere in a local government activity at Unley, where the council proposed a properly conducted waste management transfer station within its own associated depot. That application was refused, supposedly on planning grounds. The Minister gave the lie to that position when she acknowledged that there was probably a political connotation to the whole exercise.

The member for Unley, by interfering in the Unley council's activities, has done a grave disservice to his electorate and this will be to the disadvantage of the people of Unley for a long time because the transfer station was an essential part of the regional waste management facility that was to pass from the Unley council area into Marion, probably at Tonsley Park.

The Minister's advisers were also able to indicate that, although they were aware of the dangers of toxic waste products, following the problems at Port Adelaide, they were not certain of the origins or destinations of a number of those materials. Following the contact that the Chairman of the Waste Management Commission had with the media, it was subsequently reported that it was feasible that a number of those waste products were going straight into the sewer or being disposed of in the Adelaide area when there was a question about the efficacy or efficiency of the operation. While it was possible to extract from the Minister a guarantee that the Waste Management Commission would, as a matter of priority, seek to identify these toxic waste products and ascertain a means of disposal that was safe to all, she indicated that it was not necessarily a project that would progress rapidly because of other demands on the commission.

The experience at Port Adelaide certainly showed very clearly the importance of an aggressive and positive attitude to these inevitable problems. During the course of the discussion before the Estimates Committees I indicated that earlier this year it had been my good fortune to look at waste management controls in America, more particularly in Los Angeles, and that I had been on a waste management site that was disposing of between 8 500 and 9 000 tonnes of waste a day.

When completed, the site will be more than 500 feet high. The waste is being disposed of in a canyon. At present, they are extracting 9 000 cubic feet of methane gas per second and burning it off in the atmosphere, although they are in the process of utilising that methane gas to generate electricity and put it into the city grid.

Although that same waste management depot was licensed under Californian law to dispose of toxic materials, the company was refusing to take in the toxic material, and all toxic material identified from the Los Angeles area was being taken more than 180 miles away for disposal. This unfortunate or ridiculous situation arose because legislators saw fit to allow action to be taken in Parliament, and subsequently in the courts, that companies that had disposed of waste some 30 to 35 years before according to the ordinances of the day, in places where they were licensed to place those materials, were then taken through the courts for damages as a result of leachants and other toxic materials still being in the area.

Where is the rationality of a system that permits a company to perform on behalf of the community and allows it to undertake disposal of products, yet 30 to 40 years later it is responsible for its being prosecuted before the courts? This means that it is very difficult to dispose of toxic materials in the whole area. When it is difficult and costly there is a greater chance that people will surreptitiously displace that material on the sides of roads or in places where it is more likely to be dangerous.

I believe that the Waste Management Commission in this State fully appreciates all the likely dangers of that situation and that it will, as a matter of course, make an effort to identify the cycle relating to waste and toxic materials. I advise that the Opposition will give full support to any moves towards a rational approach in relation to the future handling of toxic materials, whether it be that which occurred in the member for Price's area (and very close to the member for Semaphore's area and likely to spoil his fish on the other side of the river) or an incident elsewhere. A similar situation was highlighted in the *Adelaide News* last Thursday: at Coonawarra, almost adjacent to the wineries, materials similar to those which escaped at Port Adelaide are likely to escape into a watertable which is only 18 inches to 2 feet below the surface. I trust that the decision of the Penola council in allowing that project to proceed will be reassessed in light of the most recent damage caused at Port Adelaide and that it will recognise that it must play a very important role in overcoming potential danger in its area in future.

I turn now to the examination of the Housing Trust. On a number of occasions the Minister sought to be helpful, but he only dug a deeper hole for himself in relation to his lack of appreciation of the seriousness of the housing problem over which he is currently presiding. For example, he indicated that it was a fact that the Housing Trust was paying an additional across-the-board 8.5 per cent increase in council rates in 1985-86. The Minister acknowledged that there had been an increase in sewer rates and water rates of approximately 6 per cent per year. He indicated also that there is a growing demand for maintenance and that restrictions are being placed on the funds available to the Housing Trust or the housing industry as a result of Commonwealth Government activity. For example, in the year 1985-86 there was a slight decrease of approximately \$100 000 from the amount made available in 1983-84.

The Minister indicated that the cost of housing has escalated dramatically. Evidence given before the Estimates Committee indicated that the cost per unit of Housing Trust dwellings for 1984-85 was \$39 937. He subsequently acknowledged that to 30 June 1984 (that is, for the 1983-84 year) the cost of a unit of housing was \$32 470 an increase per unit of housing of \$7 467 or 23 per cent in one year (so that I am not accused of using an incorrect figure, the actual increase was 22.996612 per cent).

I am not positive that I am looking at apples with apples here because the mix of housing in any one year, that is, the number of cottage units and flats proportionate to

detached or semi-detached houses, can alter the overall cost. Basically, the mix has been pretty much the same with the possibility of a few more cottages or aged persons flats during 1984-85, so the increase to \$39 937 may be a little low when compared to the mix that occurred previously.

I have asked the Minister to make available through the Housing Trust the cost per square metre of building during those two years, because those figures will be most revealing. At a time that these sorts of increases are occurring, the Minister has said that the Housing Trust will build more homes. I hope that he is right. However, he has not been right in either of the past two years. In fact, as I sat here listening to my colleague the member for Morphett in relation to a dispute that officers of a department have with the Auditor-General's Report I thought that I was back before the Estimates Committee involving the Minister of Housing and Construction when he disputed claims made by the Auditor-General in relation to housing stock.

Earlier this afternoon the Minister made certain claims, at about the time that the Premier laid on the table the Housing Trust report for 1984-85. The statistical material appended to the back of that report is quite revealing. Those statistics do not reveal what the Minister has been saying: they do not reveal that housing rental stock has been increasing at the rate that the Minister has been claiming publicly. Certainly, the figures contained in the report are more in keeping with figures available in the Auditor-General's Report. The actual figure for rental dwelling stock on hand as at 30 June 1985 is 53 281 units—precisely the figure that the Auditor-General claimed.

In the same document the Minister is claiming that he had a yearly increase of 3 014 homes. Simple arithmetic and resort to the Auditor-General's document shows that that is not the case: the net result is a considerably smaller figure. Also, we have had the revelation from the Minister and his staff that, as soon as the contract is let for a house, it is claimed as a unit of production. I suppose it is splitting hairs to say that it is not a unit of production—it is in production.

For the purpose of statistical record what is important is the number of units that are available for rental, and a unit in production is not available for rental. In fact, there was a considerably smaller number than 3 014 homes available in 1984-85, particularly when it relates to the sale of units that must come off the rental stock and has reduced the total number available. For example, if members look at page 403 of the Auditor-General's Report they will find that for 1984-85 there were 463 Housing Trust homes sold. That is not a sin—it is a reality. Sales have been supported by Governments of both political persuasions but, if one sells 463 units, one cannot claim them within the increase for the year.

Obviously, that 463 units has to be taken from the total. We also have the position, which I mention in passing, that from those 463 homes that were sold, the profit was \$6.5 million—not \$6.5 million of funding—there was considerably more than \$6.5 million of funding. If we look at the book value and associated costs, we find that the amount for which they had been sold included \$6.5 million of profit by the trust for 1984-85, and that is associated with \$6.6 million of profit from the sale of commercial buildings in 1984-85.

We find there has been a profit accruing to the trust—it is shown in the records—of \$13.1 million. By any other name, that is a positive form of privatisation. We had in several of the Estimates Committees attempts by the member for Hartley and other members to suggest that privatisation was a dirty word and was something that the present Government would not and did not believe in, but this shows the lie to that position purely and simply on Housing

Trust records. If one adds to it the sale of land at Glenside and the various other activities or other facilities and assets that have been sold, then clearly this Government has been involving itself in privatisation: getting rid of assets and using the funds for another purpose. In fact, the increase in the number of houses—the overall increase—into stock for the purpose of rental in 1984-85 was a net figure of 2 367.

It was not the 3 014 that the Minister had agreed to. The figures are in his own report tabled today by the Premier and are consistent with the Auditor-General's Report, notwithstanding that the Minister sought to abuse the effectiveness of the Auditor-General's Report when the Committee was sitting.

Another interesting piece of information which ought to be read against the overall cost of the housing industry lines is the statement in the report that for 1984-85 the sum of \$43 900 000 was made available for the purchase of 690 units on a design and construct basis. A very simple piece of arithmetic will show that those units are going to be taken into stock (if there is no increase as a result of mark-up) at \$63 625 each. When one reads that against the average cost that was pointed out, obviously one can see that the trust will need every penny that it can lay its hands on.

What is the position with the Commonwealth Government? I mentioned briefly that it had made available less funds in 1985-86 than it did in 1984-85. It also gave an indication of two things. First, that money from the loan funds used for housing which has been available at 4.5 per cent interest (the concessional interest rate) will attract a higher interest rate in the future: that is, the funding which has been available over many years for Governments of both political persuasions will attract a higher interest rate as a result of the Hawke Labor Government decision. Secondly, as of the next year, of the fund of money made available by the Commonwealth for housing and all the ramifications of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, only 60 per cent of it (and then varying alterations to that figure over subsequent years) will be able to be made use of for housing.

There is a series of other packets directly associated with the needs of people in the housing field, and we find that again a centralist federal Government is starting to direct a State Government as to how it will apply Commonwealth funds to the States. For some time, and certainly since 1975, Governments of both political persuasions have prided themselves in the fact that there has been a massive reduction in tied grants and that State Governments have been permitted to use grants as they see fit in the best interests of the people they represent.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): During the Estimates Committee proceedings in relation to the Lands Department, I raised the matter once again of the Lands Department's role in providing housing and industrial land in country areas across South Australia. I highlighted the fact that some 12 months earlier in about 50 towns for which the Lands Department was responsible as the developer of last resort, only some 10 towns had land available that could be readily purchased by young home builders or people looking for industrial sites. On this occasion, some 12 months later, I raised the same issue and the Minister provided a further breakdown of what the situation is at the moment. We find that currently the State Government through the Lands Department is acting as the subdivider of land in some 46 centres across South Australia.

Of the 46 centres, only seven have housing blocks available, and there are four under construction. In 35 towns

across South Australia there are no blocks available, or 'under investigation'. The situation has not improved one iota from what it was this time 12 months ago: if anything, it might have deteriorated. The Minister acknowledged the importance of land being readily available in small country areas and he recognised the Government's responsibility as the developer of last resort. But the point is that things have stood still or perhaps deteriorated.

What the Government intends to do about this is not quite clear. It is claimed that the matter is under vigorous consideration, but all I can say is that the situation has not improved. If the Government is serious about decentralisation, and if it wants to get people to move to the country and stay there, something must be done about this problem as a matter of urgency. I hope that in the next month or so, when we again question the Government on this issue, the Minister will be able to give details of an improved situation.

Another matter that concerned me during the Estimates Committee consideration of the Department of Lands lines was the situation in relation to the Paringa council. That council has taken the initiative to develop a marina immediately above lock 5 catering for 40 houseboats. The council entered into an agreement with the Department of Lands whereby the lease of the land would be \$300 per annum plus CPI increases. However, now that the council is well down the track in developing this facility and it is quite obvious that it will be a big success, the Government has changed the ground rules and has told the council that the \$300 per annum agreement no longer applies. The Government now wants \$50 per boat and a percentage of the gross takings.

That is an incredible position for any Government to adopt. We have been told that the Government is endeavouring to promote tourism and to encourage people to develop small businesses, whether councils or individuals. The position now adopted by the Government means that very few people will have the confidence to go ahead and develop such a project, use a bit of initiative and invest significant sums when they do not know what the Government's end position will be and how much it will rip off the enterprise once it becomes successful. In responding, the only comment that the Minister could make was, 'This is a complex matter and I will ask Mr Rod Elleway to respond.'

The Minister did not know whether it was Government policy to move away from a fixed rental position with either a revaluation or a CPI increase built into the lease. He was unable to provide any information as to what the Government's future position would be. However, it was spelt out clearly by Mr Elleway that it was certainly the direction in which the department was going: it was considering leases in the future as being business operations and the Government would look for a percentage of the take of any projects that were developed on Government land.

There is no indication of what the Government's percentage will be other than it has said that it wants a percentage of the gross take. Having established that, no-one has any guarantee whatsoever of what the take will be next year or the year after. Therefore, there is no incentive for anyone to put up capital and take the risk, only to find, if it is a success, the Government coming along and creaming off whatever profits exist; that is the way in which it could be read.

I am sure that any person considering putting up a significant amount of capital would look at it in exactly the same way. This is an appalling situation that needs to be clarified very quickly by the Government so that future investors in South Australia are left in no doubt as to the Government's position. If that is the Government's posi-

tion, then let it say so, so that the people of South Australia know exactly where they stand.

In relation to the Estimates Committee's consideration of the water resources, I raised during the debate the issue that interest payments, as a percentage of direct costs of operation and maintenance in the E&WS Department, take up 91 per cent of the total costs. When I asked the Minister of Water Resources what the situation would be in the future, his only response was that this matter was more appropriately directed to the Treasurer, as was the case during the Estimates Committee.

The Minister is responsible for his department and he ought to know the effect of the increasing interest burden and, indeed, what effect it will have in four or five years. I pursued the matter, but I am afraid that no response was forthcoming as to what the future implications for the E&WS Department would be in relation to interest payments. When one considers the massive interest bill of \$90 million-odd per annum in straight-out interest that the E&WS Department is paying, one cannot help but wonder just what the future holds for this State, if we continue down that path, especially, when we consider that in 1981 the E&WS Department was paying 75 per cent, in this respect, and that figure has now risen to 91 per cent. The situation is deteriorating very rapidly and, if the Minister of Water Resources cannot provide us with any answer, then certainly the Treasurer had better come up with a fairly positive answer quickly.

In relation to the estimates of payments of a capital nature, the member for Eyre referred to Wallaroo and the estimated cost of \$380 000 for upgrading the North Beach water supply. The lines provided for the total cost, moneys spent to this point, the funds provided this financial year and the anticipated completion date. The completion date was December 1985, so it is due to be completed in about six months time. In a project with a total cost of \$380 000, \$101 000 has been provided. There was no indication under the line 'Moneys previously provided and already expended on the project', so quite obviously the sums just do not add up in that situation.

The Minister of Water Resources gave some explanation, which, to say the least, is really quite absurd. In trying to explain the discrepancy, the Minister said that the scheme will be completed this year and part of the expenditure would have been for the purchase of pipes prior to the end of the financial year in anticipation of carrying out the scheme, so the \$101 000 would be labour costs and that the pipes had already been purchased. If the pipes had already been purchased, then that should have been shown under the line previous expenditure on that project, so either the setting out of the document is incorrect, or the Minister is incorrect.

In the same area there were three or four other examples of the same situation, so once again I suggest that the Minister go back to that document, have a close look, and find out where the error is and whether it is in the preparation of the figures that were provided by the department, and I hope that he will bring down to this House a clear response as to what the situation is in relation to the discrepancy of the figures that I have indicated.

The other area to which I wish to refer relates to the Murray River and the fact that there has been a lot of talk by this Government in the past three years and very little action. While the Minister continues to emphasise that this Government's approach is conciliatory and not a confrontation type of approach, I point out also that during the three years he has been Minister of Water Resources, no new projects have been implemented to come to grips with the salinity problem and, at the rate he is going, it looks as though it will be a long time before this Government will

achieve any new initiatives in the battle against Murray River salinity.

I refer to an article in the *Australasian Post* of this month, October, headed 'Australia's shame. The Murray turning into the world's longest drain.' It is written by two journalists, Martin King and Geoff Easdown, who are regarded as top reporters in Australia. They have spent quite a deal of time studying the Murray-Darling total system and reporting on it. The article states:

The Murray River, Australia's greatest natural resource, is in peril. This once magnificent waterway—the inland holiday mecca for thousands of Australians—is a vital water source for one-seventh of Australia's agriculture. In money terms, it is a river which generates an income of about \$10 000 million a year for the country.

For 150 years it has given generously to the white man, meeting his every demand. But today it is choked with salt, exploited as a tourist asset, poisoned by chemicals, and its waters are impounded, locked and mined for every agricultural dollar the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia can get.

Now the beautiful Murray—a living, breathing eco-system, and vital lifeline to Adelaide—is at risk. Thousands of magnificent redgums, so synonymous with the river, have been killed by salt or drowned by man's interference with the flow regime.

That is a comment by two journalists who have travelled down the Murray and studied it in detail, seeking advice and information from as many people as possible. They go on to say:

The River Murray Commission, the joint Commonwealth-three state authority in charge of its administration, itself admits there are problems. The authority's chief executive, Mr Kenneth Johnson, says the river is sick, but he adds that it is not yet too ill that it cannot recover.

Johnson admits the commission is sensitive to the ecological issue. Those problems that emerged during a two-week excursion along the length of the Murray are amongst a list of more than 20 which the commission has itself listed in a seven page paper. Johnson and his commissioners want the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia to contribute to a \$55 million plan to reclaim large sections of the stream from salt flows which pollute the river downstream.

I referred to some length to the \$55 million project that the commission has put forward. To this time there has been no indication from the Federal Government or the three States as to their intentions or otherwise in relation to the provision of the necessary \$55 million. It is interesting to note that a further comment that the two journalists make. Having pointed out the issue they go on to say:

But, politicians are politicians. Through the decades they have bickered and procrastinated. Little has changed. Today they wrangle over the role of the commission, instead of working to clean up the river.

I think I said almost the same words during the Estimates Committees. Any suggestion of the Commonwealth at this stage endeavouring to revamp the River Murray Commission into another body, when it is at a critical point in its work of developing a package of works that need to be undertaken, can be seen as nothing other than procrastination by the Commonwealth and by the three States—procrastination which will enable the Government not to have to come to grips with the \$55 million referred to by Mr Johnson. It effectively puts off the day when that money will have to be provided and, above all else, puts off the day when the vital works can actually begin.

As far as South Australia is concerned, that work is absolutely vital to this State and critical to the future of the metropolitan Adelaide, because we are talking about reducing the overall salt load in the river by some 20 per cent at Morgan making a difference of probably a 20 per cent reduction on the present figure at Morgan. It would bring the salinity level down to within the figure recommended by the World Health Organisation. At the moment water pumped to Adelaide contains in the vicinity of 1 200 to 1 300 EC units much of the time. That is way in excess of

the figure that the World Health Organisation recommends for water salinity, namely, that it not exceed 830 EC units.

It is quite clear from independent people viewing the total river system that it is in strife. The Governments of Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth are procrastinating and finding ways of diverting attention away from getting on with the job. It is high time they took a statesmanlike approach to this project, because the river system is a massive contribution to the wellbeing of Australia. The Murray Valley contributes something like

\$10 billion to the wellbeing of Australia. It is an absolute disgrace that governments continue to procrastinate in the way that they are.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
 Tuesday 8 October 1985
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

27. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many houses have been built of asbestos and timber frames for the South Australian Housing Trust from 1950 and how many are now rented by the trust and in which suburbs?

2. Have these houses been inspected by the trust in the past three years and what decisions and/or policy have been made regarding removing of asbestos or replacing these houses?

3. Are these houses a health hazard, particularly in case of a fire and, if so, what action is proposed to remove such hazard?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. It is estimated that approximately 9 000 asbestos clad timber frame homes have been built by the trust, some 4 000 of which are still rented. These homes were built throughout the State as a small percentage of most trust estates handed over between 1950 and 1983.

2. All trust homes are inspected regularly to assess repairs and painting programs but no plans have been considered necessary to remove the cladding or replace these houses on the grounds of safety.

3. This type of housing compares closely to the trust's current brick veneer construction where all internal surfaces are constructed of timber framing, clad with gyprock or waterproof wall board. These external brick surfaces are in fact only cosmetic facades and have no constructive load bearing requirement. The trust experience has shown that the fire risk to its asbestos clad houses compares closely to those constructed with a brick veneer.

Asbestos cement sheeting was used extensively in building until two years ago. It should be noted that the asbestos fibres are safely encapsulated within the base cement component, and this is subsequently sealed (and maintained) with paint only to prevent water penetration and for aesthetic reasons.

PRIMARY SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION

29. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are two portable units from West Beach Primary School being transferred to Grange Primary School and, if so, when, why, at what cost and what impact will the loss of the units have on accommodation at West Beach Primary School?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer the honourable member to my letter to him dated 25 July 1985, in answer to the same question on notice at the previous session of the Parliament, viz:

It is the intention of the Education Department to move one dual Demac unit from West Beach Primary School to Grange Primary School. It is anticipated that this relocation will take place in early July 1985.

From the commencement of school, 1985, Grange Primary School has been experiencing accommodation problems and many efforts have been made to rectify the situation.

Grange Primary School is continually experiencing increased enrolments. The ongoing situation will be monitored with the view to providing additional accommodation commensurate with the school's needs.

The solid accommodation located at Grange Primary School has a capacity of 655 students. During 1984 one additional classroom was relocated to the school site. This effectively raised the capacity to 680 students. Present enrolment is around 700 students—the additional accommodation being provided for by use of a timber transportable building located on the TAFE site, which is physically separated from the Grange school site. Due to the nature of the timber building and its location, it is completely undesirable to continue with its use. The proposed dual Demac

will be located on the same site as near as practical to the main school buildings. It will also effectively raise the capacity of the school to 730. The school has been requested to provide a clear indication of enrolment predictions by July 1985, to enable the planning for further relocatable accommodation.

The Department of Housing and Construction has indicated that the cost of moving one dual Demac from West Beach Primary School to Grange Primary School as being \$13 600.

A recent facilities review undertaken at West Beach Primary School has indicated that the school has at least 4 and up to 6 classroom spaces surplus to its requirements. Furthermore, West Beach Primary is well provided for in all other supplementary facilities. The basis of this review assessment is in line with the policy of standard requirements necessary. Undoubtedly, the proposed removal of 1 dual Demac, late June/early July, and the planned removal of a second dual Demac later this year (proposed by the commencement of term III, 1985) will have an effect on the school. The school will need to undertake some reorganisation of its room usage; however, West Beach Primary School will retain more than adequate accommodation for its present enrolment. The effective capacity after removal would be at least 320 students; the current enrolment is 260 students. The school has been notified of the planned removal of the two dual Demac buildings.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT VEHICLES

40. The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many Government vehicles are currently run by the Priority Projects Division of the Education Department, what type of vehicles are they and for what purposes are they allocated?

2. How often are the vehicles replaced and have any been purchased and registered with private plates instead of Government plates and, if so, why and what action, if any, has been taken to correct this anomaly?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Part 1

(i) Two vehicles which form part of the Education Department fleet.

(ii) Twenty-nine motor vehicles.

(iii) Seven non-motorised vehicles.

All vehicles in (ii) and (iii) above were purchased from Priority Country Education Program funds. This is a Commonwealth Government Program.

Part 2

Vehicles listed under (i) above

The first vehicle is a Holden Commodore Sedan, Reg. No. UAP128. It is Car No. 906 of the Education Department Fleet and was supplied to the Priority Education Office on 10 February 1983.

The second vehicle is a Falcon XF Station Sedan, Reg. No. UQA491. It is Car No. 1073 of the Education Department Fleet and was supplied to the Priority Education Office on 12 February 1985.

Vehicles listed under (ii) above

These vehicles can be categorised as follows:

(a) Twelve buses—all but one of which are Toyota Coasters. The remaining bus is a 1979 Bedford 42-Seater.

(b) Five four-wheel drive vehicles—all of which are Toyota Landcruisers.

(c) Four light commercial vehicles—all of which are Toyota Hiace vans.

(d) Eight passenger vehicles (6 Station-Wagons; 2 Sedans). These vehicles are all Fords or Holden Commodores.

Vehicles listed under (iii) above

Six of the vehicles listed in this category are trailers associated with various programs and buses.

In addition, the Elliston Priority Country Education Program Local Action Committee purchased a mobile kitchen

(Reg. No. TWU680) for use in connection with their Outdoor Education program.

Part 3

Vehicles listed under (i) above are allocated to the Priority Education Office to enable the Warradale-based professional staff to visit Declared Disadvantaged Schools and schools in Declared Priority Country Education Programs Areas.

Vehicles listed under (ii) above are allocated as a result of submissions received from clusters of schools in Declared Priority Country Education Program Areas for the specific needs of those areas.

These vehicles are mainly as follows:

- (a) Buses are supplied as a direct result of requests from isolated and remote schools having no appropriate access to public transport; where the use of private charter companies causes the cost of excursions to be prohibitive and where the distances travelled preclude the charter of Education Department buses.
- (b) Four-wheel drive vehicles are provided to support a limited range of specific programs. Generally these are associated with the 'Host Schools' program (operating with departmental personnel from Yunta, Port Augusta, Marree and Tarcoola) and outdoor education programs and are mainly to provide transport for children in remote and isolated circumstances.
- (c) Light commercial and passenger vehicles are provided for specific programs. Generally these involve extensive travel associated with itinerant teachers who provide specialist skills, support and resources to children and teachers in remote and isolated schools.

2. Part 1

The vehicles are replaced at the request of the Local Action Committee in consultation with officers at the Priority Education Office and within the guidelines for Government fleet replacement.

Part 2

Yes

Part 3

All the vehicles listed under (ii) and (iii) of Question 1 are registered in the names of specific school councils.

The provision of vehicles purchased through the Priority Country Education Program and registered in the names of school councils is consistent with the Commonwealth Government's guidelines for the expenditure of these funds, and is not considered to be an anomaly.

ENFIELD HOSPITAL BUILDINGS

41. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it the Government's intention that the Education Department will take over the old Enfield Hospital buildings to establish a Curriculum Centre and, if so—

- (a) what will be the cost of the site and of refurbishing the buildings; and
- (b) how many staff are to be transferred to the new centre and what other Education Department property will be vacated and sold as a result of this move?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is the Government's intention that the Education Department takes over the former Enfield Hospital buildings, except for Willis House and the former children's outpatient building. The former will remain with the Health Commission, and the latter will continue to be used by the Department of Community

Welfare. This decision follows a feasibility study into the establishment of a Curriculum Centre.

- (a) There is no cost of site, which is Crown land. The cost of refurbishing the buildings has been estimated at \$2 million and this is expected to be recouped from sale of property at Wattle Park, Barton Terrace and Kings Park.
- (b) The number of staff to be transferred to the new centre has not yet been determined. This will depend on which particular centres are actually relocated there. As it has now been decided to give some space to the Department of Community Welfare, plans for allocation of space are being reconsidered. It is intended that the Education Department properties at Wattle Park and Kings Park, occupied respectively by the Wattle Park Teachers Centre and the Special Education Resource Centre be sold, and that the Education property at Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, occupied by the Media Studies Centre, be transferred to the Department of Correctional Services for its redevelopment and use as a staff training centre.

UNECONOMICAL WATER SCHEMES

42. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Will the Government provide funds towards the completion of uneconomic water schemes listed by the E&WS Department and will it give urgent consideration to areas such as west of Ceduna, including Denial Bay?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Government will give consideration to the provision of funds to undertake deferred water supply schemes as and when funds can be made available for this purpose. Should funds become available, a water supply scheme to supply areas west of Ceduna, including Denial Bay, will receive consideration along with the other 32 deferred water supply schemes listed.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ADVISORY COUNCIL

51. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health:

1. What is the annual remuneration and out of pocket expenses granted to the following members of the Controlled Substances Advisory Council:

- (a) Dr C.C. Baker;
- (b) Dr R.G. Pols;
- (c) Mr P.L. Carroll;
- (d) Dr B.G. Priestly;
- (e) Dr L.N. Sansom;
- (f) Mr R.S. Blake;
- (g) Mr J.L. Davis;
- (h) Dr P.L. Scanlon; and
- (i) Mrs M.V. Byrne?

2. When was the remuneration amount set and what was the reason for the delay?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Dr C.C. Baker, Dr R.G. Pols, Mr P.L. Carroll and Mr J.L. Davis are employees of the Government and receive no additional remuneration for their membership over their normal salary. The other members of the council are paid \$85 per session. To date no additional out-of-pocket expenses have been paid for members.

2. It is not considered that there was an unreasonable delay in setting the remuneration.

WILPENA STATION

83. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. When was the decision made to purchase Wilpena Station and add it to the Flinders Ranges National Park?

2. Is it intended that all grazing on this property will cease and, if so, when?

3. What is intended to happen to the homestead, outbuildings and store in the immediate future?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 February 1985.

2. All grazing of stock will cease by the end of September. Native species will continue to graze the property and for park management purposes minimal grazing of horses may take place in zoned locations in the future. A program for control of feral goats in the park will continue.

3. The Government recognises the heritage value of the homestead, outbuildings and store at Wilpena Station and intends to maintain these buildings and gardens in their present condition. It is anticipated that the buildings will be utilised for the use of the public for park interpretation purposes.

STIRLING EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL

89. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Minister reply to the letter from the member for Murray dated 23 May 1985 regarding facilities at the Stirling East Primary School and is there any specific reason for the delay and, if so, what is it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In recent weeks the Education Department, through each of its area offices and central representatives, has been reviewing the current and forward program for major works. Each area has submitted an area list of ranked projects which have then been prioritised into a State-wide forward program for capital works. This process by its nature is naturally lengthy. Stirling East Primary School was one project from the Adelaide area submitted for consideration.

In the past year a number of responses relating to proposed timing of capital works at Stirling East have been provided. Rather than provide a further interim response, it was decided to wait the outcome of the annual review process mentioned above. Now that the situation relating to Stirling East has been clarified, responses have been provided not only to the member for Murray, but to a number of other inquiries.

As a means of further clarification, the following information relates the current situation and program for Stirling East Primary School:

- (1) A standard multi-purpose hall with canteen will be built by means of the capital works program.
- (2) Design and documentation for the above will commence during 1985-86 financial year with construction to take place during 1986-87 financial year.
- (3) Other aspects of the proposed stage II redevelopment are deferred at this time but will be reconsidered during future annual reviews of the capital works program.

93. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Stirling East Primary School hall and the upgrading of the other buildings and grounds be completed?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Recently the Education Department, through various committees, has reviewed the

forward capital works program. As a consequence, the following is scheduled for Stirling east Primary School.

- (1) A standard multi-purpose hall with a canteen will be built by means of the capital works program.
- (2) Design and documentation for the above will commence during the 1985-86 financial year with construction scheduled for the 1986-87 financial year.
- (3) The other aspects of the proposed stage II redevelopment are deferred at this time, but will be reconsidered during future annual reviews of the capital works program.

At this time it is not possible to specify precisely when the remaining aspects of the redevelopment proposal may be actioned. The Adelaide area will retain this work amongst its high priority projects. The future of further works will be assessed in relation to the whole State needs in line with the funds available.

HALLETT COVE-WILLUNGA RAILWAY

99. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to reopen the rail link between Hallett Cove and Willunga and, if so, when?

2. Is the Minister aware of the danger to the public and in particular to children of the open, 20 feet deep, cutting between Zwerner Drive and Lonsdale Road, Hallett Cove, and that there has been a number of accidents involving motor vehicles?

3. Is the Minister aware that Zwerner Drive crosses the cutting which has been filled, as has the part Lonsdale Road crosses, and also that it is an acute right-hand turn?

4. If the Government has no plans to reopen and re-lay the track, will the Minister take immediate steps to have the cutting filled in and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government has no immediate plans to reopen the old Willunga railway line between Hallett Cove and Hackham. It is monitoring population growth in the area to determine if and when it would be economically and financially justified to re-open the line in the future. I am aware of the increasing danger to the public and, in particular, children, caused by the presence of urban development adjacent to the cutting. Prior to development in the area, the cutting presented little hazard. Records retained by the Highways Department indicate that there have been no motor vehicle accidents over the past three years on Zwerner Drive or on Lonsdale Road between Shakes Crescent and Ramroo Avenue.

A manproof fence could be erected between Lonsdale Road and Shakes Crescent and adjacent to Zwerner Drive in order to deter access to the cutting from Shakes Crescent. It is considered, however, that Marion council would be responsible for the provision of such a fence. The State Transport Authority has undertaken repairs to the fence that were considered necessary to minimise the possibility of small children falling into the cutting.

HALLETT COVE LAND

100. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Is the Government through the Housing Trust or through any other department acquiring any land or property in Hallett Cove and, if so—

- (a) which part or parts;
- (b) what is the size of each part;

- (c) what is the intended use and, if any is to be used for housing, in which parts, what type of houses, how many will there be for sale or rent, and has the Minister informed the trust or any other body of such intentions; and
- (d) is it contemplated that any blocks or houses will be transferred to any other departments: if so, which departments and, if not, why not?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: There is no proposal for the Government to purchase additional land in Hallett Cove via the South Australian Housing Trust.

COAL DEPOSITS

104. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. In relation to the Lochiel and Sedan coal deposits, respectively:

- (a) what is the energy rating of the coal in gigajoules;
- (b) what is the overburden ratio;
- (c) what are the proven reserves, and by how much does the quality vary;
- (d) what are the moisture, soda ash and sulphur contents; and
- (e) on the basis of currently proven reserves, for how many years could the supply of coal be maintained (acceptable grade) to a 500 MW power station operating at full capacity?

2. Where is the preferred site for the next 500 MW power station and what is the estimated cost of transport infrastructure to enable transportation of coal from each of the deposits to the preferred site?

3. At current prices, what is the estimated cost of supplying coal for one year's power generation to a 500 MW power station located at Wallaroo from Lochiel and Sedan, respectively, and how does this compare with New South Wales black coal?

4. What cost advantage would accrue from a tentative proposal by ETSA to burn black coal at the Torrens Island Power Station?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Energy rating of coals (MJ/kg)—		
	Lower Heating Value	Higher Heating Value
Sedan	7.3	9.05
Lochiel	6.9	8.9
(b) Overburden Ratio (M/tonne coal)—		
Sedan	8.6	
Lochiel	3.6	
(c) FEAC assessment of reserves for 500 MW study was:		
Sedan	70 p.c. measured,	30 p.c. indicated
Lochiel	82 p.c. measured,	18 p.c. indicated

For quality variation, see (d) below.

(d)	Sedan	Lochiel
Moisture (p.c.)	55.0—61.0	60.0—64.0
Sodium (p.c.)	0.12—0.36	0.2—0.7
Ash (p.c.)	5.8—10.3	5.0—7.9
Sulphur (p.c.)	1.7—2.7	0.9—1.2

(e) On the basis of currently proven reserves, supply is sufficient for approximately 28 years. However, it is assumed that additional drilling will confirm estimated reserves sufficient to fuel at least a 1 000 MW power station at Lochiel and a 500 to 750 MW station at Sedan for 35 years.

2. The FEAC report indicated further work was required to identify the preferred power station sites. However, only one site was considered for Sedan; Black and White Hill adjoining the mine. For Lochiel, four sites were considered: two at the mine site, one at Wallaroo and one at South

Hummocks. The latter site was marginally cheaper than the other three. Further detailed studies would be required to confirm this.

3. The incremental cost of moving Lochiel coal to Wallaroo (relative to using it at South Hummocks) is approximately \$1.60 per tonne. The delivered cost is approximately \$10.50 per tonne or \$1.50 per GJ. This compares with black coal imported from N.S.W. at an estimated \$60 to \$65 per tonne or about \$2.20 to \$2.40 per GJ.

4. At present there are no cost advantages that would accrue from burning black coal at Torrens Island. However, the gas supply and price situation may change in the future and alter this situation. In those circumstances, the advantages depend on the relative price of gas versus coal, and on the ability to convert an existing power station rather than develop a new one.

SAND MINING LEASE

107. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What factors contributed to the delay by the Department of Environment and Planning in processing Mr A.G. Bennett's application for a sand mining lease at Mount Compass, which was lodged with the Department of Mines and Energy in December 1984 and which was expected to be finalised within 12 weeks?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Procedures for dealing with mining lease applications involve two stages of consultation. The Department of Mines and Energy in the first stage consults with the Department of Environment and Planning and other departments and agencies to seek advice on factors that need to be considered when assessing the application. On the basis of the information received the Department of Mines and Energy prepares a departmental appraisal of environmental factors. The second stage of consultation involves the referral of the application, together with the Department of Mines and Energy's appraisal, to the Minister for Environment and Planning for a report from the Planning Commission, pursuant to section 59 of the Planning Act.

In relation to the mining lease application by Mr A.G. Bennetts, the Department of Environment and Planning first received correspondence on the proposal on 20 February and responded on 4 March (Aboriginal Heritage Unit), 2 April (Assessments Branch) and 19 April (Planning Sector Manager). The second consultation seeking a report under the Planning Act was received on 7 June 1985. The SA Planning Commission's report was sent to the Department of Mines and Energy on 23 July 1985. A factor contributing to this time period was the need for the proposal to be deferred from a meeting of the Extractive Industries Committee, to enable clarification to be sought from the Department of Mines and Energy on the extent of the mining area in relation to a stand of stringybarks on the site. These trees have been identified in the earlier consultation report from the Department of Environment and Planning, as worthy of retention.

HEALTH COMMISSION PROPERTY

115. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. What real estate is currently held in the name of the South Australian Health Commission or by the Government for Health Commission purposes which have been identified as surplus to requirements and, if any, what is the current valuation of each property?

2. What real estate has been sold by the SAHC (or the Government) over the past 12 months and, if any, how much was obtained from the sale of each property, to whom were they sold and through which account were the proceeds paid?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The following information concerns identified surplus commission real estate and real estate sold in the financial year 1984-85.

1. Identified Surplus Real Estate

Property	Owner	Approx. Value \$	Remarks
Corner Grand Junction Road and Fosters Road, Hillcrest	Crown Land	1 500 000	Vacant land approx. 10 hectares
Arroona Road, Sheidow Park	M of W	2 000 000	Vacant land of 54 hectares
30 Harvey Street, Woodville Park	Elizabeth II (land under title)	60 000	house—leased to private tenant
Old Port Road, Royal Park	Elizabeth II (land under title)	150 000	Vacant Land 1.68 hectares

2. Real estate sold in 1984-85

Property	Sale price \$	Purchaser	Account Proceeds Credited to
House, 28 Hughes Street, Mile End	48 000	SA Housing Trust	Proceeds used as offset in purchase of No. 6 Hughes Street, Mile End, currently leased by Drug and Alcohol Services Council.
Davenport House, 3 Eva Street, Millswood	350 000	Norris Hospital Pty Ltd	Consolidated Revenue
House, 12 Thule Drive, Murray Bridge	37 000	Mr F. Wilson, District Health Surveyor	Consolidated Revenue
Remaining Portion of 'The Pines'	145 000	Southern Cross Homes	IDSC—funds to be used for patient community housing.

In addition the property and assets at Markam Avenue, Enfield, were transferred to the Education Department.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES INSTITUTION MANAGERS

118. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Correctional Services: What provision is being made for the training of Correctional Services institution managers and what experience are they gaining in the actual operation of an institution as part of that training?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The ongoing training of departmental managers is conducted in three main ways: firstly, an institutional heads Planning Committee meeting is held every six weeks, that is, eight times per year. These meetings are usually of two days duration, or longer, and cover at least one day of business and one day of staff training. The day allocated for staff training is conducted as a specialised exercise for this group only. Examples of topics covered during the first year include: occupational

health and safety; staffing reviews/budget preparation/building program; the new Correctional Services Act; visit to South Australia by Mr D. Yeomans, visiting fellow, Commonwealth Fellowship Plan; Mobilong Medium Security Prison; Adelaide Remand Centre; and a training program on disciplinary matters.

Secondly, institutional heads are involved in the affairs of the department which includes both metropolitan and country managers in trips to the city to undertake committee work. This helps them keep in close personal touch with senior departmental management and departmental philosophy and practices. These opportunities include membership of the Uniform Committee, occasional attendance at the Operations Division meetings, staffing review meetings, and inclusion on interviewing panels.

Thirdly, provision is made for institutional managers to undertake up to five days staff development experience during each financial year. In 1984-85 staff development activities included:

- a five day visit to country prisons in Victoria to examine managerial practices and procedures;
- a three day visit to high security prisons in New South Wales to examine managerial practices and procedures;
- a two week secondment to Head Office in a senior Operations Division managerial position.

In 1985-1986 an overseas trip has been undertaken by the newly appointed manager of the Adelaide Remand Centre, to up-date departmental knowledge on the state of the art in northern America, including the operation, managerial practices and procedures of downtown, high rise remand centres. Promotional courses are provided for chief correctional officers as they move through the system and thus some form of managerial training is provided at an earlier level for uniformed staff who later become institutional managers. Further to this, the department has a trainee manager program. Currently there are two trainee managers undertaking two years of carefully selected and monitored vocational experiences in the department. One officer is currently undertaking the training course for uniformed officers before taking up a three month placement in the Programs Branch of the Operations Division. The second officer is working in an Assistant Manager position at Adelaide Gaol.

WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES

125. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: How many uneconomic water schemes does the E&WS Department have listed and how much money has the Government allocated towards completing each of these schemes during the past two financial years?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The total number of deferred water supply schemes listed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department stands at 33. No funds were specifically allocated to undertake deferred water supply schemes in the past two financial years. However, construction on the Coffin Bay water supply scheme which was top priority on the list commenced on 22 April 1985. This scheme is being funded through the Commonwealth Employment Program (CEP) and the Engineering and Water Supply Department loan funds. The CEP grant is for \$1 021 040 and the total Engineering and Water Supply Department loan funds allocation is \$918 960 to make up the total estimated cost for the project of \$1 940 000.

BUILDERS LICENCES

127. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General:

1. In the past five years, how many licences under the Builders Licensing Act, 1967 have been revoked or not renewed as a result of disciplinary action by the Builders Licensing Board?

2. Does the board conduct periodic inspections of contractors engaged on building sites and, if so, how many such inspections have taken place during 1984-85?

3. Will the Minister give consideration to amending the Act to require the builder's licence number to be included on all advertising for work for which the contractor must be licensed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Builders Licensing Act 1967 does not empower the Builders Licensing Board to revoke or refuse to renew a licence as a result of disciplinary action by the board. The Act requires that all disciplinary matters be dealt with by the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal which is established under Part IIIB of the Act. The tribunal has cancelled nine licences during the past five years for terms ranging from one month to an indefinite period. Section 14 (4) of the Act provides that no person is entitled to renew a licence at any time during which any licence previously issued to him is cancelled or suspended.

2. Yes. Statistics on the number of inspections carried out by the Builders Licensing Board inspectors are available only for the period 7 November 1984—30 June 1985. During that time 308 inspections were made. Investigation officers from the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs also conduct licence checks on building sites as part of their routine duties.

3. Section 21 (2) of the Builders Licensing Act, 1967 prohibits an unlicensed person from using the words 'master builder', 'licensed builder', 'building contractor' or 'builder' to lead other persons to believe that he is entitled and willing or able to carry out any building work. Section 21 (16) requires the holder of a licence to display a prominent sign at any site where he is carrying out building work declaring his name, licence number and type of licence held by him. The Government also proposes to amend the Builders Licensing Act to establish a licence number advertising requirement similar to that which presently applies to the second-hand vehicle dealers.

ABORIGINAL POLICE AIDES

149. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What is the status of the program announced earlier this year to appoint Aboriginal police aides and aimed at creating a greater and more effective understanding between police and Aborigines?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government has recently approved an increase of the Police Department's establishment to allow the recruitment of five Aboriginal police aides. A number of funding issues relating to the program are being discussed with the Federal Government. The initial stages of the trial program will be commenced when these funding issues have been resolved.

HOCKEY STADIUM

156. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Does the Minister intend to provide the information requested in question No. 567 from the past session and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

(a) The question with respect to the proposed hockey stadium development at the South Australian

Women's Memorial Playing Fields is no longer relevant as the international hockey stadium will now be built on the land north of the sewage treatment works at Glenelg North.

(b) This site was selected for the following reasons:

- greater amount of land for the hockey stadium and adjacent hockey fields;
- greater amount of land will enable the building of a sporting complex with an international hockey stadium, an international small bore rifle range and a weight lifting centre;
- more land available for parking;
- the site has better access for competitors and spectators; and
- lower cost of site works.

PETROL PRICES

157. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government take action to equalise fuel prices throughout the State in the interest of equity and tourism development?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only feasible way of equalising fuel prices is to introduce a fixed wholesale price and a fixed retail price throughout the State. This would have undesirable anti-competitive effects.

To maintain a fixed wholesale price, the State Government would have to meet all the freight costs of the oil companies which are not covered by the federal fuel freight subsidy scheme. The federal scheme has proven complex to operate and difficulties have been experienced in verifying claims for subsidies. The State Government does not propose to operate a scheme of this nature.

The State Government is also opposed to any scheme which would result in the removal of all competition, as this would not be in the interests of consumers generally.

PETROL SELLING

160. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier aware of the practices of some petrol companies which give rebates and other concessions to a few selected retailers and, if so, are these practices forcing many retail operators into serious liquidity problems?

2. Is the Premier aware that one of these practices is to give 90 days "to quit" notices to operators on commission agents sites enabling the companies to bring in more money slot operating (ghost) pumps?

3. Has the increase in the number of ghost pumps been examined to determine the number of jobs which will be eliminated and, if not, why not?

4. Does the Government intend to bring about a code of business practice in the petroleum fuel industry and, if not, why not, and what action is the Government going to take to reduce the unfair practices?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, and representations have been made to the Government on their effect.

2. This practice does not appear to be occurring in South Australia.

3. The South Australian Council of Technological Change prepared a report on automated fuel systems in December 1983, which dealt with this matter.

4. No. The Government does not intend to impose a code of business practice on the petroleum industry. However, the Government has announced that it is prepared to provide counsel to assist the Motor Fuel Licensing Board in examining any arrangement alleged by the South Australia

lian Automobile Chamber of Commerce to contain discriminatory pricing provisions at the wholesale level.

A committee comprising representatives from the oil companies and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, and an independent Chairman, is being formed to discuss trading hours and the possible rationalisation of the number of service stations. The committee chairman will also be asked to negotiate with the Transport Workers Union in relation to cross-brand purchasing.

PLANT NURSERY OPERATIONS

161. **The Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Forests:

1. What were the full operating costs and returns of the Woods and Forests Department nursery operations including extension staff, sub-contractors, etc. at Monarto, Belair, Berri and Cavan, respectively, for each of the years 1982-83 to 1984-85?

2. How much revenue was received from the sale of native plants only at each outlet in the years 1982-83 to 1984-85?

3. From which Government account was the Monarto complex funded and what, if any, were the reimbursement arrangements associated with that investment?

4. Has the native plant sales division of the department at any or all of its outlets ever been investigated by the Public Accounts Committee and, if so, when did this occur and what were the details of its findings?

5. Was any capital expenditure incurred during 1984-85 at Monarto, Belair, Berri or Cavan sales outlets and, if so, how much at each location and what are the respective capital and interest servicing arrangements?

6. Does the department offer private nurserymen plant stock at wholesale trade prices and, if so, what has been the value of that trade in the years 1982-83 to 1984-85 and, if not, why not?

7. Which areas of the State did the department service with its mobile truck sales during 1984-85 and did the local councils in each area ask for the service, welcome the service, object to or express any concern regarding the service and, if so, what were the details?

8. How many complaints did the Minister or the department receive in 1984-85 about its—

- (a) nursery plant or native plant selling activities;
- (b) retail timber sales; and
- (c) nursery plant advertising?

9. How much did the department spend on advertising during 1984-85?

10. What did the country truck sales services cost in the years 1982-83 to 1984-85?

11. Is the department receiving revenue from other than its own resources for the Jubilee Rural Tree Scheme and, if so, how much is involved and from what source and, if not, how much money from the department's own funds is involved in the total project and what proportion is earmarked for advertising?

12. What steps does the department take to conduct its native plant activities profitably?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The requested costs and returns are set out below:

	1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Exp.	Rev.	Exp.	Rev.	Exp.	Rev.
Murray Bridge	251 171	228 585	405 365	272 866	586 263	204 225
Belair	102 920	227 620	141 394	271 278	165 998	342 190
Berri	20 635	50 255	26 528	48 740	36 181	49 742
Cavan	—	—	1 116 463	1 136 078	1 146 231	1 165 781

NOTE:

- (1) Adjustments for stock variances are not included.
- (2) For 1982-83 and 1983-84, extension and management costs are not located at Murray Bridge and are not extractable, hence have not been included. In 1984-85 changes in the accounting system enabled inclusion of management costs and all departmental extension costs.
- (3) Revenue and expenditure on contract tree planting have not been included.
- (4) Cavan expenditure and revenue combines plant and timber sales.

2. The returns from native plant sales are set out below:

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Murray Bridge	228 585	239 752	204 225
Belair	227 620	271 278	338 814
Berri	50 255	48 740	47 631
Cavan	98 115	97 293	111 632

3. The Monarto nursery complex was initially funded by a Commonwealth grant, with control subsequently being transferred to the Woods and Forests Department in exchange for a combination of—

- (1) management of planted Monarto lands, including transferred personnel, and;
- (2) purchase of associated land for \$165 000 with funds from departmental earnings.

4. The Public Accounts Committee last reported in detail on departmental operations on 11 November 1975, without specific reference to nursery operations.

5. Total capital expenditure relating to nursery operations and extension during 1984-85 was \$77 404 at Murray Bridge

and \$27 520 at Belair. Funding of departmental capital works is achieved by either retention of accumulated earnings or from Treasury with repayment on the following basis:

- (1) interest at the common public sector interest rate as determined by the Treasurer;
- (2) quarterly rests;
- (3) the question of principal repayments to be subject to:
- (4) (i) negotiation as part of the budget process, and (ii) the capacity of the organisation to pay, and all principal repayments to be taken in on the capital side of the accounts, in lieu of the present sinking fund contribution arrangement.

6. Sales of bulk stock are available to any purchaser, including private nurserymen. Advanced ordering enables lower prices. The Woods and Forests Department keeps no record distinguishing nursery operators from other private purchasers.

7. The country sales trips serviced Cleve, Eyre Peninsula, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Yorke Peninsula and Kangaroo Island in 1984-85. All local councils involved welcomed the

service. (Criticism was received by the Whyalla community for not visiting. The local council indicated a preference not to be included and this was complied with.)

8. No adverse complaints were received about the specified activities in 1984-85.

9. A total of \$272 263 was spent on departmental advertising of which \$27 079 related to plant sales and extension in 1984-85.

10. Costs of country sales trips are detailed below:

1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
12 272	19 036	24 221

11. The Woods and Forests Department is not receiving any external funding for the Jubilee Rural Tree Scheme. The net cost is expected to be \$10 500 of which approximately \$4 800 is advertising. The objective is to further encourage rural tree planting by involving land owners and providing trees at minimum cost. The net expenditure is currently regarded by the department as an extension service.

12. During 1982-83 the department reviewed its native plants activities and method of management accounting. This resulted in some changes in action covering operations and records of accounts. Operational changes included redirection of staff action into increasing sales level and to resolving some technical production and planting problems identified. Accounting changes aim to identify costs and revenues of the nursery operation (propagation and sales) separate from field advisory extension costs and ensure these records are no longer confused with other departmental management and advisory costs. These changes began in 1984-85 but will only be fully operative in 1985-86.

The aim is to identify whether and how effectively the department's native plant policy of funding the associated extension service through its plant sales and related contracts is being achieved.

DRIVERS LICENCES

164. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many persons in South Australia hold licences to drive motor vehicles in more than one State and how is the figure arrived at?

2. Did a national road freight inquiry find that some truck drivers frequenting other States held more than one licence and, if so, what were the reasons given for having more than one?

3. What action is contemplated, and when, to curb the practice of persons holding current drivers licences simultaneously in more than one State?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Not known.

2. Yes—apparently to circumvent the penalty point system used in the States.

3. Uniform legislation throughout Australia would be required. This matter is subject to discussion at the Australian and New Zealand Transport Authorities Conference in March 1986.

FRIENDLY TRANSPORT COMPANY

167. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What were the individual and total costs of acquisition of all land, road reconstruction, associated works and site preparation to relocate Friendly Transport and what compensation was paid to the company?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: Costs attributable to the relocation of Friendly Transport from South Road, Black Forest, to South Road, Richmond are as follows:

	\$
Compensation (difference in value between the two sites)	100 000
Reinstatement of Richmond site to the operational standard of the Black Forest site	204 655
Incidental service costs associated with the relocation	5 000
	<hr/> 309 655

To this must be added the associated legal and transfer costs, the amount of which is not known at this time, but it is anticipated to be in the order of \$60 000.

EDUCATION ADVISORY SERVICES

173. Mr GUNN (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Education Department, under its re-organisation plans, intend to modify or reduce the centrally located Advisory Services Branch and, if so, why and when?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In 1986 resources will be transferred from the central office to the area offices, as planned in the Education Department reorganisation. This is being done to ensure services are readily accessible to the area offices or in the schools which they serve. The transfer of resources to the area offices will result in there being fewer advisory services provided from the central offices, but better service available through the area offices. Further modifications may occur in 1986 when it is anticipated that a limited number of positions currently held by seconded teachers will be converted to public service positions. However, the number of advisers actually delivering services for schools in 1986 will increase over the number in 1985.

TERTIARY FEES

175. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Government made representations to the Federal Government opposing the reintroduction of tertiary fees and, if so, what representations has it made, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. Representation has been made to the federal Minister and to all South Australian members of the federal ALP Caucus opposing the reintroduction of tertiary fees. In addition, I called on the Chairman of the Australian Education Council to convene a special meeting of all Ministers of Education. This meeting duly took place and accepted my recommendation that the council does not favour the reintroduction of tuition fees for tertiary education.

NOARLUNGA TRAIN COLLISION

176. The Hon. D.C. BROWN (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the train collision which occurred on the Noarlunga line on Monday 19 August 1985:

(a) what type of signal indication was on the track and how does that type of signalling protect train movements;

(b) was the signalling system functioning at the time of the collision;

(c) are there standard instructions to the crew of a disabled train;

- (d) are operational instructions adequate in all circumstances;
- (e) did the drivers of the trains involved observe all the signals;
- (f) were there detonators and flares on board the first train; and
- (g) what efforts were made by the crew of the first train to warn the train behind that a breakdown had occurred?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

(a) Three aspect automatic block signalling operates on the Noarlunga Centre line. When a train passes any given signal, the signal immediately goes to a red aspect, indicating to any following movement that it should stop. The signal in question was a permissive signal. The rule to pass this signal is general rule 36 of the common general operating rules, which is as follows:

A permissive block signal must not be passed when displaying a 'stop' indication until the train has been brought to a stand at such signal, except as prescribed in paragraph (c) of this rule. If the signal does not clear, the train may proceed (expecting to find a broken rail, train, or other obstruction in the block) as prescribed hereunder:

(a) On double line, after waiting one minute, at low speed to the next fixed signal. Should a preceding train still be in the same block, the following movement must not approach within 100 metres of that train. If the preceding train has stopped, the following train may close up when signalled to do so by the guard of the preceding movement. If the 'stop' indication displayed by the signal was not due to the passage of a preceding train, the train controller must be advised at the first opportunity.

(b) On single line:

(i) Where communication with the train controller is not readily available, in accordance with paragraph (a) of this rule.

(ii) Where communication with the train controller is readily available, the driver (guard of a railcar) must immediately communicate with the train controller who must, after ascertaining that the block is clear of any movement, issue a train order authorising the train to pass the signal at 'stop' and proceed at low speed to the next fixed signal. Should it be established that the cause of the signal failure is:

(aa) An unsafe track condition (broken rail or other obstruction), the train may pass the signal at 'stop' on the authority of a train order and proceed at a speed over the affected portion as is considered safe by a track supervisor. Such speed and the location of the track defect must be included in the train order.

(bb) Not an unsafe track condition, the train may pass the signal at 'stop' on the authority of a train order and proceed at normal speed.

(c) (i) Into or through a station yard, at low speed, upon receipt of the prescribed hand signal which must be displayed at the facing switches when the train may enter the yard without stopping.

(ii) Should there be no fixed signal at such station governing the entrance to the section ahead and the driver is in possession of an electric staff or train order for such section, normal speed may

be observed after the train has passed through the station yard.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) The driver of the second train failed to stop at the signal prior to the disabled train.

(f) Detonators were carried as standard equipment on the first train. However, the use of flares for train protection was discontinued more than 10 years ago in South Australia.

(g) The crew of the first train advised the control centre that they had stopped. From the time of stopping until the collision, a time of 3-4 minutes elapsed. The crew of the first movement did not have sufficient time to obtain and place detonators on the track.

PLANNING ACT

181. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Does the Government intend preparing a consolidated copy of the Planning Act 1982 and accompanying regulations and making them available to councils and, if so, which; and, if not, why not?

2. Is it intended to amend the Real Property Act 1886 to require that land for open space (or a contribution in lieu) in respect of all urban-type land division proposals outside metropolitan Adelaide be provided to the council concerned in lieu of the Planning Commission and, if not, why not?

3. Is it intended that the decision whether land is given for open space or a contribution made be at the discretion of local government and, if not, why not?

4. Is it intended to amend the Real Property Act 1886 to raise the contribution payable in lieu of the provision of open land in respect of land division within areas outside metropolitan Adelaide and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The Parliamentary Counsel's office is currently preparing an official consolidation of the Development Control Regulations under the Planning Act. It is likely that this consolidation will be available from the Government Printer prior to the end of the year. In the meantime, the Department of Environment and Planning has an up-to-date internal consolidation and makes this available to councils and interested individuals or groups upon request. With regard to consolidation of the Act itself, the priorities for consolidation of other Acts of Parliament, makes an official consolidation unlikely until next year. However, the Department of Environment and Planning has prepared an internal consolidation and as with the regulations, this is available upon request.

2. The Real Property Act provides that where land is divided into more than 20 allotments, the monetary contribution or the open space allocation is made to the relevant council. This is the situation throughout the State. Where land is divided into 20 allotments or less, the Act previously provided that a monetary contribution be made to the S.A. Planning Commission. However, amendments to the Real Property Act passed by Parliament in April 1985, commenced on 12 September 1985, and now allow the commission to waive the monetary contribution where the applicant and council wish to provide open space in lieu. Accordingly smaller parcels of open space, or linear reserves for walking trails, or along creeks, can now be provided in the smaller land division proposals. Any monetary contribution however, still goes to the commission for credit to the Planning and Development Fund. Amendments to the Planning Act which came into force on 15

August now give the Minister responsible for that Act, the power to make cash grants from the fund to councils for recreation facilities. As a result councils may now apply for grants to allow provision of recreation facilities.

3. Where land is divided into more than 20 allotments, the Real Property Act has, since November 1982, given local government the choice of requiring land, or requiring a monetary contribution. The amendment to the Real Property Act effective from 12 September 1985 also gives local government the discretion of taking some land and some money. Where land is divided into 20 allotments or less, the discretion lies with the commission. As stated earlier, the commission can now agree to waive the monetary contribution where the council has made a legitimate request to promote a linear parkway, or where an area is clearly deficient in local open space. If that discretion were vested in the relevant council it could be anticipated that the council would almost certainly take the land in preference to allowing the commission to have the money. Such a move would severely deplete the Planning and Development Fund as a source of capital for development of regional open space, and for schemes such as the Second Generation Parklands System for Metropolitan Adelaide. Accordingly, such an amendment is not being planned.

4. Section 223 of the Real Property Act fixes the amount of contribution payable in association with land division proposals. Subsection (4) of that section allows the South Australian Planning Commission to vary the contribution to reflect movements in land values for the previous financial year. Accordingly, after full data is available from the Valuer-General for price movements in the 1984-85 financial year, the commission will consider making a variation in contribution rates. The data is not expected to be available until the new year, and must be gazetted prior to June 1986. Under the Act the Government has no power to vary the contribution rates and at the present time has no intention to amend the Real Property Act to give the Governor or the Minister such authority.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

183. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many accidents have been reported on the Mount Barker Road between Cross Road and the commencement of the South Eastern Freeway in the past 12 months, what were the main causes given for them and how many of them involved transport vehicles?

2. What action is the Government taking to alleviate spillages from vehicles on this road?

3. What was the average week day usage of the road in July 1985 and how does this compare with July 1984?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. 196 accidents in the period 1.5.84 to 30.4.85, this being the latest 12 month period for which accident statistics are available. The main causes were rear end collision, side swipe and collision with a fixed object, e.g., guard railing. Semi-trailers were involved in two accidents and rigid trucks in 16 accidents.

2. The Highways Department is conducting an in-depth review of traffic conditions to determine the feasibility of improvements in both the short and long terms.

3. July 1985—24 400 vehicles, July 1984—22 000 vehicles.

TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY

185. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many homes are owned by the Teacher Housing Authority?

2. What is the proposed budget for 1985-86?

3. What percentage of market rent is charged for the housing?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Teacher Housing Authority owned and on school grounds		1 187	
Rented from the SA Housing Trust or private persons		637	
			1 824
2. Tentative estimates for year ended 30 June 1986:			
Income and Expenditure	\$'000		\$'000
Income			
Rental including subsidies		5 400	
Debt servicing grants		385	
Interest on investments		70	
Total income			5 855
Expenditure			
Rents paid—SA Housing Trust		1 400	
—Private persons		400	
Council and water rates		550	
Fees for rent fixing		55	
Administration and sundry property expenses		350	
Maintenance		800	
Interest		2 300	
Total expenditure			5 855
Capital works			
Purchase and construction of houses		5 220	
Modernisation and upgrading of houses		1 144	
Purchase of furniture and fittings		91	
Administration and miscellaneous		100	
			6 555

3. Average rentals (including subsidy) currently approximate 70 per cent of average market rental.

STATE SUPERANNUATION SCHEME

186. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does the Government intend to review the State superannuation scheme and, if so, when?

2. Has consideration been given to modifying the benefits or increasing the employee contribution?

3. What was the total cost of funding the scheme in the past financial year?

4. What was the employee contribution for the past financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. An inquiry into South Australian public sector superannuation is being undertaken currently.

2. The Government will not be making any changes to benefits and contributions under the State superannuation scheme until the recommendations of the inquiry have been fully considered.

3. The total cost of State superannuation scheme pensions to the State Government in 1984-85 was \$60.2 million. In addition, pension costs were paid by the Commonwealth in respect of ex SA Railway employees (\$15.6 m) and by statutory authorities (\$5.7 m).

4. The employee contribution in 1984-85 was \$30.2 million.

SCHOOL BUSES

187. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many school buses were operating at the beginning of the school year?

2. What is the proposed budget for the operation of school buses for 1985-86?

3. Does the Government have a policy of replacing petrol buses with diesel?

4. When does the Government intend to commence the air-conditioning of all buses?

5. Will preference be given for air-conditioning school buses that operate in the northern and western parts of the State?

6. Does the Government have a policy that prevents pre-schools and kindergartens from hiring school buses during school hours when they are not in use?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. There were 412 departmentally owned, and 269 privately owned school buses operating at the beginning of the 1985 school year.

2. Proposed budget for the operation of school buses for 1985-86 is:

Recurrent Expenditure—\$12 457 000

Capital Expenditure—\$3 200 000

3. Buses are purchased on a tender basis and options for petrol or diesel buses must be kept open. However, only diesel powered units have been purchased in the last purchase program and the current purchase program.

4 and 5. No plan of action has been formulated at this stage for the air-conditioning of school buses. However, two buses which operate between Olympic Dam and Anda-

mooka are currently being fitted with air-conditioners and they will operate on a trial basis commencing in the third school term, 1985. Priority for air-conditioning will be considered for areas which experience extreme sustained climatic conditions and such provision will be assessed alongside long standing building and redevelopment needs or requirements for adequate school furniture.

6. Education Department owned buses can only be hired by Education Department schools for approved excursions for Education Department school children.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

190. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many appointments have been made to the Children's Services Office from the Education Department, the Department of Community Welfare, the Kindergarten Union and other sources, respectively, and what are the qualifications and classifications of those appointed from each source?

2. Are all positions now filled and, if not, why not, which positions remain to be filled and when are they expected to be filled?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows:

APPOINTMENTS TO THE C.S.O.

(Actual numbers of staff employed as at 1/9/85 expressed in FTE terms)

	Education Department	DCW	KU	Other	Total	Qualifications and Classifications
Executive	—	1	3	7	11	Various tertiary. Director, Assistant Directors, Regional Managers, Secretary to Director
Professional (including teachers, F.D.C. Co-ordinators etc.)	—	44.5	742.8	1	788.3	Various including pre-school education, child care, social work, education, teachers, family day care co-ordinators, special services staff, etc.
Admin. & Clerical	2	35	25.4	12	74.4	Various. CO and AO classifications
TOTAL:	2	80.5	771.2	20	873.7	

Unfilled Positions: (other than FDC and Pre-school

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Consultant (Special Services) | } Nominations made but subject to appeal |
| 2. | Children's Services Advisers (10 positions) | |
| 3. | Project Officer (Planning and Development)—Position advertised and interviews in progress. | |
| 4. | Typist-in-Charge—Position advertised and interviews in progress. | |
| 5. | Project Officer (Services)—Position advertised September 1985. | |
| 6. | Clerical Officer Grade I—(A number of positions where workload is under review). | |
| 7. | Senior Project Officer (Multicultural)—Successful applicant yet to commence. | |

191. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What are the titles given to the various regional managers and advisers who are being appointed to the Children's Services Office and who will control preschool education in each region?

2. What are the qualifications of each person appointed to those positions?

3. Is it considered a prerequisite for appointment to these positions that the successful applicant has qualifications in preschool education and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Titles are: Regional Manager and Children's Services Adviser.

2. Qualifications are:

Regional Managers—three with qualifications in education; three with qualifications in social work

Advisers: Ten with qualifications in education; three with qualifications in social work and one with qualifications in psychology and parent education and counselling.

3. A majority of the appointees to these positions possess qualifications in education; however, their duties include provision of support and advice to a range of early childhood services, including child care, family day care, out of school hours care, toy libraries, playgroups and family services centres. A range of persons with broad qualifications is therefore needed to fulfil the duties adequately.

EUROPEAN WASP

192. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier negotiate with relevant State and Federal Ministers to have the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control in London or Jamaica begin a program to find a biological control for the European Wasp?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Department of Agriculture is maintaining close contact with the Victorian Department of Agriculture which has been involved longer with European wasp and which is investigating its biological control.

A parasitic wasp, recommended by the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, has been introduced into New Zealand to assist in controlling the wasp pest. A recent request by the Victorian Department to the Department of Primary Industry, Canberra, to import the parasite (under quarantine conditions) into Victoria from New Zealand and Greece for evaluation purposes has been rejected. The reason for the rejection was that a risk existed of introducing a disease which could attack honey bees and be a threat to the honey industry in Australia. However, the Victorian department has been invited to submit a modified request.

Entomologists with the Department of Agriculture in South Australia will continue liaising with the Victorian department and other organisations in an effort to develop biological and other means of controlling European Wasp in South Australia.

GLENDI FESTIVAL

193. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. How many complaints did the Department of Environment and Planning receive following the Glendi Festival at Wayville Showgrounds and what were the details of the complaints?

2. Has approval been sought from the Department to stage the next Glendi Festival at Wayville and, if so, has it been granted and, if not granted, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. A petition containing 17 names and one independent complaint were received regarding the level of noise and the lateness of the finishing time.

2. Approval from the Department of Environment and Planning is not needed. However, conditions for staging the festival were agreed by Glendi organisers and the Wayville Residents Action Committee at a meeting called by the department in May this year. These conditions are still acceptable to all parties.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

194. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the estimated cost of providing workers compensation for members of Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No specific provision has been made for providing workers compensation for members of Parliament. However, actual costs would be met when and if they occur.

CHILD CARE PROJECT

196. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Why was the site for the Polish Community child care project on Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park, deemed unsuitable after being promised by the Government and after Government condemnation of the Mayor of West Torrens for the council's refusal to grant consent?

2. Why, after over two months, has documentation not been provided on the agreement for use and architectural instruction for upgrading the new preferred site at Enfield Primary School, as promised?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The West Torrens council had objected to the establishment of the Jas I Malgosia Polish Nursery on the pro-

posed site on Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park, in particularly strong terms. Following advice from the Minister of Environment and Planning and from the Crown Solicitor, it was agreed that this particular option should lapse.

2. Negotiations have been undertaken with Enfield Primary School, which has agreed in principle to the project being located on the school property, but there are still issues to be clarified with respect to additional costs which will be incurred in order to meet the school's requirements. It is hoped the work will be able to commence in the near future.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

197. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Why do certificates of title issued by the Lands Titles Office no longer display a plan of the allotment subject to transfer or amendment?

2. Why has the Government introduced a fee for certificates over and above the other charges levied by the L.T.O. in respect of property transfers and recently increased that fee concurrently with removal of the plan from the certificate of title?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Not all certificates of title issued by the Lands Titles Office are issued without a plan of the allotment. There are many instances where a certificate of title containing a plan will need to be issued, for example, where an allotment is subject to or together with rights of way or easements, other than statutory easements, where the data of an allotment has been physically corrected or amended in a deposited plan subsequent to the deposit, where reproduction of the original deposited plan from the microfilm record is unsatisfactory and many others.

Certificates of title that issue as a result of the deposit of a plan of division no longer contain a plan of the allotment. This action was taken to offset to some degree the heavy labour intensive and time consuming element of producing a certificate of title with a plan. In these instances, a copy of the plan containing the allotment is readily available. This also assisted in reducing backlogs in title production at a time of record plan lodgements, reflecting the high level of activity in real estate transactions.

Strata titles have never embodied a plan and reference in the title has always been made to the relevant deposited strata plan. The Real Property Act, 1886, has, since its inception, made provision for land in certificates of title to be illustrated either by diagram contained in the title or by reference to a plan deposited in the Lands Titles Office.

2. In 1980 a fee for certificates of title was reintroduced because, as indicated, the issue of titles is a heavy labour-intensive process in which there has been a substantial increase in costs particularly in recent years.

The fee for a certificate of title was last increased in 1984 as part of the overall revision of Real Property Act fees and has no bearing on the decision to omit plans from some, but not all, certificates of title.

WORD PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

198. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Have any House of Assembly electorate offices been issued with word processing equipment by the Government and, if so, which offices?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No House of Assembly electorate offices have been issued with word processing equipment by the Government.

AMBULANCE SERVICE

200. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Will ambulance manning for the Australian Formula One Grand Prix comprise a mixture of volunteer and permanent ambulance officers or will it be restricted to the paid employees?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, ambulances will be manned by a mixture of volunteer and permanent officers.

FINGER POINT

202. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What type of treatment system is planned for the proposed Finger Point sewage plant?

2. What alternative treatment systems would be possible?

3. Has an environmental impact study been undertaken in respect of the disposal of the resulting effluent and, if not, is it intended to undertake such a study?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. The proposed Finger Point sewage treatment works will provide secondary treatment to the sewage before final discharge to the ocean. The selected process incorporates an aerated lagoon system followed by a number of facultative aerobic lagoons which will have a dual role as secondary treatment for the effluent, and sludge storage and digestion. The final effluent will be disinfected prior to discharge to the ocean.

2. A number of physical, chemical and biological processes are available for the treatment of wastewaters.

(i) Physical processes include screening, sedimentation, floatation, filtration, flocculation, etc., and one or more of these processes can be used in any particular sewage treatment works.

(ii) Biological processes involve the breakdown of complex organic molecules by micro-organisms to end products consisting of gases, salts and water with the release of energy. Specific aerobic processes include activated sludge, biological filtration, aerated lagoons and stabilisation lagoons.

(iii) Chemical processes include coagulation, precipitation and disinfection.

Various combinations of these processes can be grouped to provide a primary, secondary or tertiary treatment. The selection of appropriate treatment processes for wastewaters depends on:

- (i) the nature and concentration of the pollutants;
- (ii) the use of the receiving waters; and
- (iii) the practical requirements of the situation including availability of finance, materials, etc.

A number of treatment and disposal options have been examined. The range of options include direct ocean discharge via a new 1000 m long outfall, primary (or physical) treatment of varying complexity, secondary biological treatment by either aerated lagoons or activated sludge processes, and land disposal involving varying degrees of treatment. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has also evaluated the possibility of using in-main oxygen treatment.

3. Finger Point was originally chosen for the sea disposal of sewage from Mount Gambier because of the high energy of the sea which it was considered would provide rapid mixing and dilution of the sewage with the seawater, and thereby limit the impact of the discharge on the environment.

Considerable effort has been directed on investigations into the impact of the existing outfall on the marine environment in the vicinity of Finger Point. Investigations have been conducted to determine levels of bacteria, trace ele-

ments and other chemical constituents in the sewage and in the seawater and marine life.

Following commissioning of the proposed Finger Point sewage treatment works, the effluent would then have minimal effect on the environment. Since the discharge of treated effluent will provide a significant improvement in environmental impact compared with the existing situation, it is not considered that an environmental impact study for the disposal of treated effluent is warranted.

ELIZABETH SWIMMING CENTRE

203. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier representing the Minister of Labour:

1. Is the Minister aware of allegations by Miss V. Argirov concerning the Elizabeth swimming pool CEP project published by the Messenger Press in which she quotes information allegedly obtained from senior sources within the Department of Labour?

2. Which officer of the department provided the information to Miss Argirov on which the press article is based?

3. Did the Minister authorise the release of information held by the department to Miss Argirov and, if not, is the officer concerned to be dealt with under section 58 (i) or 58 (j) of the Public Service Act 1967 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. As a result of this question the Minister is aware of the statements referred to.

2. The Chairman of the CEP committee provided Ms Argirov with a press release and other background material previously provided to the press.

3. On 26 June 1985 when Acting Minister of Labour, the Minister authorised the Chairman of the CEP committee to publicly respond to the criticism of the CEP scheme in relation to the Elizabeth swimming pool CEP project.

ROYAL SHOW

206. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many public servants are given half days off to attend the Royal Show?

2. How many public servants avail themselves of the half day and what was the cost to the State this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Public Service Act officers employed in the metropolitan area have had the privilege of a half day paid leave to attend the Royal Show since approximately 1900. Until 1973 the practice was for Government offices to close on a designated day for the afternoon and for public servants to take the time off on paid leave. Since 1973 leave has been taken on a rostered basis.

2. It is not possible to answer this part of the question without a comprehensive study of all departmental leave records. This would be an expensive and time consuming exercise for which I consider there is insufficient justification.

WATER RATE CONCESSIONS

207. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: How many persons have had their water rates concession cancelled during the year 1984-85, what were the reasons and how does the number compare with the previous year?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The total number of cancellations during 1984-85 was 10 244. This compared with 10 001 during 1983-84. The reasons are many and varied, however, the major ones are death of the pensioner and ineligibility due to changed circumstances.

This is not an accurate indication of the number of persons who have had their rates concession cancelled during those years, as some percentage of these are reinstated, generally due to changes in addresses. Some 958 remissions were cancelled during 1984-85 as a result of a check into the Department of Social Security records. This check was undertaken to ensure that only those persons eligible were in receipt of a remission. The corresponding figure for 1983-84 was 605.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE

210. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many applications are there from people seeking to become qualified teachers in agricultural science through courses undertaken in colleges of advanced education during the forthcoming year?

2. What is the present number of vacancies within the Education Department for agricultural science teachers?

3. What is the projected number of vacancies for agricultural science teachers in the department for 1986?

4. How many places are there in colleges of advanced education for traineeships for people wishing to become qualified teachers in agricultural science?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. As the closing date for applications for entry to courses of advanced education in 1986 is 18 October 1985, it is not possible at this stage to identify how many people will apply to train as agriculture teachers in 1986. In 1984-85 some 15 students applied for entry to the graduate diploma in education at the South Australian College of Advanced Education, which is the major source of newly qualified agricultural science teachers.

2. One contract teaching vacancy of approximately eight weeks duration exists at present. It is likely that this position will be filled by a person who is granted an authority to teach by the Teachers Registration Board. Nine other contract vacancies have been filled in the agricultural science area during 1985 by persons who have been granted authorities to teach. These vacancies have occurred in country schools.

3. The 1986 staffing process is not advanced to the stage that a prediction of the number of vacancies can be made.

4. In 1985 a quota of six places within the graduate diploma in education were allocated to students wishing to train as agriculture teachers. It is estimated that in 1986 between six and 10 places will be made available.

CEREALS

211. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister support the cessation of the plant breeding program of cereals at Roseworthy Agricultural College and, if so, why?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc. recently submitted to the Minister of Agriculture a report from the Coordinator of Field Crop Breeding and Research Working Party. This report, while recognising the importance of cereal plant breeding to the State's agriculture, recommends some changes to current arrangements. The various organisations involved

in plant breeding, including Roseworthy college, have been invited to comment on the report's recommendations. Their replies are now being received. No commitment has been made to change any of the current plant breeding arrangements.

ADOPTION

212. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. What is the waiting time for adoption of children in South Australia?

2. How many children, including special children, were adopted in 1984-85 and how do these figures compare with each of the previous two years?

3. How many persons are employed by the Department for Community Welfare specialising in handling adoption applications and placements; and are staffing numbers adequate and, if not, why not?

4. Why do applicants have to wait up to five months to be interviewed at home and what action is being taken to reduce such delays?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. For an Australian-born child, the average waiting time is 45.4 months. For an overseas-born child, the average waiting time is 26.6 months.

2.

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Australian born	78	85	56
Overseas born	49	47	34
Total	127	132	95

3. The equivalent of 10.7 full-time positions (including 5.4 clerical, 3.3 social workers and two senior positions). My department has increased attention to the placement of children with special needs. There has also been an increased demand from the public for information on adoption and assessment relating to intercountry adoption. Steps are currently being taken to deal with these problems.

4. Preparation for adoptive parenthood is a process in which time is an important element. From the time applicants express an interest in becoming adoptive parents they are encouraged by staff to inform themselves on all aspects of adoptive parenthood, through participation in group discussions with other applicants, by reading of recommended literature and individual discussions with social workers and other people. In the early stage information is sought from the applicants' doctor, the Police Commissioner and the referees nominated. I believe that five months for a home study to be prepared under those circumstances is not unreasonable.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

215. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Labour:

1. What are the maximum workers compensation lump sum payments in New South Wales and Victoria and how do they compare with the current maximum amounts payable in South Australia and with the amounts proposed in the future?

2. Will the proposed maximum lump sum payments mean a downgrading of current payments?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The only prescribed maximum lump sum payment in New South Wales is \$58 900 on death, payable to dependants. The loss of bodily function under the New South

Wales table has \$24 000 as the highest level, but this could be greater when there are multiple injuries. The prescribed maximum lump sum payment in Victoria is \$61 750.

The maximum lump sum payment under section 69 of the current South Australian Workers Compensation Act is \$40 000. The maximum lump sum payment mentioned in

the South Australian Proposals for Workers Compensation Reform discussion paper is \$30 000.

2. The present and proposed sums are strictly not comparable, because the latter are part of a package including improved benefits by way of pensions.