

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 21 October 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** 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:

Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act Amendment,  
Coroners Act Amendment,  
Local Government Act Amendment (No. 3),  
Local Government Finance Authority Act Amendment,  
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 4),  
State Supply Act Amendment.

**PETITIONS: CENTRAL STANDARD TIME**

Petitions signed by 11 328 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the retention of Central Standard Time were presented by Messrs Olsen and Blacker.  
Petitions received.

**PETITION: STATE TRANSPORT BILL**

A petition signed by 631 residents of South Australia praying that the House not pass the State Transport Bill until satisfactory negotiations have been completed with the transport industry was presented by Mr Blacker.  
Petition received.

**PETITION: SCHOOL SPORTS**

A petition signed by 859 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Primary School Amateur Sports Association scheme in South Australia was presented by Mr Blacker.  
Petition received.

**PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES**

Petitions signed by 241 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs De Laine and Peterson.  
Petitions received.

**PETITION: MURRAY BRIDGE CRIME**

A petition signed by 404 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient personnel to combat the increase in crime in Murray Bridge was presented by Mr Lewis.  
Petition received.

**PETITION: OLD NOARLUNGA DRAINAGE**

A petition signed by 356 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide

deep drainage in the area of Old Noarlunga was presented by Mr Wotton.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions except Nos 65 to 77, 101, 120, 149, 150, 156 to 158, 161, 163, 167, 176, 178 to 180, 182, and 183; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**DRINK DRIVING**

In reply to Ms **LENEHAN** (27 August).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: The Government intends to introduce a Bill during the current session which will deal (among other things) with 'means to pay' fines. Included in that Bill will be wider powers for all courts, exercising criminal jurisdiction, to impose community service orders in lieu of imprisonment and where a person is (for genuine reasons) in default of payment of a fine. This Bill is currently being drafted and the matters of concern to the honourable member are being taken into account.

**BRIENS ROAD-BRIDGE ROAD**

In reply to **Hon. T.M. McRAE** (27 August).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Briens Road between Grand Junction Road and South Terrace, which operates as a four lane clearway in peak periods, is considered adequate for the present. There are a number of roads in the metropolitan area with similar capacity and traffic volumes. It is expected that the section of Bridge Road between South Terrace and Wright Road will be duplicated during the current financial year. A planning study examining the Gepps Cross-Cavan-Wingfield area is presently being undertaken by the Highways Department and will determine the desirable future arterial road network for the area. The study, which it is anticipated will be completed by late 1987, will indicate whether it would be appropriate to duplicate Montague Road between Main North Road and Bridge Road. Pending the outcome of the study, the department is undertaking an examination of a possible interim treatment that could be undertaken to improve the traffic flow at the intersection of Montague Road and Bridge Road. Implementation of any works will be dependent upon the availability of resources.

**MURRAY RIVER CHANNEL**

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (5 August).

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The maintenance of a navigable channel along South Australia's section of the River Murray, including the possibility of productively using the dredged sand is under consideration by an interdepartmental dredging and desnagging committee. It is understood that the committee has completed its deliberations and when it has been considered by the Government, a detailed answer by letter will be forwarded to the honourable member.

### WUDINNA AREA SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (27 August).

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The redevelopment of Wudinna Area School is high on the Western Area's major works priority list. However, this redevelopment is not on the current forward program, because capital works funds have been almost entirely expended in providing new schools in developing metropolitan areas. Although not programmed for major works in the current program, considerable expenditure has occurred at the Wudinna Area School within the last decade. For example, using the Area Minor Works program, in the late 1970s the school was provided with an art and photography complex at a cost of \$40 000.

Earlier this year the administration area of the school was completely upgraded at a cost of \$60 000, from the same funding source. Further, under the Major Works Capital Assistance Scheme, a gymnasium, including three squash courts, was provided, at a total cost of \$166 000, in the early 1980s. This work was done in two stages. Stage I expenditure was shared between the school council and the Education Department, with the school council contributing \$15 290 and the Education Department \$36 710. Repayment of the school council loan of \$69 000 was shared by the school council, which repaid \$22 000 and the Education Department, which repaid \$47 000. Stage II expenditure was shared between the school council and the Education Department, with the school council contributing \$4 000 and the Education Department totally funding the loan of \$41 000. In summary, the Education Department has expended \$224 710 on works at Wudinna Area School during the last decade.

### ELECTRICAL CABLE

In reply to **Mr GREGORY** (26 August).

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The trust has a padmounted transformer station and underground 11 kV and low voltage cables installed on Lot 199 Dallas Court, Wynn Vale, pursuant to a statutory easement. The cables are installed in conduit. As grantee of the easement the trust is entitled to enjoy the easement without interference. However, as a result of the earthworks carried out by the owner in connection with the construction of his house the easement has been interfered with inasmuch that the earth cover of the cables has been reduced in some parts to much less than the standard 1 metre cover. This has resulted in an unsafe situation. The trust, as the grantee of the easement, requires therefore that the owner at least replaces the earth cover which has been removed. Failing that he will be responsible for the cost of relaying the cables to an acceptable, safe depth. However, I understand there are several options available for making the cables safe which are open to negotiation between your constituent and the trust.

### REDWOOD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Ms GAYLER** (19 August).

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** In her question the member for Newland referred to a report prepared for the previous Minister of Education which detailed cost comparisons for the various types of relocatable buildings. A dual timber building was requested to be relocated from St Morris Primary School on 15 November 1985, to Redwood Park Primary School. At that point in time no other known alternative relocatable building was available to be pro-

grammed. However, since 15 November 1985, available single metal clad relocatable buildings have been identified, which has enabled an amendment to the original request. Redwood Park Primary School is now to receive two single metal clad relocatable buildings at an approximate cost of \$4 000 per space. The solid construction facilities at Redwood Park Primary School have been given a student capacity value of 330. Therefore, in line with Government policy, this school is considered to have its solid core, and any additional classroom space required is to be supplied in relocatable building form. The school council have been advised that the first of these buildings has been scheduled for relocation, and they appreciate that their wishes to have metal clad classroom space rather than timber classrooms have been achieved.

### KIDNEY DIALYSIS

In reply to **Mr TYLER** (13 August).

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** My colleague the Minister of Health has advised that in metropolitan Adelaide chronic haemodialysis is provided at the three major teaching hospitals and the Adelaide Children's Hospital. In addition, there are two satellite units primarily concerned with training patients to undertake home haemodialysis as well as ongoing chronic haemodialysis. One is located at North Adelaide and the second opened in May 1986 in Goodwood. Decisions on which services to be used are based on clinical need. The South Australian Health Commission, through its Renal Advisory Committee, continues to monitor the need for additional facilities and policies with respect to them. Cost effectiveness is clearly of great importance since the resources needed to provide these services are very high.

### PROPERTY VALUATIONS

In reply to **Mr S.G. EVANS** (5 August).

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The decision to discontinue sending notices of valuation was made in 1981 by a Liberal Government. The cost of reintroducing the system would be over \$240 000 and in the current economic climate that cost is not warranted. Moreover, details of valuations now appear on water and sewer rate accounts, land tax accounts and local government rate accounts.

### TOURISM RESEARCH

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (23 September).

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am advised that the contract for the tourism market research study to which the honourable member refers was awarded to a company known as Research International Australia Pty Ltd for the sum of \$150 000. The total of \$250 000 for market research mentioned by the honourable member includes an additional \$100 000 to be spent during the financial year on numerous regional surveys following the national survey which the company is undertaking. The proposal for the tourism research study was referred by the Department of Tourism to the State Statistical Priorities Committee on 7 April 1986 in accordance with the guidelines which I established on 1 May 1984.

### PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (24 September).

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In terms of Education Act Regulation 221—Part 16 (a), all property purchased by a

School Council becomes the property of the Minister of Education when installed at a school:

any item of property purchased . . . from the moneys in a (school council) account . . . shall become the property of the Minister, and the Principal shall be responsible for its proper care and safekeeping.

This information was restated in a circular to principals and school councils from the Director-General of Education dated 17 July 1986. From a memorandum of advice dated 15 August 1986 from the Crown Solicitor's Office on liability in regard to playground equipment, it is understood that the Education Department has legal liability for any accident/injury occurring on a school property. Personal liability would not rest with the school principal or school council unless there was evidence of deliberate negligence (e.g. disregard of a direct instruction).

In relation to playground equipment, the Department of Housing and Construction has been asked to prepare a document on playground design, safety and maintenance for distribution to schools by the beginning of the 1987 school year. Meanwhile, schools are able to seek the services of the Department of Housing and Construction's site development office to comment on the structural and safety standards of existing equipment in school playgrounds, and to receive advice on the design suitability of new or replacement equipment proposals. Schools have been advised to contact any of the following for detailed advice on procedures for the management of school playgrounds: the Area Education Office Facilities Manager; the local District Building Officer, Department of Housing and Construction; the School Building Information Unit of the Education Department.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the statement of the Register of Members' Interests for June 1986. Ordered that statement be printed.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—  
Australasian Formula One Grand Prix Act 1984—Regulations—Resale of Tickets, Seating and Sale of Products.  
Remuneration Tribunal—  
Report Relating to Chief Executive Officer.  
Report Relating to the State Coroner.
- By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—  
Judges' and Governors' Pensions Schemes—Report, 1985-86.  
State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1985-86.  
Superannuation Act 1974—Regulations—Part-time Employment.
- By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—  
State Theatre Company—Report, 1984-85.  
Carrick Hill Trust—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Lands, on behalf of the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—  
Beverage Container Act 1975—Regulations—Deposit Levels.  
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1984-85.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
Department of Lands—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
Forestry Act 1950—Proclamations—

Hundred of Kuitpo.  
Hundred of Parilla.  
Hundred of Goolwa.

- By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—  
Technology Park Adelaide Corporation—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—  
Local Government Act 1934—Regulation—Prescribed Body.  
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulation—Health Centre Audit.  
District Council By-laws—  
Elliston—No. 26—Camping.  
Stirling—Nos 1 and 9—Metrification.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—  
Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.  
Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Cramer)—  
Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulation—Exemptions from Classification (Amendments).  
Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—  
Powers of Chairman.  
Powers and Functions of Tribunal.  
Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Powers of Chairman and Registrar.  
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—General Regulations, 1986.  
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Grand Prix Party Restrictions.  
Second-hand Goods Act 1985—Regulations—  
Registered Premises.  
Record Maintenance.  
Trustee Act 1936—Regulation—Trustee Investment Status.  
Report of the Attorney-General Relating to Suppression Orders, 1985-86.  
Legal Services Commission—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. G.J. Cramer)—  
Children's Services Office—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—  
South Australian Housing Trust—Report, 1985-86.  
South Australian Department of Housing and Construction—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins)—  
Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act 1972—Regulations—Safe Working in a Confined Space.
- By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins)—  
Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.  
Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—  
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—  
Undersized Rock Lobster.  
Investigator Strait Experimental Prawn Fishery—  
Extension of Licence Tenure.  
West Coast Experimental Prawn Fishery—  
Extension of Licence Tenure.  
Southern Zone, Rock Lobster Fishery—Licences.  
Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licences.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—  
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1985-86.  
Department of Recreation and Sport—Report, 1985-86.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ARMTECH LIMITED

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Further to my statement in the House on 25 September 1986 regarding Armtech Limited and subsequent press reports implying my statement contained certain inaccuracies, I have received a report on the matter from the Director of the Department of State Development. The report in part reads:

Officers of the Department of State Development have been attempting (since early August 1986) to clarify the position of Armtech's purported arms contract with the view to identifying the possibility of investment and or manufacturing opportunities for South Australia should the said contract exist.

Telephone calls were received from both John Travers (Armtech director) and Mark Kerr of International Public Relations (acting for Armtech) on Tuesday 26 August 1986. Both stated that the purported contract with Greenhorn Pty Ltd of Hong Kong was *bona fide* and that a prototype of the company's automatic rifle (the ART 30) has been successfully test fired and that an additional 11 prototypes were being constructed.

Officers of the Department of State Development recently viewed a videotape of a test firing demonstration of the ART 30. The test firing showed that a prototype does function as claimed.

Further, several opportunities have been provided to the company to confirm its contract with Greenhorn; however, Armtech has not chosen to take this up and consequently the Department of State Development is not able to confirm or refute the *bona fides* of Armtech Limited. This afternoon I will be sending a telex as Minister of State Development and Technology asking for the company to respond to inquiries and confirm the information given earlier.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WRONGFUL REGISTRATION PARTICULARS

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** My attention has been drawn by the Registrar of Motor vehicles to an area of abuse caused by registered owners of motor vehicles who register their vehicles in country areas when, in fact, these vehicles are garaged or kept in metropolitan areas. Vehicles registered in country areas carry third party insurance premiums that are cheaper than those payable for vehicles kept in the city. The metropolitan area, for these insurance premium purposes, is defined as being within a 40 kilometre radius of the Adelaide GPO.

In some vehicle categories—especially for motor cycles—the difference between city and country is quite significant. Consequently, the avoidance of the higher premiums by dishonest persons means that registered vehicle owners in the metropolitan area are carrying the cost of the differential.

Let me provide an example of the difference for motor cycles: above 250cc engine capacity, the metropolitan cost is \$275 and country \$128 for 12 months premium. What has given the Registrar reason to suspect a substantial degree of evasion of proper payment is the gradual increase in numbers of cycles, especially the larger machines, in the country, and a parallel decrease in total numbers registered as being garaged in the metropolitan area.

The totals speak for themselves. The Adelaide metropolitan area, where more than 80 per cent of the population resides, had just 2 618 bikes of more than 250cc claiming metropolitan status on 1 July, yet in the country there were 7 445 bikes of more than 250cc. There was a disparity also—though less marked—for motor cycles of up to 250cc: 11 206 in the city and 14 133 in the country.

Given this curious disparity, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that some registered owners are deliberately and

wrongly claiming that they are garaging their vehicles in country areas. This contention is supported by a recent study of applications for registration of motor cycles. Three possible courses of action are available to overcome this problem. First, the Registrar can institute legal action against a person who falsely gives information in an application to register a motor vehicle. The penalty here is \$1 000. Secondly, the Registrar can institute legal action against a person who fails to advise a change of address within 14 days, and the penalty here is \$400. Thirdly, the Registrar can refuse to register a motor vehicle until he is satisfied as to the correctness of details of the application.

In the circumstances, I propose that, from 1 January next, officers of the Motor Registration Division pay special attention to applications received for the registration of new vehicles, or the reregistration of existing vehicles, to ensure that correct information is given on the location of the garaging of vehicles. Officers will be instructed to refuse applications until such time as they are completely satisfied that these particulars are correct.

Finally, I wish only to observe that although motor cyclists appear to be overrepresented in the statistics, they are not the only group of vehicle owners who are apparently avoiding paying their due premiums. The comments I have made apply to all motorists, and appropriate action will be taken against all who are found to be abusing the system.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on questions I advise the House that questions that were to have been directed to the Deputy Premier should be directed to the Minister of Lands.

#### PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT

**Mr OLSEN:** In return for specific evidence of recent cases of extortion and corrupt work practices involving the Ship Painters and Dockers Union at Port Adelaide, will the Premier give a clear and unequivocal undertaking that the evidence will be thoroughly investigated, that action will be taken to stamp out these practices, and that the shipping companies affected by them will be protected?

Late in 1984 the Costigan Royal Commission reported on the following practices involving the Ship Painters and Dockers Union in South Australia: workers compensation frauds; fraudulent use of false names, addresses and dates of birth; social security and taxation frauds; extortion rackets particularly requiring shipowners to pay large sums of money before a ship was handled—sums of up to \$30 000 were involved.

The South Australian Government refused to take any further action on the Costigan report, because most of the malpractices exposed by Costigan were some four to five years old. However, the Opposition has now received further firm evidence that some of these practices have continued. The following is a list of some of the worst cases of money demanded by the Ship Painters and Dockers for work on ships at Port Adelaide since the Costigan report:

- Company A—1½ hours work cost \$6 000
- Company B—5 hours work for \$19 000
- Company C—8 hours work for \$10 000
- Company D—2½ hours work for \$6 000
- Company D—three quarters of an hour's work for \$5 500.
- Company D—2 hours work for \$5 800

In a seventh case in August 1985 a ship was delayed in Port Adelaide for some days because the union demanded more than \$10 000 to clean the holds, even though the ship was

not taking on perishables but merely proceeding to Malaysia to take on bulk sugar. The company involved finally capitulated and paid the union \$8 100 to obtain the ship's release. Each of the above cases involved cleaning work which, I am advised, could have been provided by private cleaning contractors for less than \$1 000.

Shipping companies have been reluctant to go public with this problem because of union intimidation and Government inaction. I am informed, for example, that one company executive, resident in South Australia refused to drive his own car for a year because he feared reprisals, that is, that it would be blown up. However, in discussions with the Opposition, information has been provided which the companies involved are willing to have forwarded to a properly constituted investigating authority provided the Government gives a guarantee that it will be thoroughly investigated, that action will be taken to stamp out these practices and that the companies will receive appropriate protection from union intimidation.

Less than an hour ago, my office received from the Attorney-General a copy of a letter he has forwarded to the shadow Minister of Industrial Relations offering to make available senior police officers to discuss this matter. Provided the Government will also guarantee that action will be taken to stamp out these practices, and that the companies involved will be protected, the information will be provided to the police on a confidential basis, and I now ask the Premier whether he will give those specific guarantees.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is the first time I have heard of conditional proffering of information about illegal activities. I must say that, if that is in fact the case with those companies, then they have been pretty irresponsible—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—grossly irresponsible.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I particularly call the member for Murray-Mallee to order for continuing to interject when the House has been called to order. The Leader of the Opposition—

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat. If he wishes to take a point of order, he can do so in a moment. The Leader of the Opposition was heard in courtesy by the House while delivering his question. It would be expected that the same courtesy would be extended to the Premier. Does the member for Murray-Mallee have a point of order?

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, Mr Speaker. I did not say anything when you called the House to order. At no point was my mouth open.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair withdraws the remark directed to the member for Murray-Mallee.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I accept that the remark came from me.

**The SPEAKER:** The cooperation of the member for Victoria is appreciated.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Let me first correct a statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition, who has been dragged reluctantly—I hope reluctantly, because it is pretty irresponsible behaviour—in the wake of his hapless shadow Minister and another Federal member, who got themselves a little publicity at the weekend and, pleased and gratified with the response to that, decided that they were on a good thing. Then, the Leader of the Opposition said, 'Hey, wait a minute, Stephen, nobody knows who you are. Give it to me, and I will see if I can pump it up a bit more.' That is what has happened.

I think it is irresponsible of the Leader of the Opposition, and I will say why in a minute. Let me first correct most importantly one statement. The South Australian Government, he alleged, refused to take action on the Costigan report. That is absolute and complete nonsense. On the receipt of that report and its findings, the South Australian Government took immediate action. It did what was appropriate. It asked the police to make their investigation and see whether or not charges could be laid or if further lines of investigation should be followed. The Police Commissioner responded by saying, 'With respect to the laying of charges in this State, there is no evidence available to support such action.' There was no evidence that they could produce. They were asked by the Attorney-General to continue with their surveillance on this matter, and, if anything was reported to them or anything needed to be followed up, they should take action. That is the situation that applies today.

Recently, in the light of this beat-up from the hapless frontbenchers who have been pushed aside so that the Leader could grandstand on the issue, the Attorney again asked the police if in fact they had further evidence or if new matters had been brought to light. Their response was 'No'. Secondly, the matter was also considered by the Crown Prosecutor, who was asked to see what action could be taken in the light of those findings. Again, the advice received from the Crown Prosecutor was the same as that received from the Commissioner of Police, namely, that the Crown would fail to establish a *prima facie* case that an intent to steal existed.

In the light of that advice, and the Government having taken that action, there was nowhere it could go. If in fact there is this further evidence, and there are apparently people who will come forward provided that all sorts of protections are given, conditions are made and deals are done, then let them come forward, but let them do it as honest citizens, openly, and putting the matters before the appropriate authorities. In answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question, if that is done, there is no question that the Government will support the proper processes of the law, just as we have done throughout.

Secondly, in relation to criminal matters—and still no-one has come forward with names or details of that nature on which any basis for prosecution could be formed—those matters will be dealt with. Further, if breaches of awards are involved, again there is quite an appropriate procedure—an Arbitration Commission, in which those matters can be pursued at any time, without fear or favour and with appropriate protections. So, there is absolutely no case for anybody saying either that the Government has taken no action—because it did—or that there is no recourse to those who feel aggrieved, because there is.

All I can say is that I think this is a pretty disgraceful beat-up as far as it has gone. If there is substantial evidence, as the Attorney said in his letter to those who raised the matter (and a copy of that letter was forwarded to the Leader of the Opposition), then certainly the appropriate authorities will take action. I do not think that we should have any truck with those particularly, I notice, from Sydney, since that is where we get a quote in one of the articles about this matter. Somebody over there said, 'Well, yes, Adelaide is apparently a very bad port for this sort of thing.' That is absolute nonsense. I do not know how many painters and dockers are in Port Adelaide—I suspect about 10 or a dozen at most. One should read the Costigan Commission report, although I suspect that the member who raised this matter over the weekend did not: perhaps his Canberra

colleague, who put the idea in his mind and gave him the courtesy of letting him share a bit of the publicity, did so.

The State Liberals are getting sick and tired of Mr Downer appearing every Sunday with stories on State issues. They have obviously said to him, 'Alexander, when you are making these statements and getting a bit of publicity, can you get us involved too?' So, he probably rang Stephen Baker and said, 'Stephen, I have a good one here. Would you like your name on it as well?' That is obviously how it works, because I heard the hapless State member trying to explain the story on radio and, frankly, neither the reporter nor I could understand it indeed; I suspect that the honourable member could not do so, either. I suggest that in future State Liberal members leave Alexander Downer to do his own thing and not ask to be part of it. In that way, they will come out of it better.

Having said that, I think that one of the most concerning things about the way in which this matter has been treated is that it has been done with a reckless disregard for possible consequences in a period when we are involved in a lot of port developmental projects and, most importantly, when we are at a delicate stage of the submarine project.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** If what has been said by these members was not old hat stuff that was recycled in order to get a cheap headline on a Sunday, but rather was some new and major case, they would have every right and responsibility to raise it. But, the most superficial reading of what they have said indicates that there was no such intention in mind.

I excuse the honourable member in this Chamber from any kind of conspiracy in this approach, because he would not really have the brains to realise its implications, and I am sure that he is not so malicious as to want to undermine our bid for the submarine project. However, I am not so sure about his Federal colleague, because Mr Downer often makes statements about how badly South Australia is doing and about how this, that or the other thing is going wrong. Perhaps he has not such a vested interest in South Australia's future. We are at a very delicate and most crucial stage of the submarine project negotiations, and I should have thought that any honourable member, however concerned he was about matters at the Port, would think twice before trying to get himself a headline that could in any way be interpreted as undermining our bid.

I make it clear again that, if this was a substantial, well based honest story which had come to light and about which something needed to be done, I would not object, but it was not: it was a fabricated story to get a cheap headline and, in so doing, the honourable member inadvertently clumsily stumbled right over and tramped on some very delicate and important negotiations, just as a few weeks ago he got himself a bit of a cheap publicity, not in this State because that did not matter so much, but in another State on the radio, about our having a terrible strike record, whereas we have the best industrial relations in the country. Just as then, the honourable member has again blundered in and done damage to the State without realising the consequences.

The head of the Submarine Task Force, who has been involved in detailed negotiations in the past few weeks, has telephoned me to say, 'What will we do? We have successfully really put the Newcastle and Sydney people on the back foot. We have them running on the ropes. I pick up this paper, which I know will be read by these people interstate. I have been on the telephone all morning putting

out bushfires and telling people not to get alarmed because there is not gross corruption at the Port and the submarine project will not be affected.'

Why must the head of the submarine project be subjected to that, and why must we pick up the pieces after these people, as they undermine South Australia? At bottom, that is what it comes down to. How about their thinking before getting into their sleaze game? We know that they are well on the track. We get daily statements nudging away on this sleaze factor of politics. Most of these scandals that are announced never lead to anything. They do their damage perhaps by getting a one day wonder headline, and then we hear nothing more about them. If these people would resist the temptation to do this in areas where they are doing it we would be much better off; otherwise, they could seriously and adversely affect South Australia. A bit more of that approach and I suspect that members opposite would be doing better than they are.

## RABBITS

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I again call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Mitcham to order.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of recent CSIRO findings that cattle grazing modifies the environment in favour of the survival of rabbits? According to research that has recently come to light, reduction in stocking rates has produced a dramatic decline in the rabbit population in the Northern Territory. Therefore, I ask the Minister to investigate the relationship between stocking rates and rabbit populations in arid zones of South Australia with a view to curbing stocking rates, possibly, and even controlling the rabbit population in the north of our State.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his interest and question. I, too, saw the article in the *Sunday Mail* on the implications drawn out by the CSIRO research staff in the Northern Territory, highlighting the fact that modification of the environment can in fact introduce rabbits to the area. The suggestion is that by removing cattle we in fact remove the rabbit population as a consequence. Research in the Northern Territory suggests that the system of grazing introduces rabbits, because of the modification of land use, and the implication is that, if we remove grazing from the area, we remove rabbits. There are a number of examples in South Australia that defy that supposition, and we could consider areas in the Simpson Desert and the Musgrave Ranges where there is a high rabbit population but little grazing.

The Vertebrate Pests Authority, the control authority in South Australia, monitors the situation constantly and is aware of the research being undertaken. I believe that the authority is concerned that South Australian graziers should not be too alarmed about this matter, given that the study has been undertaken in a limited sphere in the Northern Territory and does not necessarily apply to the South Australian environment. I will draw the honourable member's question to the attention of the authority and ask it to monitor the progress being made in this regard by the CSIRO in the Northern Territory. Again, I spell out to the rural community that people should not be too alarmed, as I believe that the study is seen as being experimental and very much a limited research exercise.

### PORT ADELAIDE WATER FRONT

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister representing the Minister of Emergency Services reveal why certain individuals associated with the Ship Painters and Dockers Union have recently come under notice of the South Australian police? The Attorney-General's letter to the shadow Minister of Labour states, in part:

Certain individuals have come under notice of police, but not for activities nominated by Mr Costigan.

This was said in the context of continuing police monitoring of the persons and organisations nominated by Commissioner Costigan, particularly the Ship Painters and Dockers Union and its members. In answering the question, can the Minister reveal what action, if any, the police have taken as a result of their monitoring of this union?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I am not aware of the matter to which the Leader has referred. I have not seen the Attorney-General's press release: I was not privy to what he stated in that release. I will certainly follow up this matter on behalf of the Minister of Emergency Services and obtain that information for the Leader.

### ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION UNDERPASS

**Mr DUGAN:** Will the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made in the opening of the new underpass near the Adelaide Railway Station and whether any concessional areas have been or can be made available in the underpass? It has been put to me that arrangements should be made for those ticket sellers of the many charity raffles who operate at the top of the Adelaide Railway Station ramp to be accommodated in the pedestrian concourse now being constructed under North Terrace. Presently these people have little protection from the elements and will soon lose a substantial portion of their market as commuters begin to use the underpass.

Is the suggestion made to me to allow charity raffle ticket sellers in the underpass part of the current plan for the underpass usage? If not, will the Minister pursue the matter? Further, will the Minister advise when the underpass will be opened so that commuters can begin to avail themselves of the new facilities in what is a most exciting redevelopment connected with the Adelaide Railway Station?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I cannot tell the honourable member the exact date of completion of the underpass. Certainly, the construction agents have had some technical difficulties to face, and I will obtain an urgent report. It is full speed ahead as far as the Government and others involved are concerned and I will need to check the exact date. I will also check with the authorities the possibility of charity raffle ticket sellers being able to move into the underpass from their present unsatisfactory location in times of bad weather (as we all appreciate).

I suspect that no provision has been made for them in the underpass. I also suspect that enterprising charities would want to have ticket sellers in both places if they are able to achieve that. I can see no reason why they should not be able to be placed strategically within the underpass. I cannot imagine that there would be any difficulty. However, there may be well be, and I will talk to the agents and the people involved in the planning and bring back a report.

### PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Will the Premier immediately call on the ACTU to withdraw its support for the corrupt practices

of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union at Port Adelaide? I have in my possession a letter dated 2 October 1985 signed by the Secretary of the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers Union of Australia. It refers to a resolution of the ACTU supporting the use of shore-based labour and draws particular attention to the following:

We call on the unions concerned to strengthen their vigilance to secure implementation of ACTU policy on this matter and suggest the unions concentrate on a particular company in each State.

This refers to the vessel that was going to Malaysia. In my investigation of this matter, shipping companies have said that the ACTU, in endorsing the union's practices, is turning a blind eye to the impact on other workers caused by importers avoiding the Port of Adelaide because of the enormous additional costs imposed by this union.

South Australia's international reputation as well as significant volumes of trade are at risk because of the activities of this union. A recent plea for action to the Federal Government by the Australian Chamber of Shipping was flatly turned down. In view of the circumstances now revealed, I call on the Premier to immediately seek a commitment from the ACTU that it will withdraw its support for the corrupt practices of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union. In view of the Premier's response to the question concerning appropriate action and protection, the comment made by one of the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** —shipowners at the Port—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** —that there seems to be a conspiracy by the ALP—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will withdraw leave for that question in view of the member's persisting after I called him to order. If he wishes to resubmit the question I will consider it

### VICTORIAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE

**Mr De LAINE:** My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If I call the Leader of the Opposition to order again I will be required to warn him. The honourable member for Price.

**Mr De LAINE:** Would it be legally possible for a Victorian Football League club to transfer operations to South Australia, as the Swans did to New South Wales? It seems that the Victorian Football League is not satisfied with the situation in Victoria, where most league clubs are in financial difficulty, but seems determined to impose its worst run clubs on New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. This move, if successful, would have a disastrous effect on existing league clubs in these three States.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** This matter is of interest particularly to the football supporting members of the South Australian community, and I thank the honourable member for his interest in the issue, albeit he barracks for the wrong club. The situation is, of course, of great concern to the SANFL, and also to the Government. We could be faced with the potential of a Victorian club being moved across here or a consortium being established in South Australia that would detract from our excellent juniors program and also from the exhibition of league football that the State league has provided for South Australians over the 100 years or so that it has been operating.



There is no legal impediment to a VFL club's establishing here in South Australia. That is in accordance with the Federal Constitution and it probably would be seen as improper if anyone stood in the way in the sense of legal barriers. There are, of course, essential facilities that a VFL club, if establishing in South Australia, would require: the first would be a significant oval. There are probably only two ovals that would cater for the financial commitment that the VFL would have to encounter in order to establish a club.

I was talking over the weekend to someone who was involved in the Brisbane consortium that made an unsuccessful bid for the Brisbane team. They were having to front up with \$6 million on the knocker in order to provide a licence to the team if successful in the bid. He was saying that he was quite delighted that they had lost the bid because, when the facts started to untangle themselves from the original briefing and submission put forward, it appeared quite financially unviable for them to go on with the bid. In addition, the commitment they would have to have made and the financial costs they would have to have met in the first year would have been rather crippling if the bid had been successful.

South Australia per capita has one of the highest attendances at football of all the mainland States. This year we had a million people through the turnstiles to SANFL matches. For our population that was quite significant, and of course it was helped by the finals.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The member for Henley Beach suggests that it would have been better if Port Adelaide had been in the finals. I beg to differ, but we were both very disappointed. Certainly, I support the decision of the league, which has taken a most cautious and sensible decision given the commitment. It has a responsibility to look at junior football in the State and the effort put into that. It has to look at maintaining the league as a spectacle and also maintaining the standard and skills exhibited. What might have happened, in terms of the unknown, could have undermined the whole structure of football in this State. The league is committed and the President has made comments publicly and privately to individuals, including the shadow Minister, that the league is committed to looking at a national football league in the true sense and not just an extended VFL competition. That is basically the proposal floated by the VFL.

To be harsh, it has been an exercise in bailing out a couple of bankrupt clubs in Victoria. Why should South Australians, who have supported football for years, have to reach into their pockets to support VFL clubs because there are too many in competition or because they have not structured their games successfully as we have in South Australia? The league, I think, has done the right thing in being cautious. I hope it is not caught out as a result. If there was an attack from a VFL club into our bailiwick certainly the Government would have to think seriously about its commitment and the first point of call would be the SANFL, as the established State league. I have reassured the State President and Executive Officer that our support is with them to see that football in South Australia survives and maintains its current level of skill and support.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** It is easy to promise things in Opposition. The situation in relation to the SANFL and the VFL is that the SANFL basically has received a fairly raw deal in its treatment by the VFL in the past, and any onslaught of VFL clubs across the border to South Australia would detract from football as it stands. I will be interested

to see what comes out of the Brisbane and Western Australian bid. There will certainly be some impact on our players, a number of whom have not yet committed themselves to their local clubs. That would suggest that bids are being thrown around for, I suppose, our more prominent players in the league. In a sense, that is a worry, but it had to be expected. I hope that we get an agreement with the VFL and the NFL to establish a true national league which will have a proper base and fit into the structure of football in South Australia so that it does not take away the skilled players or detract from the junior sports program within football itself.

I thank the honourable member for his concern, which is shared by many thousands of South Australians. I know that they are very anxious but it is quite obvious, both from the polls taken by radio stations and research by the football league, that South Australians as a whole support the league's decision; I think more than 70 per cent support the decision not to move into the extended VFL and in fact seek a true national football league base. I think that is inevitable. The Government, I believe, would like to see that happen, as I am sure all State Governments would like to see the game promoted as a national game throughout Australia.

#### PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question delivered by the member for Mitcham was accompanied by an explanation that did not, in the opinion of the Chair, meet the requirements of Standing Orders. I endeavoured to call the honourable member to order. Due to a determination to uphold the authority of the Chair which was being flouted by the honourable member, who continued, after being called to order two or three times, I withdrew leave for his question rather than merely withdrawing leave for his explanation. However, if the honourable member now wishes to repeat his question, without the explanation, he is at liberty to do so, and that will not deprive the Opposition of what normally would be considered its turn for a question.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have indicated there was an error in the denial of the member to ask his question. Is it your intention now to call the member for Mitcham and then another member of the Opposition, so that—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Chair has just said that that procedure will be followed.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I will accept the invitation, Sir. The question asked was: will the Premier immediately call on the ACTU to withdraw its support for the corrupt practices of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union at Port Adelaide?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I was not clear from the explanation, to the extent that it was in order, where the member was quoting from a letter, to which resolution adopted by the ACTU he was referring. It was very difficult to distinguish whether he was quoting from a letter from the painters and dockers, a resolution of the ACTU, or his own remarks. To the extent that that resolution apparently refers to ensuring that a maximum of employment activity takes place in Australia, I would have thought that would have the hearty endorsement of all members. After all, it is the basis of a 'Buy Australia' campaign and a number of other things. Surely, we actively encourage the use of Australian based labour—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** An excuse—

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Does the honourable member disagree with that?



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitcham is in the unique position of having asked his question twice. I do not think that he ought to be asking it a third time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** To the extent that it refers to that, and if that is what it is all about, I do not know that there can be any objection. However, to the extent that it talks about corrupt work practices and forms of extortion, that cannot be tolerated, and I should be amazed if the ACTU was tolerating it. I will certainly try to understand what the honourable member has said, and, if my colleague or I need to talk to the ACTU about it, that will be done. Let me put clearly on the record that we do not condone or tolerate extortion and other illegal practices on our waterfront. I repeat that, where any question has been raised on this matter, the Government has acted on the advice of the Police Commissioner and the Crown Prosecutor whose duty it is to determine where or not action lies. If there is further evidence on which sustainable prosecutions can be launched, the Attorney-General will act forthwith.

### FRENCH NAVAL SHIP

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In view of his statement in the House on 21 August concerning uranium sales to France, when he said that he does not trust the defence policies of France, does the Premier oppose the current visit to South Australia by the French naval ship *Commandant Blaison*?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not. In fact, I took part in a ceremony on Saturday in which there was a re-enactment of the historic encounter between Nicholas Baudin of France on the *Geographe* and Matthew Flinders on the *Investigator*. I had a cordial conversation with the French captain and heard the French sailors in full voice, no doubt assisted by the very fine lunch that was provided, singing *La Marseillaise*. The member for Alexandra (who was also present) and I had no problems at all. France is and has been an ally of Australia. We have no objection to friendly and fraternal relations between the French people and their naval vessels and us. However, I have objected, and still object, to French nuclear tests in the Pacific. Such tests are unacceptable. I object to some French attitudes in relation to certain aspects of foreign affairs. That is not my prerogative, but I have a personal opinion on that. In regard to the visit to commemorate the historic encounter, I fully support it and warmly welcome it.

### EARTH TREMOR

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House on last night's earth tremor? Media reports this morning indicate that the tremor was felt across a wide area of the State and has clearly aroused a great deal of public interest. Any information that the Minister can provide will obviously help put the incident into perspective.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I thank the honourable member for his question, and I appreciate his reference to public interest. I suppose earth tremors are one of those things which we all share equally and worry about after to the same degree. Officers of the Department of Mines and Energy have this morning had an opportunity to carefully examine the chart from the seismograph recorder, which is housed at the department's central office on the corner of Glen Osmond and Greenhill Roads, Parkside. The actual sensor itself is on Mount Bonython in the Adelaide Hills.

When the chart was examined last night by senior officers, it was still mounted on the machine and rotating. Of necessity, this meant that the information released was of an approximate nature only. However, it has proved to be pretty close to the mark. I have been informed that the tremor occurred at 8.13 p.m. and was of very short duration. That is the simple part of the message because, when it comes to describing the intensity of the tremor, it becomes more complex. Most members of the House would be aware of the Richter scale—the invention of a Mr Richter in the 1930s which was developed specifically to measure earthquakes in California.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** Yes, it a logarithmic scale, and it has come into common use around the world. The Richter scale measures the maximum amplitude or intensity of a tremor, but other formulae are also used and measure such things as duration of the tremor.

In South Australia, our geophysicists have such a local formula, and it is duration based. I understand that the reason for this is that the degree of damage likely to be caused by a tremor is related more to duration than intensity. Using the Richter scale, last night's tremor registered approximately three. Using the local formula, it measured about two. This fits the general perception of last night's event as a short, sharp shock.

The department also reported a tremor at 12.45 p.m. last Thursday—at this stage thought to be related to the Para fault, lying north of Elizabeth Downs. That tremor had a magnitude of three using the local formula—indicating that it was of longer duration—but, using the Richter scale, it was marginally smaller than last night's event, indicating a lower intensity.

The question has been raised whether last night's tremor could have been related to the activities of RAAF aircraft currently exercising in South Australia. While geophysicists are not prepared to give a categorical 'No' to this possibility (reminding me of geologists), it appears to be unlikely. Last night's tremor was felt at Renmark and was recorded on the seismograph at Cleve, on Eyre Peninsula. It is thought unlikely that sonic booms would have been felt that far afield.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The honourable member told us a story years ago about birds flying underwater, so I do not think we will involve him in any further interjections. Both last night's and last Thursday's tremors are thought to have had their epicentre with a 20 to 25 kilometre radius of Mount Bonython, but more precise estimates will have to await the arrival of charts from the State's other seismographs. Arrangements are being made to have these couriered to Adelaide and we should know more in the next few days. The reason that so many people heard or felt last night's tremor could have a number of explanations, but the most likely is that it was shallower than last Thursday's event and therefore was felt more readily.

In summary (and almost stating the obvious), last night's tremor was not serious and no reports of damage have come in at this stage. However, I should point out that South Australia is subject to tremors, numbering several hundred each year. It is important that we understand and do all that we can in this area. Therefore, I was pleased to be able to announce not so long ago that we would be perpetuating the work of the Sutton Institute which has been carried out for the past few years at Adelaide University. This will now be based in and operated by the Department of Mines and Energy, subsequently and hopefully leading to the formation of an incorporated body.

### VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Will the Minister of Transport advise the House what action he has taken and what further action he intends to take to ensure that the Steamranger Southern Encounter tourist trains to Victor Harbor will resume without further delay following the decision by the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemmen to insist on relief crews, and will he also advise the House what arrangements were made to enable the train to run at the weekend in view of the fact that it has been reported that no insurance company is prepared to provide cover for Australian National, whose crews drive the Steamranger trains on State Transport Authority track?

It is interesting to note the discussion that is taking place between the Premier and the Minister of Transport, presumably in an effort to provide an answer concerning the insurance question. To enable tourist trains to run on what has been described as the most scenic railway track in Australia, the track to Victor Harbor has been restored at a cost of \$2.258 million of which more than \$2 million has been provided by the taxpayer. A further \$100 000 annually for three years of taxpayers' money has been committed by the State Government to offset operating costs on an important tourist service for which significant advance bookings have been made. The tourism industry and the taxpaying public regard it as scandalous that, after years of effort and a huge investment of public funds, the project can be put at risk at the eleventh hour by union demands imposed by a narrow majority of members of the AFULE.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I will certainly answer that question. I should point out initially that the responsibility in negotiations with the AFULE remains with Steamranger. The difficulties that Steamranger faces involve the operations of AN and not so much the operations of the STA, but that is Steamranger's responsibility, as the honourable member acknowledges. I was aware of the difficulty that had arisen in relation to the AFULE which, frankly, strongly supports the establishment of the Steamranger service and the Steamranger management. One of my officers spoke to them prior to the initial running of Steamranger on Sunday morning. I will use what good offices we have to ensure that there is a continuation of that service.

I should point out that the State Government has been very supportive of this whole venture. In fact, the venture would never be up and running if it was not for the consistent and, I think, significant substantial support of the State Government. Late on Friday afternoon, the Premier and I were involved in ensuring that Steamranger was able to run its services over the weekend. My department has been in almost continuous discussion with the Australian Railways Preservation Society, with which we have an agreement to ensure a working relationship.

In relation to insurance, there is a problem in terms of Steamranger's obtaining cover from its insurers, and we are working on that now. Again, that is essentially not a problem for the STA or for me as the Minister: it is a matter that is shared with Australian National. On the weekend there was residual property cover. The State Government indemnified Steamranger against—

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** To what magnitude?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** It was general cover. We ensured that Steamranger was able to run. So much work had been done and expectations were so strong, and the operation was tied in with a significant South Australian Jubilee venture, that the State Government felt it was appropriate to ensure that the train ran on Sunday morning. We have encouraged Steamranger to obtain insurance cover. Again, we will assist where it is appropriate—

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yes, the State Government indemnified Steamranger over the weekend.

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** To what value?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** To whatever value: it was a general cover.

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** It could have been millions.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** It was nothing: the cost to the State Government was nothing, but the benefit to the State was significant. I am surprised that the former Minister of Tourism is being so finicky and trying to point out to the people of South Australia that the South Australian Government, in ensuring that the Steamranger operation took place on Sunday morning, was somehow at fault. That is what she is trying to say. Instead of congratulating and thanking the State Government for the action that it was prepared to take to ensure that a significant tourist venture was able to proceed on a day of significant cultural and heritage importance to South Australia, the honourable member is now being finicky and trying to make it seem as though we have done something wrong.

We will encourage the historical society to negotiate an appropriate cover with the insurers. My office is working with the Premier's office, with AN and with the historical society to ensure that that occurs, because the State Government will not inevitably pick up general coverage. This really must be a commercial decision by a commercial operation.

I want to make one further point: if the Steamranger service depends on the State Government's always picking up the tab, always getting it out of its difficult commercial problems, Steamranger has no future. I have told Steamranger quite clearly that it is expected to run in a commercial way. We will underwrite losses of \$100 000 a year for three years but, if at the end of three years it is still not able to operate commercially, it has no future. It has no future now if, every time the operation runs into a problem, the Minister of Transport is required to bail it out of what is a normal commercial arrangement. We want the society to understand its responsibilities and to act in an appropriate managerial way, with a knowledge of its commercial responsibilities. I am confident in telling the House that the historical society and Steamranger agree with me: they understand that and they are doing their best to conform.

### STATE DEVELOPMENT

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the outcome of his discussions with bankers and companies during his recent visit to Hong Kong, and will he also advise the progress that has been made in relation to the encouragement and support given by him and the State Government to the application by Cathay Pacific airlines to the Federal Department of Civil Aviation for flights into Adelaide International Airport? An article in the *South China Morning Post* of 12 October stated:

South Australia is pushing hard to convince Hong Kong businessmen to stop passing it over in favour of its bigger neighbours. As a major technology centre with a growing population and the country's best industrial relations record. South Australia is the perfect place to invest, according to Mr Lynn Arnold, Minister for State Development and Technology.

With such ripe conditions for investment Mr Arnold said the South Australian Government would now like to encourage direct flights from Hong Kong to Adelaide, the State's capital.

The article further points out that during his trip Mr Arnold also spoke at the 'Trading Technology 86 and Beyond' seminar at the Excelsior Hotel. An exhibition that involved

13 technology companies was held simultaneously in the Australian Commission. I would welcome information from the Minister, particularly in relation to the discussions he had with bankers and business people and also information about possible landing rights for Cathay Pacific airlines at Adelaide International Airport.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I can certainly say that the quick trip that I took to Hong Kong was very successful. I can further say that we are in the process of debriefing the South Australian companies that took part in the exhibition in Hong Kong. In the near future I will issue a more detailed report on the results of that exhibition, which was called 'Trading Technology 86 and Beyond'. I can already say that the interim reports indicate that very positive reports were received from a number of South Australian companies that attended that exhibition and confirm the decision made by the Government and the Department of State Development that it was worthwhile promoting South Australian technological expertise in the important East Asian market, because we can sell a range of products there.

The area that I was concentrating on, as well as opening that exhibition and a seminar program on South Australian technology and research, focused on three areas, one being investment, with two sub areas—business migration and general investment; the second was export promotion; and the third was possible air links between Hong Kong, or East Asia, and South Australia. In the investment arena, I was very pleased to hear that South Australia's standing in the Hong Kong area is very high indeed. From a situation where in 1982 South Australia was bottom in terms of interest in and business migration from Hong Kong to the States of Australia, we now find that in 1986, as a result of the work carried out by the State Government and the Department of State Development, South Australia is equal second in ranking with Victoria.

Of course, New South Wales ranks first, given the family connections with the Chinese population in that State. However, we are now second. We are a desired location for business migration, and that is as a result of the constant effort that has been put into that area by the South Australian Government. It is true to say that the second area, general investment—in other words, where the capital is coming over but not the person owning the capital—still needs more work. We are not getting our fair share of that investment.

I was very pleased with the responses I was receiving from a number of financial people in Hong Kong. Certainly, one of the purposes of my visit was to leave a calling card pointing out that South Australia is a viable and active place to be associated with, and has a diverse manufacturing base and technological expertise.

I was promoting the general range of South Australian exports and certainly confirming that we are a valid source of raw materials, fruit and vegetables, and other agricultural products, but also wanting to say that we were a viable source of value added goods. I guess it is a matter of concern to us that traditionally the East Asian market, including Japan and Hong Kong, very often does not regard South Australia—or Australia—as a viable source of value added products. We were there to say that we are; that we can make sophisticated products in the technological sense and can promise delivery, we are cost competitive, and we can fit the particular needs of those areas.

Hong Kong, as a very important international trading entrepot, is clearly an area where we have to be well represented. The contacts I established, and indeed those established over a long period by a number of contacts in that

area—most significantly, of course, including those made by the Premier on his business trip to Hong Kong this year—are building that image of South Australia and are part of its permanent calling card being left in that area.

We now have the situation that companies are interested in value added products that this State is making. However, further reports will be available on that later. With an international airport, South Australia now has direct links to the west coast of the United States, Europe and New Zealand. However, we have a major gap, that is, the gap to East Asia. What we said to Cathay Pacific is that, when it is considering putting its next application to the Federal Government for further landing rights, we will support a case if that case includes Adelaide. We realise that Cathay Pacific's case is dependent on being market driven (that is, that there is profit in it for Cathay Pacific). We were able to give them figures of the burgeoning growth in air freight from Adelaide to Hong Kong. Presently, air freight is having to be transhipped domestically or internationally at some other airport, but the growth rate of air freight to Hong Kong is doubling every year: this year's figure is double last year's, and last year's is double that of the year before.

South Australian exporters are exporting there even against the difficulties and we put to the airline that there was more air freight to be gained if that service was there. We indicated to it that the present coverage of seven flights a week to Sydney and Melbourne in a triangular route and one flight a week to Perth would be well and truly complemented by a service to Adelaide either basing that service direct to East Asia or linking it with the Perth or Melbourne service.

We have indicated that we will support such an application to the Federal Government because we believe that South Australian exports need better access to export facilities to the East Asian market. The trade is growing and could grow more rapidly with direct air links. The last contact Cathay Pacific had with the South Australian Government was in 1981. We are anxious now to push this matter further. Further discussions will take place when it has firmed up on its decision to have an eighth service to the eastern or south-eastern part of Australia.

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Premier, as Treasurer, immediately investigate allegations of wasteful expenditure in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the State Transport Authority? Allegations have been made to me that senior officers of the E&WS, who will be participating in a hyperbaric seminar to be held at the South Park Motor Inn during December, will be accommodated at the motel for the duration of the week long seminar at taxpayers' expense even though the officers concerned live in the metropolitan area. In the case of the STA, it has been put to the Opposition that recently senior staff held a series of luncheons for themselves at a leading Adelaide restaurant and ran up a sizeable bill. In view of the stringent conditions that the Government calls on all members of the public and departmental officers to observe, will the Premier investigate the allegations that have been made to us?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will refer both those matters to the appropriate Ministers and seek a report.

### CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the Appropriation Bill, the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill, and the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act Amendment Bill be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

### APPROPRIATION BILL

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr FERGUSON:** 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.

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Ms GAYLER:** 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 opening this debate I first commend the Public Service for the manner in which information was provided to the Estimates Committees and its involvement in the committees themselves.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** If they were allowed to.

**Mr OLSEN:** I was going to make that point. The public servants who sat with their Ministers answered questions, in the main capably and helpfully when, as the Deputy Leader rightfully points out, they were allowed to do so. With small resources, the Public Service has demonstrated a significant professional commitment to the Estimates Committees since they were introduced by the former Administration. The Public Service is certainly fulfilling its role in this important process. However, I do not believe that the same can be said for Government Ministers. Because information was withheld from the Estimates Committees on a range of important matters, Parliament cannot play its full role in the process—it cannot ensure accountability for day to day Government management. The Estimates Committees are intended to put checks and balances in the

system, to ensure accountability and to prevent mismanagement. However, the Government does not seem to see it this way.

I list the following as examples of Government indulgence, inaction, indecision—or a combination of them—highlighted during the Estimates Committee which are reflecting poorly on this State:

continuing problems with the ASER project, including the Government stonewalling on the escalating cost under the thin disguise of commercial confidentiality which has not been adequately defined in this place at any time in the past (through convenience, I might add);

the dismissal of the ASER industrial trouble-shooter only two days after the Minister of Labour told his Estimates Committee that the trouble-shooter was doing a good job (he obviously did not have a close finger on the pulse as to what his troubleshooter was doing on site);

the Government's failure to come to grips with avoidance of the tobacco tax;

the Minister of Labour's refusal to reveal when the workers compensation legislation will be proceeded with; a 200 per cent increase in workers compensation payouts to teachers in just two years;

One in four people employed in CEP projects receiving workers compensation payouts;

the failure of the Government to make any budgetary provisions for the promised changes to workers compensation and industrial safety arrangements despite the fact that these moves will require a significant increase in capital and manpower resources, particularly through the establishment of a new workers compensation commission;

despite the many Government pronouncements about the prospects for finding more gas in the Cooper Basin, the necessity to find a further two years supply just to satisfy the Sydney contracts;

no decisions yet from the inquiry into ETSA tariffs even though it has been going on for some 18 months;

uncertainty about the Government's attitude to ETSA's proposals for blackouts over wide areas in the event of a repeat of Ash Wednesday weather conditions;

Government timidity in the face of union opposition to proposals to privatise AMDEL—the legislation was drafted last year but the Public Service Association and now the Trades and Labor Council have forced the Government to back off;

the failure of the Government to come to grips with deterioration in the metropolitan water and sewer system—this remains obviously, in the too hard basket;

no policy to grapple with the STA's mounting deficit—now costing taxpayers almost \$200 a minute—and still no inquiry started into the STA even though the Minister of Transport announced the inquiry almost five months ago;

no legislation yet to deal with the massive increase in the deficit of the SGIC's compulsory third party insurance—now rising by \$214 a minute; no Government policy on the petrochemical project—a uranium enrichment plant (although we understand they pulled out of South Australia)—

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, the Minister did not know it. That is another example of lack of ministerial responsibility and accountability. There is little prospect of that occurring in the future. Examples of the Government's neglect continue:

no policy, no direction, no purpose for Youth Affairs despite the establishment of the ministerial portfolio more than 15 months ago;

no agreement yet on how to fund the running costs of the Aquatic Centre even though the Auditor-General first invited the Government's attention to this matter more than two years ago;

no clear indication yet of how the police will administer the on-the-spot fines for marijuana possession;

uncertainty about if or when an entertainment centre will be built.

As one talkback program host said the other day, it is pretty clear that this issue will be brought out just before the next election—the sod will be turned and the foundation stone will be laid. Well the Premier might smirk! I understand the cynicism of the media towards some of his announcements.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, Finger Point is another classic example. Bulldozers were taken to Finger Point specifically for the election. They have not been back since to undertake any further earthworks or to go on with that project, which was a solemn election promise of this Administration.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** The member for Mount Gambier got a photograph of it.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am glad he got a film of bulldozers on the site; the only way they will return is under a Liberal Government. Continuing with examples of the Government's neglect:

Inaction on recommendations by the Auditor-General to contain costs in the Health Commission's Central Office—the Auditor-General reported on this matter last year but, instead of taking any notice, the number of staff increased yet again by 25 to 323, increasing costs by \$1.6 million when the Auditor-General had recommended savings of \$1 million—the \$2.6 million difference between the recommended action and the actual outcome means more funding cuts in hospitals.

To overcome the waiting lists in hospitals the Government redefines the criteria for waiting lists and in so doing puts people off the list. It solves the problem by re-establishing a new waiting list. Talk about half truths! They are not even half truths—that is being over generous to this Administration. The list continues:

Uncertainty about Housing Trust rents—about the only thing tenants can be sure of is that there will be another rise this year because the Government has meddled with the trust and forced it into an operating deficit.

This list is by no means exhaustive. What it illustrates is a Government incapable of making major decisions. To give some semblance of action and coherence, it just recycles or rehashes old press releases. For example, over the last two years there have been 35 announcements about new recreation and sport facilities. The small bore rifle venue has been announced eight times. The hockey stadium has been announced nine times.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** They are the real mirages.

**Mr OLSEN:** They are not there yet. The velodrome has been announced nine times and the entertainment centre five times.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is starting to sting the backbenchers. They do not like the truth. The Government is rehashing old press releases to try to make it appear that it is doing something when it is doing nothing. The sport and recreation centre has been announced some four times, with the latest proposal estimated to cost \$55 million—175 per cent more than the original estimate. It is the Aquatic Centre on action replay. The Government's propaganda machine has also been working overtime on the latest increase in electricity tariffs—something like the overtime the Premier is

spending at Adelaide Airport welcoming every person arriving. He was there to meet the first mechanics and crew arriving for the Grand Prix from overseas. However, only three people on the plane had anything to do with the Grand Prix. The Premier had to do something to look right, so he started shaking hands with everyone coming off the jumbo jet. It is a new plus for tourism in future to shake hands with the Premier when getting off a jumbo jet. Talk about recycling stuff and squeezing every ounce of benefit out of a project! No doubt the passengers were grateful that the Premier was there early in the morning to shake hands with them.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** No, they probably did not know who this young man was at the end of the gangplank saying, 'Welcome to Adelaide for the Grand Prix,' when they had nothing to do with the event. I bet the Premier will do a few flits back to the airport over the next couple of days to line up in front of the cameras with anything relating to the Grand Prix, in order to squeeze every ounce of benefit out of it. It is a great thing for South Australia, and I am glad that he has been involved. However, the credit ought to go to the people who thought of the idea—Kym Bonython and one or two others, as well as the Jubilee 150 Board, which initiated discussions on staging the Grand Prix. Those people have been forgotten in this exercise and left to one side. They were the ones that put up the project. The Jubilee 150 Board had several million dollars taken from it to be allocated initially to the Grand Prix.

The Government's propaganda machine has been working overtime on electricity tariffs. The Premier keeps talking about a 2 per cent cut. Let me strip away some of his rhetoric to highlight the reality. For a start, all taxpayers, not only power consumers, paid for the Premier's so-called cut in tariffs. It was achieved simply by transferring \$11 million of tax revenue to the trust—akin to your wife saying here's your birthday present, and here's the bill. But that is not all.

In fact, electricity tariffs did not fall by 2 per cent last year, as the Premier keeps saying. The trust's own figures show that they did not, and that what the Premier said during the last election campaign and what he will say now to justify this 6.8 per cent rise in tariffs is all false. The trust's own figures show that, in 1985-86, its income from sales of electricity for residential purposes was \$223 316 000. The amount of electricity sold for residential purposes was 2 752 000 megawatt hours. That means that electricity to heat the home, to keep the living room lights on, cost 8.15 cents per kilowatt hour in 1985-86. The equivalent cost for the previous year, again calculated from official trust figures, was 7.74 cents per kilowatt hour. What this adds up to is not a 2 per cent cut, but a 5.3 per cent increase in the cost of residential power in South Australia. I ask people to pull out their electricity bill and compare apples with apples, and they will see clearly that the increase in the electricity tariff is clearly documented.

Further analysis of the trust's figures show just how much the Government's meddling in its operations will cost consumers in the long run. Without the \$11 million election year transfer to the trust and another one-off gain of \$9.5 million from a sale and lease-back arrangement, the trust last financial year would have suffered an operating deficit of well over \$20 million. This is unprecedented for the trust. It had always been the trust's policy, until this Government came to office, that it maintained its operating results in the black. Yet at one stroke, for base political purposes, the Premier overturned what had been one of the

trust's most enduring policies: that it should not operate at a loss.

The taxes and charges the Government now collects from the trust add up to more than \$45 million a year. Out of each \$13 the trust is paid by power consumers, one goes directly into general Government revenue as a tax or charge on the trust. It is time the Government came clean about the trust's operations. It has put the ETSA board under ministerial control and stacked it with what used to be Labor Party heavies so that it can manipulate tariffs and the trust's operations.

I will have more to say later about what any responsible Government would do to protect the interests of power consumers. Before I do, I want to deal further with the Government's attitude to workers compensation legislation. When asked during the Estimates Committee about when the Government intended to proceed with the legislation, the Minister of Labour would only say, 'When the Government feels it is appropriate to do so'.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** When the union gives them the green light.

**Mr OLSEN:** Exactly. The Minister's nonchalant attitude to a matter of very vital concern to every worker and every business in South Australia is nothing short of a scandal. It is interesting that the President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, in his address to that body on Friday night, made reference to that very fact.

Just one year ago, the Premier spent thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to advertise the Government's intention to deal with the problem of escalating workers compensation premiums. Now, the Minister of Labour will not even give any commitment to proceed with the legislation, let alone any priority to it. Instead, the Minister is trying to stir up division between employees and employers. He has made some reckless statements about South Australia's work safety record. By selective quoting, he has painted a false and frightening picture. But what he has failed to mention is that industrial accidents and diseases have dropped by 20 per cent in South Australia in the past four years.

By far the majority of employers adopt a responsible attitude to worker safety. It is quite clearly senseless to do otherwise. Yet to listen to the Minister would give the impression of mayhem in the South Australian workplace. Nothing is more likely to turn business away from South Australia than is the current attitude of the Minister of Labour. He is quite simply, quite blatantly anti-business and pro-union. I suppose he makes no apology for that fact whenever he meets employers or employees. We well know what he said on the steps of Parliament House in relation to the industrial safety, health and welfare legislation.

He is interested only in confrontation to serve the ends of the left wing union officials he represents in the Cabinet, in the Caucus and in this House. He claims to possess a monopoly of moral integrity and to be morally unassailable in his belief that what he knows is best. Anyone who disagrees with him is abused as uncaring and uninterested in the safety and welfare of workers. His assumption of moral superiority disguises an abiding determination to pull the Labor Party as far left as he can.

In the position he holds, and with the freedom he is obviously given by the Premier, he is a danger to the future economic well-being of South Australia. Let that not be misunderstood. The extent to which, through him, key union officials run this Government is shown not only by the Government's attitude to workers compensation and industrial safety but also its attitude to sales of uranium to France, its failure to tackle work practices in the STA which

are contributing to its escalating deficit, its 'softly softly' approach to problems at SAMCOR, and its dithering and delay on proposals to privatise AMDEL. The Government's failure to give a lead, its surrender to union influence, is now showing up in business confidence.

The ABS has just released its latest figures on private new capital expenditure. They show that this financial year private new capital expenditure in South Australia is expected to fall by 2.1 per cent on last financial year. This State is the only one to record a drop. This trend is also shown in foreign investment figures. On the latest figures, South Australia has only about 1 per cent of current foreign investment in Australia. And already this investment drought is being reflected in the work force. Not only the 7 000 that we added to the unemployment queues last month, but South Australia's unemployment rate rose to 9.5 per cent—the highest of all the States. Over the last year, the number of jobless in South Australia has increased by 13.2 per cent compared with the national growth of 8.4 per cent. Our current teenage unemployment rate of 26.5 per cent is the highest of all the States. The latest ANZ jobs advertisement series shows a decline of 31 per cent in the number of job vacancies in South Australia over the past year—almost three times the national decline.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** What did the Premier say—'Trust me'?

**Mr OLSEN:** 'Trust me,' yes. When the latest unemployment figures came out, we increased the unemployment queue by 7 000 but he said, 'That is not a problem: look at the number of people who have a job.' Really, what he is doing is trying to sweep the problem under the carpet, rubbing salt into the wound. One had to chuckle when reading 'The Premier's Dream for South Australia'. As reported in the *Sunday Mail*, one of his dreams was that he wanted to have full employment. Everybody wants to have full employment, but this Premier is presiding over quite the opposite. He is presiding over a great decline in employment prospects and opportunities for South Australians, particularly young South Australians. We added 7 000 to the unemployment queue and we will have school leavers on the job market in a few weeks time. What will happen to the unemployment figures in South Australia at the start of the new year? Clearly, it is something of national concern and something of quite serious concern to South Australia that we lead this national economic decline.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Sounds like a no answer, no trust Premier.

**Mr OLSEN:** We got that today on the painters and dockers, for example. When you do not have an answer to a problem, you say, 'You should not raise that, because you might put the sub project at risk.' The Ship Painters and Dockers Union has absolutely nothing to do with the sub project in South Australia—nothing.

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It has not, and you know it has not.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** I can understand that members opposite do not like a little of the home truth, especially the member for Florey. They are presiding over a great decline in South Australia's economic position that will hurt a lot of South Australians in the future, in addition to those already hurt.

In other key indicators, retail sales growth in South Australia on an annual basis is only about half the national average; motor vehicle registrations are at their lowest level for 14 years (August registrations were 20 per cent down on August 1985 compared with the national slump of 14 per cent); new dwelling approvals for August were down 33 per cent in South Australia—again, above the national aver-

age. The reality is that, despite a more favourable international economic climate, despite being spared a rural drought, despite the ongoing benefits of the 1983 wage pause, Labor over the past three years has not been able to establish a basis for sustained economic recovery nationally, and in South Australia we are leading the decline. Just as the nation is leaderless and directionless under Mr Hawke, so is South Australia under this Government. The opportunities are there, but the uncertainty, the instability, and the paralysis of will at Government level mean that they are not being taken up.

The most alarming aspect of Labor's administration has been the build-up in the current account deficit. In 1981, our overseas debt was 12 per cent of GDP. It is now 40 per cent. It may reach \$100 billion within the next 12 months. Talk about mortgaging our kids' future! They will be paying the penalty for decades to come. The interest bill alone is \$5.5 billion: 17 per cent, or almost one in five of our dollar earnings from exports, is needed just to pay the interest on our import bill. It is this point to which the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has drawn the Premier's attention. The chamber is concerned about the \$100 million loan under the deferred annuities scheme on the basis that \$325 million must be repaid in 1992-93. To quote the chamber: 'You are mortgaging the future of South Australia. You are mortgaging the future of our kids in South Australia.'

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Do you think that the Premier understands the whole thing?

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, but he is trying to buy time, popularity and favour in the interim. The Opposition well understood the deferred annuities scheme. The Federal Treasurer dropped the boom on that as soon as it was raised because, as presented, the scheme was not honourable as it had a tax avoidance component—and that from a Labor Government that is supposed to be lilywhite. So much for being lilywhite in terms of offering deferred annuities!

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Was it a conspiracy?

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, because we saw three Labor Governments join forces to cook up the scheme.

**Mr Lewis:** From the greatest Treasurer on earth!

**Mr OLSEN:** The Federal Treasurer is no longer the greatest Treasurer on earth. He has been downgraded below the Third World countries. It would be one thing if the build-up of debt had been caused by overseas investment being channelled into enhancing the productive capacity of our economy. However, in the main it has been accumulated in borrowings to allow us to go on importing beyond our means, and beyond our earnings from exports.

While the situation must be turned around and while net exports must increase, the circumstances simply are not being created which will restore confidence and which will encourage the development of more import substituting and export oriented activities. The official figures speak for themselves—especially, unfortunately, so far as South Australia is concerned. The remedies are as clear as they are urgent: a tighter wages policy; a tighter fiscal policy; and a much simpler, more efficient, tax structure. Yet where does this Government stand on these fundamental issues? Its record on wages is simply defined: support everything the unions demand. It has done this in successive national wage cases.

On fiscal policy, State Government spending will increase again in real terms this financial year. It has gone up by more than 60 per cent—by double the inflation rate, since this Government came to office. On tax, this Government is an unashamed supporter of the fringe benefits tax, the capital gains tax, the assets test, as well as being the per-

petrator of the biggest State tax grab in South Australia's history, and it just closes its eyes to the alternatives: labour market deregulation, reducing Government spending through improving efficiency and reducing Government involvement in activities already being provided by the private sector.

In this last respect, last week it was revealed that EPAC—the body whose membership includes the Premier—has prepared a report recommending that Government enterprises like the State electricity authorities should be opened to private competition. It will be interesting to hear what the Premier thinks about that. He spent all the election year whipping up a scare campaign about this sort of proposal—typically parroting union opposition. Yet now it is being put forward by a body he has been pleased in the past to be associated with.

The Government has fiddled with AMDEL. I suppose that it could be said that it is still fiddling with AMDEL. It has moved at long last on the STA Roadliner, despite criticising the Liberal Party's policy for three years on the STA charter bus operation. Instead of proceeding in this piecemeal, timid way, the Government should immediately set up an Instrumentalities Review Committee which should comprise representatives from the Public Service and the private sector. It should be given very strict terms of reference and a time limit to review the role of all Government activities and operations of the State's 480 statutory authorities. Its yardsticks must be basic: consumer needs, consumer benefit. They are the only yardsticks.

This Government must take action, must show a firm positive hand, and must break the shackles of union control. If it does not, South Australia will fall even further behind the other States in the race that really counts. Unless this Government is prepared to pick up that message and recognise that we are on an economic slide and that we need a change of economic direction, far more South Australians will be hurt in future.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** During the Estimates Committees stage, I attended on most days as an observer. Although I believe that much information was gleaned from those committees, I am concerned at the deterioration of the committee system and at the lack of effectiveness of the 13 sessions of the exercise. Although I do not reflect on any member or on any committee, I believe that this House should seriously consider the effectiveness of the Estimates Committees because their intention when they were set up six or seven years ago is being lost, albeit not completely, but many members have expressed concern and disquiet about the effectiveness of those committees.

I suggest that the practice of considering the estimates in committees be reviewed. I must admit that I cannot suggest an alternative at present, but time limits on questions and answers might make the committee system more effective. Indeed, often when a question that was asked had a remote relevance to a prepared reply, the committee was subjected to the full length of that reply although most of it was not directly relevant to the question. I consider that that objection needs to be raised.

I used the opportunity to raise certain matters, especially the maternity and obstetric services in country areas. This issue has often been raised previously, but at present it is the subject of debate and public responses to the Health Commission. As I see it, the problem is that the Health Commission has circulated a proposal from which it could be inferred that country hospitals will be closed where there are fewer than 50 maternity cases a year. I have read the discussion paper at some length and, although I accept that



that paper in the main reflects what has been happening for 20 years or more. I believe that the paper causes concern because, if the Government acted in accordance with its contents, many country hospitals could be effectively closed or the maternity and obstetric services could be removed from certain hospitals.

The real concern flowing from the possible loss of obstetric services at a country hospital involves the probable inability to attract general practitioners to the area. Also, once one of the services of the hospital is taken away, eventually the hospital will be closed, not necessarily because of the loss of obstetrics but because a series of events could occur to lead to a hospital ultimately being unable to attract a doctor to the area.

I cannot say much more than that, but I express my concern at the possibility of certain hospitals being closed. I admit that there is room for rationalisation, but such rationalisation should not be at the expense of the health care of any citizens of the State, regardless of where they live.

The other issue that I wish to raise is the Government's proposal to introduce Eastern Standard Time. Since I last spoke in this Chamber, there have been many developments that should be brought to the attention of the House. Last Thursday the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln sponsored a public meeting to which it invited the Leaders of all political Parties. They had hoped to present to a Government member a lengthy petition but, regrettably, all Parties—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that we are dealing with the budget estimates papers, and his remarks should refer to that matter. The question of Eastern Standard Time is not related to the budget papers. The honourable member must connect his remarks to the subject before the House.

**Mr BLACKER:** Thank you, Sir. I appreciate that my remarks may be interpreted in that way and that basically we are talking about the economy of this State and, more particularly, the ability of one section of the State to compete effectively with other sections of the community. I understood that a debate of this kind could relate to wide sweeping areas, and my dilemma is that no portfolio specifically covers the area in question. I can attribute my remarks only to the Treasury or to another portfolio. I am really seeking your advice, Sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am positive that the honourable member will have an opportunity to express his views on the introduction of Eastern Standard Time. I cannot accept the argument put forward by the honourable member that the subject which he is now debating is connected to the budget estimates papers, and I ask him to come back to that matter.

**Mr BLACKER:** Thank you, Sir. I trust that a similar determination will be applied widely. I return to the matter that I raised during the Estimates Committees, that is, maternity and obstetric services, which are the subject of a Government report. I do not wish to reflect, but I believe that in many ways this subject comes into a similar category, because it, too, is the subject of a Government report. There are finances involved under the budget lines of the Health Commission.

I have considered very carefully how the proposals in relation to maternity and obstetric services would affect my district if the report was adopted in totality. I appreciate that, if the obstetric services of all hospitals that handle fewer than 50 maternity cases a year were to be terminated, the obstetric services of 49 hospitals in this State would be closed down. I do not think that anyone in their wildest

dreams would accept that as a reasonable proposition. Further, if it was proposed that the obstetric services of hospitals where there were fewer than 20 deliveries a year be closed down, 13 or 17 hospitals would be involved—I cannot recall the exact number. In any case, that would represent a significant reduction in the health services that are provided to this State.

Most of the hospitals in my area cater for well above 20 deliveries a year. According to the last peri-natal statistics, only one hospital handled fewer than 20 deliveries a year, and that was the Kimba hospital. When one considers the background and the lack of doctors in that area at that time, one sees why the maternity figures in that town were low. Kimba is 90 miles from Whyalla and perhaps even further from the nearest hospital to the west, and it is about 80 kilometres to the nearest hospital to the south. It would be impossible or impractical for the Government even to consider closing a hospital under those circumstances.

The remainder of the hospitals would meet the distance criterion, that is, travelling time of 45 minutes to the nearest maternity service. The only hospitals that could be subject to discussion would be one or other of the Cummins or Tumby Bay duo or one or other of the Cleve or Cowell duo. In either case, if the services at either of those hospitals were reduced, the time limit outlined in the Health Commission's discussion paper could not be complied with. If we took the letter of the law or the letter of the recommendations of the Health Commission, we should be building more hospitals in country areas to ensure that all country people have access to medical facilities within 45 minutes driving time. That is not an unrealistic suggestion. However, I realise that, given the economic difficulties of the time, it would be an impossibility to bring up things of that nature.

Another issue of concern and disquiet that has been raised with me by councils is what is really happening to our road funding. Over a period there has been a gradual reduction in funds. I attended a meeting of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association only the other day and a message came across fairly loud and clear that the Federal Government seems to be opting out of its responsibilities and that, therefore, the State Government is tending to scale down its responsibilities, falling back more and more on local government. Local government has a limited ability to raise the funds required for road construction. Everyone is in a dilemma. What seems to be happening is that 90 to 95 per cent, and in some cases 98 per cent, of roads in the built-up areas are sealed, and people are sitting back and enjoying the situation. However, in many of the district council areas less than 46 per cent of the roads are sealed, and people in those areas cannot share the same enjoyment. They now feel that, because of economic constraints, they are being left out.

While I believe that the Minister of Transport recognises the difficulties, he seems to be able to do less and less about them. Whether he is getting less of the economic cake, I do not know. Perhaps his colleagues could assist me in this case. But, along the line, the expansion of the sealed road program is being considerably reduced. Two main roads in my district are allegedly on the priority listing, and they are the Lock to Elliston road and the Cleve to Kimba road, both of which, if developed at the present rate of construction, will be completed in 22 years. If we take 44 years from our next road construction program and if no other funds are available for other major road construction, obviously the roads in the area will deteriorate beyond recognition.

We cannot continue in this way. We must change the formula system that is causing the problem and get back to a situation where areas of need are considered as priorities. I, probably like every other member, have received a list of

the local government grants available, and I found that metropolitan areas receive millions and millions of dollars, but country areas, where there are vast road networks, receive only a few hundred thousand dollars.

Obviously, a lot of funds in the metropolitan area are going into community and social welfare type programs and not into road construction and that type of work. There is room for a reappraisal of priorities in relation to the allocation of funds because, after all, the right to be able to travel on a serviced road should be available to every citizen in this State. The areas most in need for upgrading of roads are in the producing sector of the State.

I know that one could get into an argument many times about where the wealth of the nation lies. However, let us face facts. Despite the rural crisis that is presently on us we are still the principal export earner, and to that end those export industries need to be serviced. If a large mining or any other corporate venture were to come to the State that could attract anywhere near a fraction of the export income of rural commodities, then this Government or any other Government would bend over backwards to help it. Just look at the mining industries in the north and other areas like that where countless thousands, if not millions, of dollars are brought to the nation: the Government bends over backwards with sealed roads and services, and gives considerable concessions. I am not against those concessions; all I am after is similar treatment for the primary producing sector.

Another area of concern to me is the school development program. A few weeks ago I asked a question of the Minister of Education about the redevelopment of the Wudinna Area School. I have been asked to attend at that school in a few days time to further debate that redevelopment. I am not being critical of the Government of the day, but I guess I am being collectively critical of the last three Governments because there has been promise after promise for the total redevelopment of that school.

Every time an application or approach has been made for upgrading the school or a portion of it those involved have always been put off and told, 'Hang off, because you are in the program for total redevelopment.' That 'put off' attitude has applied for many years and it is getting to the crisis stage. I do not believe this school's program can be put off continuously, as is presently occurring.

I know that it seems wrong to raise an issue that occurred three or four years ago when there was a mouse plague. That school is still basically lined with caneite. One does not need much imagination to know what occurred to that school. The mice would burrow through the caneite, run along the rafters inside, and out through the caneite wherever they chose. It was impossible to have a room in the school that could be mouseproof. The mice were eating the rollers in the gestetners and printing machines. A room could not even be sealed for a sick room and the domestic arts room could not be sealed. The domestic arts building had cupboards which, instead of having handles on them, had scalloped holes where a person put their fingers in and opened the door. Through every one of those mice used to run. During the day they had to put steel wool in all the holes where people opened the doors.

While many patch-up programs have been attempted by the school community, and the general community has bent over backwards to help the school, it is not getting anywhere. To demonstrate the dilemma in the local community, the Minister's reply to the question I asked on 27 August states:

The redevelopment of Wudinna Area School is high on the Western Area's major works priority list. However, this redevelopment is not on the current forward program, because capital

works funds have been almost entirely expended in providing new schools in developing metropolitan areas. Although not programmed for major works in the current program, considerable expenditure has occurred at the Wudinna Area School within the last decade. For example, using the area minor works program in the late 1970s the school was provided with an art and photography complex at a cost of \$40 000.

Earlier this year the administration area of the school was completely upgraded at a cost of \$60 000 from the same funding source. Further, under the Major Works Capital Assistance Scheme, a gymnasium, including three squash courts, was provided at a total cost of \$166 000 in the early 1980s. This work was done in two stages. Stage I expenditure was shared between the school council and the Education Department, with the school council contributing \$15 290 and the Education Department \$36 710. Repayment of the school council loan of \$69 000 was shared by the school council, which repaid \$22 000 and the Education Department, which repaid \$47 000.

Stage II expenditure was shared between the school council and the Education Department, with the school council contributing \$4 000 and the Education Department totally funding the loan of \$41 000. In summary, the Education Department has expended \$224 710 on works at Wudinna Area School during the last decade.

That is not much joy to the people of the area. The areas cited, whilst beneficial, are also enjoyed by most other schools of that size in this State. A request was made for a covered approach to the community library, from one building to another, and they were told that that could not be done. Another example was a simple ramp between two buildings at a similar level, but they were told that that could not be done because of the pending redevelopment of the school.

I am not sure how I can further express the concerns and dismay of the Wudinna community. The former member for Eyre, when Wudinna was in his area, I recall raising this issue a number of times. I have raised it countless times—and, although everyone says that they have sympathy for the school, it seems to be continually put aside.

I have been asked to attend a Jubilee function at the Mount Hill Rural School next weekend. Last night the local media telephoned me to ask whether I knew anything about that school being closed. I am rather concerned at that, because I made inquiries a few months ago about the future of all schools in my electorate (I have something like 27 schools), and I was assured that all schools, to their knowledge, would be treated consistently, even though some of them were uneconomic on a cost per student basis and that, because of the distance involved, it would be necessary for those schools to be maintained.

My concern is that the media raised this matter with me. Obviously somewhere along the line someone has raised that concern or has gone to the media about it. I hope that the Minister will pick up my comments today and give me an assessment of the future of the schools, in particular the small rural schools not only in my electorate but throughout the rest of the State. This Mount Hill school is a considerable distance from any neighbouring school. What I am about to say might go against an earlier ruling but, if we close yet another school, the school bus runs become even longer and the implications of what I was talking about in relation to time zones would be even further compounded.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** With more time for the boys and girls on the bus.

**Mr BLACKER:** The member for Alexandra has raised the matter of children on school buses. It is not reasonable that we should have children on school buses from 7 o'clock in the morning until school starts. However, that is happening now, and I do not want to see a further extension. We should do everything in our power to see that the bus travel time is reduced and not extended. Closure of any school will further increase the travel distance necessary. The problem for schoolchildren travelling long distances on

buses is not so great or severe for secondary students, but when five-year-olds are expected to get on a school bus before the sun is above the horizon for more than 10 weeks of the year in the middle of winter, and with the prospect of that being further compounded, I am indeed concerned for them and for their parents.

The Estimates Committees have been a disappointing exercise, and Parliament did not get as much out of it as it could have. I hope that this House will see fit at least to recognise what is happening with the gradual scaling down in effectiveness of these committees and do something about improving the position.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I support the motion and would urge members to do so and get this subject of Estimates Committees and the conclusion of the budget for 1986-87 out of the way, so that members of this House and another place can get on with some more productive work. For two weeks following 1 October this year, involving seven days and five nights, a number of members were involved with these committees, gaining little if any benefit.

When the Hon. David Tonkin, as Premier of South Australia in 1979, talked about making provision for members to discuss details of the budget at length, it was proposed that estimates made by departmental personnel and specific expenditure associated with their departments be documented in what has become known as the yellow book. It was an enormously expensive exercise back in those days of the Tonkin Government. The exercise has become progressively more expensive over subsequent years, and every member of both Houses now has several of those books, tens of thousands of dollars having been spent on collating and printing that material. Notwithstanding that it has been stated by respective Treasurers over the years that such material is not necessarily accurate but should be used simply as a guide on which to discuss the budget.

Quite apart from the expenditure of collating, printing and distributing that material there is, of course, individual departmental research required to provide the material initially. It is about time that we woke up to ourselves in this place and recognised that the whole procedure is a farce, that it was in those days under the Tonkin Government, and that it has merely provided an opportunity for members, more particularly Ministers, to grandstand and publicly promote themselves and their respective departments.

**Mr Duigan:** Didn't you do that, Ted?

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Of course I did. I took advantage of it whilst Minister of Agriculture for the three financial years following the introduction of the project, and it was a farce then—it was an absolute joke. If we are going to be frank about these procedures and really sort out the wheat from the chaff to determine whether or not the exercise is appropriate, we have to be honest with ourselves and admit that it was one of exploitation, to say the least.

I agree that I was one of those who took the opportunity between 1980 and 1982 to promote my department, its activities and various divisional interests and, indeed, to give a plug or two to the officers of the day or my Party, on a Party political basis, as well as taking some credit for myself. I do not run away from that admission. However, it really does not enhance the public perception of our procedures, nor does it give us any real credit in the long term once we have recognised that it is a waste of time and that we ought to be seriously, in the time we are spending on the subject at the moment, trying to work out a more useful and meaningful method of studying the budget details and questioning the respective Ministers (which is part of our job) upon those details.

It is my view that, immediately after the initial introduction of the Appropriation Bill at budget time, the summary of details tabled by the Premier should be distributed to members; that, for the next couple of weeks or so, we should extend Question Time in this place by an hour each day specifically for the purpose of directing questions on the budget to the Ministers; and that the same privilege should be available to Legislative Council members who are in fact denied any opportunity under the current system to participate.

I repeat that the exercise is a farce when a number of our Ministers are members of the Legislative Council but other members are denied altogether the opportunity of participating in the Estimates Committees. The system precludes those members from questioning their Ministers on the subject at all. We try, in a veiled sort of way, to get around this by appointing the Ministers in question to represent their colleagues, or arranging for a Minister to take on board the questions and pass them on. This procedure further delays the system, and I do not know whether it has any useful purpose. It is certainly no more useful than the arrangements involving questions on notice in both Houses. So, again, why duplicate the system and spend two weeks of sitting time, with the staff and House expenditure as it is and with many weeks prior to that involving thousands of man hours in the various departments preparing that material if it serves no real useful purpose?

For the short time that I address the subject this afternoon I am taking the opportunity to clearly state my attitude on the procedure introduced by David Tonkin for the 1979-80 financial year and continued to date. I would hope that it is the last year that we involve departmental officers and an enormous amount of staff and Parliament House costs which, given the 110 hours that we devoted to this caper, must be five times more than under the previous system (although I admit that that was not the best system, with the whole House participating in the debate and invariably drifting into arguments). I hope it will be the end of this system and that we will seriously consider, if not my proposal of extending Question Time each day for two or three weeks so that, during the extended period, all members can concentrate on questions involving the budget, with all Ministers involved being required to answer the questions and not grandstand or take opportunities to promote themselves personally or politically as has been the case in the past.

If we accept in a bipartisan way the sorts of objectives that I am outlining, then we will continue not only to exercise a fruitless proposal of David Tonkin—God bless him; he did not make too many mistakes, but that was his worst, for sure—but miss the opportunity to get on with the business of the House. Madam Acting Speaker, I appreciate being able to participate. I shorten my address on this occasion from the total time allocated to demonstrate my belief that the Estimates Committees procedure that we adopt in this State Parliament is a gross waste of time and should be disbanded forthwith.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I wish to speak briefly on the same subject as the member for Alexandra, the Estimates Committees. I have never been a supporter of those committees, and I am pleased that the years have proved to most that they are not a success. I belonged to the Government that brought them in, but those around the place knew that I thought it was a method of depriving a lot of members of Parliament of the opportunity to ask questions. To have three members from each side asking questions of a Minister while others wait until the end of

the line being discussed before asking a question is quite ridiculous. I appreciate that when I tried to participate on this occasion I was allowed to do so even before the line was completed, and I thanked the Chairman at the time for that opportunity. No doubt the cost involved in public servants trying to prepare those documents and all the possibilities of questions that might arise, and to have the answers in a printed form in front of the Minister would be astronomical. No doubt many questions that the public servants expect the politicians to ask relating to the operations of the department are never asked.

Regardless of which Party is in government, the Opposition members ask questions to put over a political point of view or to trap a Minister into making a mistake about something in his department, hoping to use it then or later to attack that Minister or the activities of the department. Government members, in the main, ask questions to make sure that the Minister can give a long answer, using as much time as possible to shorten the opportunity for questions from the Opposition. That is the game. It is nothing more than a stage for people to get over their political points. I did it this year on the Housing Trust issue. I have no qualms about that, because I wished to debate it at a later stage. So, why not go to the method suggested by the member for Alexandra or revert to the old method where the whole Parliament was here? Even if a member did not ask a question, he or she could hear what was happening.

No-one in their right mind would sit down to read the pages and pages of *Hansard* that the employees have arduously taken down and transcribed, and the Printer has produced, to pick up a few points, most of which are Party political garbage on philosophy. We have other places to do that: in the local papers in our electorates, and through financial members or supporters who would distribute that sort of propaganda in our electorate.

We should receive a true indication of what it costs to produce those books and the public servants' time involved, having them sitting here when often no questions directly relate to their area, so they sit there all day wondering what a boring place this is. The cost of that would most probably build a child-care centre in my electorate or in another electorate each year, cover the cost of a couple of kilometres of road, or give some more money to the women's shelters, or whatever. It is money straight down the drain.

So, I think that we should in all honesty say, in relation to that part of the parliamentary process that we have experimented with, that it is a waste of time, we should get rid of it, and get back to what we had or some modification, as suggested by the member for Alexandra. Anybody in their right mind would know that what we are saying is the truth. We have a responsibility to save wastage, and that is one of the wicked wastes that takes place in Parliament. It tends to develop an attitude of mind amongst backbenchers on both sides, or those who happen to be Independents or in minority Parties, to say, 'What is the hope? I cannot really participate very well because I have to sit there for hours before I can ask a question.' So, they sit like stunned mullets until an opportunity arises. Quite often the sort of questioning does not relate to anything they want to follow through that may be of particular interest to them or their electorate, so I strongly say that we should get rid of the system.

The matter of Eastern Standard Time has had a lot of promotion. I believe that we should take the opportunity to express a view before the matter hits the House in a Bill proposal form. I do not support it. I believe that society has changed in the area of communication in recent years, and has changed dramatically. The vast majority of busi-

nesses are not interested in having a time change because nowadays, with the types of telephones that we have, one can dial a number and it will keep ringing—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler):** I would like to draw the honourable member's attention to the need to direct his remarks to the estimates before the House.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I direct my remarks to the Premier's line, if you wish, because on 17 September this year, in answer to a question from the member for Flinders on daylight saving, the Hon. D.J. Hopgood (Deputy Premier) replied:

I will certainly have to reject the suggestion in the last part of the honourable member's question. He is correct in saying that the Green Triangle Committee does not contain a majority of business interests from this State. I would have to obtain detail as to the labelling of any letters, requests or information as to who contacted the Government. The honourable member will be aware that the task given to a couple of officers in the Premier's Department to round up this matter following the amendment passed by Parliament last year on the possibility of splitting the State into time zones, is one that occupied some time, and many approaches were made by various individuals, I shall have to get that information for the honourable member.

It is obvious that the Premier's Department is employing people who are preparing submissions and reports to the Premier on this subject. It is obvious, also, that the Premier's Department and others are preparing press statements for the news media, and that those people are being paid out of the Premier's line.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Speaker has already ruled this afternoon that discussion on that subject is not within the scope of the estimates. I therefore ask the honourable member to come to comments on the estimates.

**Mr OSWALD:** On a point of order, the honourable member has put forward much information that was not put before the Chair previously in support of his reasons for being allowed to bring this matter forward. I ask you, Madam Acting Speaker, when making your decision, to consider the new evidence that has been put forward.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** To the extent that the member for Davenport links his remarks to the Appropriation Bill, he will be allowed to proceed. However, if he strays to the general policy issue of daylight saving, the Chair will bring him to order.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Thank you for your ruling. The question was asked by the member for Flinders on 17 September 1986, which is in this financial year, and the budget that has been brought down operates from 1 July 1986 to 30 June 1987. So, this matter concerns expenditure in the Premier's Department during that period, especially where people are collating material in relation to splitting the State into two time zones and going to Eastern Standard Time. I therefore submit that this matter is relevant to the budget. These two people are still employed, so far as I know (we have not been told differently), in putting together material that can be used in the future to support a Government change to the present situation.

I submit that the evidence available to the community and given to the Premier's Department must be considered in the light of today's improved methods of communication, which include teleprinters and telephones. Indeed, business has no longer the same desire as it had in the past. If it is said that because that is too general I cannot raise the subject here, I ask that later, when you, Madam Acting Speaker, leave the Chair, you read previous debates on the budget and you will find that opportunity has been given to talk in very general terms. I have been specific and submit that what you have tried to rule is a complete change from previous practice.

So, I oppose strongly the change to EST and I believe that we are wasting the money of the Premier's Department and the State by going on with that report and employing people in that way. We should be telling the Premier through this committee to stop wasting the State's money by employing these people more usefully on something wanted by most of the people of this State and not on something that would disadvantage people as regards their quality of life and the health of some young people. I ask that this waste in the Premier's Department expenditure be eliminated, and I believe that I can rightly make that request in this debate. However, seeing that you have some concern, Madam Acting Speaker, as a result of a previous ruling by another person that I should not go too far, I will leave this matter.

I wish to talk briefly about a notice of motion on a subject that is not yet before the House because I have not moved the motion. In relation to study tours, some people seem a little excited because I am moving that study tour reports submitted by members of Parliament should be tabled in Parliament and be available within the Parliamentary Library. In this regard, this matter relates to the Parliamentary Library, which is included in the budget lines.

If members do not like the way in which the press has treated them—and I think the press has treated them irresponsibly and unfairly at times—all they should do is report where they went and what they looked at and give the rest of their report in a speech to Parliament on an appropriate occasion. There is no rule that requires a detailed report to be submitted: it is up to the individual. A member merely has to indicate in a written report the places visited, the projects inspected, and the reasons therefor, and then it is up to the member's own judgment to report the rest in a speech to Parliament. That will be my line of attack later and I hope that members, in using up parliamentary time, will show the media that it is not in the best interest to denigrate members who happen to put some trivial things into a comprehensive report, because that has happened recently and in the past.

My report in 1976 comprised 64 pages and took much time to compile. I do not think that the press reported one line of it. Of course, that may have shown that, in the judgment of the press, there was nothing worth reporting. In those days it was the practice to table a full report, but today the rules are not the same. Members need not submit a detailed report in writing. They may just indicate what they have to and then give the House a more comprehensive account at an appropriate time when it will be reported more fairly by the press.

Last Sunday, a press report indicated that Mr Edwards had said that there was a crisis in Housing Trust rental accommodation. In fact, he is reported as saying that some South Australian people are living in sheds. Because it is difficult in private members' time to be sure when one can debate a specific subject, I take this opportunity of saying to the Minister of Housing and Construction, to Mr Edwards, and to his organisation, that there is no justification for anyone saying, as the Minister himself said in this Chamber during the Estimates Committees, that the Housing Trust should not become a welfare agency and have 56 000 welfare families living in trust housing, because that is not what the trust is all about.

If, as the Minister suggested, 39 000 families are waiting for trust rental homes, we have about three-quarters as many people on the waiting list as there are in trust rental homes. What justification has the Minister or Mr Edwards for saying that we should not say to tenants of Housing Trust rental homes who are on high incomes, 'You can buy the home in which you live, enjoying credit for the improve-

ments that you have made, or you can pay the full market value for your home, or, if you do not wish to do either of those, you can rent a house in the private sector and pay for it yourself'.

I admit that such a policy could not be introduced overnight, but the conditions should be laid down and such people given time to reorganise their lifestyle. Some people living in trust rental homes pay \$25 000 a year in tax while running a business, own a boat or a caravan, or even own another home, although, the rule is that no Housing Trust rental tenant can own a house or shack unless his or her work has taken the tenant away temporarily from the location of his or her own home. The tenant can live in a three bedroom Housing Trust rental home for \$74 a week, which the Minister and Mr Edwards claim is market rental.

Yesterday, on the Philip Satchell radio show, this matter was clarified. Mr Edwards said it was not market rent. He said that that was the rent that the trust must collect to cover its costs, but he did not tell the public that the trust's costs are subsidised because Commonwealth Government money, taxpayers' money, is made available at concessional rates of interest for welfare housing. When we think about that, we see that it is not market rent—it is recovery cost rent for the Housing Trust. It is now said that it does not matter what one earns: one can buy a house while still receiving that concession from the Housing Trust. A person can rent his house to someone else at \$120 or \$130 a week—the private market rent for a lot of houses in the community—while the taxpayer is subsidising that person in a Government home. Or a person can own a holiday shack, use it himself, and hire it out now and again to his friends to recoup a few bob.

The practice must change. I do not say that people should be kicked out or be told to move on, but we should lay down the rules so that they know that they must have a sense of responsibility. I know of people who live in a trust home: one is a community welfare officer earning \$40 000 a year, and another is a lecturer earning \$45 000, and they pay \$74 a week rent. What a joke! There are 39 000 people waiting for welfare housing. Where is the justice in the philosophy of socialism that we want to look after the disadvantaged? It is not there, and we know it. The Minister said during the Estimates Committees, 'Give us names and we will follow them up.' I could tell him the names of people I know who have told people to their face that they should not be living in those houses. We could give the Minister their names, but others get away with it. If we do not do something by 1990, Parliament will be asking for a royal commission into the exploitation of public funds that go into the Housing Trust. I know that it is difficult for political Parties to handle this issue. All of us along the line rely on Housing Trust tenants for support.

In Italy, people refuse to pay the rent for public housing, and no-one will make them pay because, if they did, members would not win elections—there are too many voters involved. That is the situation we are facing at present. There are a substantial number of Housing Trust houses in the swinging seats, but everyone runs away, through lack of intestinal fortitude, from challenging the problem. We must be fair to those who are socially disadvantaged and are on the welfare line: they should be helped. But then Mr Edwards tells us that people are living in sheds. Of course they are—while other people own a house when they live in luxury in a Housing Trust home.

Finally, I am amazed that we have heard nothing from the Minister of Transport about what is happening to the Coromandel Valley transport corridor. There have been public meetings, it took five years to prepare the plan and

come up with suggested routes, and we were told that it would be six months before a decision was made. We wait and we wait, but there is no decision—absolutely none. One must ask the Minister of Transport, 'When will we hear about the Coromandel Valley transport study?' I can be as silent as the Minister, but people want to hear something. They want to know when the project will commence and, in particular, which of the three options will be taken up. That is the difficult question for the Minister. Are we to do what seems to be the logical thing and adopt parts of the three routes, splitting up the traffic and tackling the issue in a sensible way so that it is not all poured into the one funnel? The community would accept that, I think, if the Minister wants a guideline.

I refer now to Old Belair Road, probably the worst road in metropolitan Adelaide: it was so bad that it was safe, because it was narrow and rough. On behalf of the community in the Hills and those who travel to the Hills, I commend the Highways Department for what it has done on Old Belair Road and James Road: that work is to the department's credit. It would have cost a lot of money, but people in the Hills appreciate that guard rails were constructed on both roads, although I believe that that was not originally proposed for James Road. The surface is excellent. The people in one or two private homes have been disadvantaged in relation to entrances, but we have tried to fight their cause.

The road is now very good, but it is the same old story: more people use that road, so it is not now adequate. Traffic builds up for 1½ kilometres in the mornings from the Mitcham cemetery roundabout to the main road through Belair and Blackwood. I ask the Minister to start considering alternatives to increase the capacity of traffic flow on either that road or another. One suggestion would be to make the top end of Old Belair Road a down track, construct a new section of down track to the south of the bottom section of Old Belair Road and use the existing section of Old Belair Road as an up track, with James Road as the other part of the up track, so that there are two lanes up and two lanes down. I ask the Minister to consider the situation now, because I realise that it would take 10 years of planning before such a project reached the top of the priority list. This must be done.

What is more important is to construct the connecting link from Old Belair Road to Fullarton Road to accommodate traffic coming down Fullarton Road to the eastern suburbs. The section through Brownhill Creek is causing a lot of congestion, as well as the roundabout (which is nearly as big as Kangaroo Island) alongside the Mitcham cemetery on Blythwood Road. I hope that the Minister will consider that proposition and determine whether congestion can be reduced.

A report on Upper Sturt Road has been prepared. The Minister has informed me that there is a difficulty, that part of Upper Sturt Road travels through Belair National Park (as most people know it) and part of that park is on the road reserve. If the situation is to be corrected, as a national Government reserve is involved, a motion will have to come before the Parliament to correct the boundaries if the report is accepted. I think that the Minister is a little sensitive about that: he is frightened about the environmental argument. I do not believe that the family of the lady who was killed a bit further up the track recently by a tree falling on her car would be too sympathetic to the existing situation.

I hope that the Minister can make the report available quickly. I believe that most people in the Hills see the necessity for the road to be upgraded to some degree to

ensure safety for those who catch STA buses, but more particularly to give STA drivers and the bigger truck operators a reasonable chance of avoiding serious problems on such a narrow road to the detriment of other motorists who travel in lighter and faster vehicles. I ask the Minister to speed up that report: the community would appreciate it.

Last but not least I want to say that I have not referred to the monetary position of the State. We all know that the Commonwealth Government is in such a position that, for every dollar it borrows, it pays 70c in interest on previous debts. The State is in a similar position. We have borrowed to the hilt, and we hope that our grandchildren will pay for it. We do not really give a damn what happens in the long term. It is a matter of political survival: spend what you get and hope that your kids will work hard enough or find a way to solve the situation. The same applies to some local government areas—it is as cold and hard as that. We no longer worry about tomorrow. It is a matter of saying, 'Just let us spend it. The poor suckers of the future might pay, but at least we stay in Parliament, and they will still vote for us because we are giving them the things they want and promising the things they want next year. The debt does not matter.' That is a poor attitude, but it is the attitude that prevails in most of the Parliaments throughout Australia, and quite often in local government.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** My views are not quite those of the member for Flinders, who expressed some concern, as did the member for Fisher, about the value of the Estimates Committees.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am sorry; I meant the member for Davenport. Some of us have been here for quite a while and old habits are hard to break. The member for Davenport expressed concern about the operation of these committees. The previous arrangements in my view were totally unsatisfactory. I recall on one occasion a Minister answering all questions, getting sick of it after a couple of hours and standing up and saying that he would get a report. The whole thing was a farce. At least under the present arrangement members have a chance to obtain information and ask further questions. It may be tiresome, a little boring at times, and it may be annoying to certain Government officials. However, it is part of the democratic process. They should be called before the Parliament for accountability and, even though it is time consuming for some of us, that should not be a reason for dispensing with the system. If the system can be improved, we should consider that.

I am of the view that we should not in any way diminish the rights of members to question the Government and its advisers and officers who, in many cases, carry out the policy and spend the money. If there is a hiccup let us look at it sensibly and rationally, and improve the system. But, for goodness sake do not talk about doing away with the system which, in my view, is a great improvement. It gives the shadow Minister an opportunity to put a Minister on the spot if he does not do his homework. It is ridiculous for Ministers to turn up with 30 or 40 public servants. That is not necessary, and I do not know whether or not it is done for prestige—one Minister outdoing his colleagues.

However, I believe that the present system is essential. If there are problems with members from minor Parties and Independents not getting on the committees, we should look at it sensibly. One suggestion that comes to mind is that some questions could be put on notice a fortnight before so that committee members could ask supplementary questions. There may be many others. It is important that Ministers are subject to proper cross-examination in relation to the operation of their departments.



I know that some of the officers did not like being cross-examined. I think the Valuer-General did not enjoy his period before the committee, but he asked for it. He ought to have known what would be involved because of the high valuations that his departmental officers have been inflicting on the people of this State. He should have known that that would be the subject of continued debate before the Estimates Committees. I am of the view that the Valuation Department has put far too high values on land and that those valuations are quite ridiculous. There has been a fall in rural land prices across South Australia, and that should be reflected in the valuations. The member for Chaffey, when Minister of Lands, brought in a system that took into account the real value of land. The problems that the department is presently having are of its own making. When the system is fully computerised, these problems and anomalies will not exist.

As we are about to celebrate South Australia's second Grand Prix, I should like to say that my constituents are again having problems in gaining access to this televised event. Last year I went to the ABC, Channel 9, the Grand Prix Board and the Premier, and it looks as though the exercise will have to be repeated. They are slow learners. Telephone calls were made to Sydney and Adelaide; it was a real round robin exercise. I had a real run-around when one switch at Ceduna has merely to be pushed so that those people can see the Grand Prix. This telecast goes overseas from Ceduna and interstate, but those people will be denied it because Channel 9 does not want to do it, the ABC cannot organise itself, the Grand Prix Board has been difficult and the Government does not appear to understand or want to know about it.

It is all right for members to laugh. All that has to be done is for someone to push a switch so that this race can be seen by all those people. But, in its wonderful way, the bureaucracy will not agree to it. I received the following telegram about this from the Chairman of the Ceduna and Districts Business Association, which states:

Ceduna Business Association urgently requests your investigation of non-coverage of Grand Prix for Ceduna area on television.

It is technically possible to have coverage through Telecom's 'Kongwirra' repeater station as transmission to Western Australia and rest of world passes through Ceduna. Coverage from this source was organised last year.

It is ludicrous that, whilst millions of people overseas can watch this event, people in own State unable to view this prestigious event.

Approaches to ABC-TV Channel 9 and Grand Prix office so far have proved fruitless; therefore urge your intervention on this matter.

*Mr Peterson interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** That is right. The same also applies to people living at Leigh Creek. They were told that the ABC could not have it relayed through the satellite, and that the people could not see it. Last year it was arranged after a tremendous fight. As the member for Semaphore rightly points out, those people have helped to guarantee and fund this with their taxes. Millions of people overseas can see it, yet the highly taxed South Australian community will again be denied this telecast because of bureaucracy and red tape. I call on the Premier to get on to the Grand Prix Board and all the other people with their fingers in the pie to fix it once and for all.

Every time that a major sporting event occurs in this State—whether it be the Test cricket or the Melbourne Cup—I have to do the round robin with Channel 9 and the ABC. It is about time that commonsense prevailed and that the nonsensical answers which I received from the ABC, which said that technically it could not do it, and Channel 9, which told me that it did not mind if it went through,

were put to an end when, at the end of the day, all that one must do at Ceduna is push a switch. On one occasion some years ago a switch was pushed and they received a telecast of the Test cricket for a few hours before the South Australian Cricket Association woke up to what was happening. It took the intervention of the Leader of the Opposition, Dr Tonkin, to calm the waters and solve that problem.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I interrupt the member here. I can understand the relationship of the Grand Prix to his electorate because of the expenditure in the budget. However, referring to the Test cricket is stretching things a little too far.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask members of the House to hear this in silence, or I will have to start naming people. I ask the member for Eyre to come back to the budget papers and link his remarks up with them.

**Mr GUNN:** I would not want in any way to interfere with your rulings or cause you any concerns, Mr Deputy Speaker, as I am concerned only with the welfare of my constituents. I do not like having to raise these matters, but I have no alternative. Around the city of Adelaide we see bunting flying. The streets are blocked off and everyone is patting one another on the back, saying 'What a great job we are doing with the Grand Prix.' However, my constituents once again have been left out on a limb.

This budget has about \$3 700 million being spent and my constituents are getting very little out of it. It contains little for people in isolated communities. This is yet another example of 'out of sight, out of mind'. The people who are supplying the coal to generate the electricity to help organise this Grand Prix cannot get this telecast, nor can a number of other people in my electorate. I therefore call on the Premier to take some firm action to solve this problem in my electorate.

I now refer to one or two other matters that are causing me concern. Unfortunately, a high priority is not placed on money for country roads. In my electorate many roads urgently need repairing and upgrading. Over the years the Highways Department, with the limited funds that are available to it, carry out a program of upgrading and maintaining the Strzelecki Track. As I understand the situation, the Highways Department's northern office has, because of budget restraints, had to reduce the size of the gang that maintains and keeps that road in reasonable repair.

I have been advised that during the last school holidays in the Eastern States 250 cars a day used that road. Many heavy vehicles are on it every day. If the gang is reduced by four persons they will only be able to fill the potholes. It is all very well for us to spend millions of dollars on such projects as the O-Bahn, yet we do not have money to put into the areas to which I refer. Many cattle come out of that country, and there is about to be a large program of exploration in that part of the State.

We must find vast quantities of gas if we are to continue to meet our obligations. If that exploration work is to take place, we have to be able to get the transport up to that part of the State. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Transport will look at the situation and take some action to ensure that those Highways Department employees in that part of the State are not reduced to the level where they cannot continue to adequately maintain that important part of the South Australian network.

For many years I have been complaining in this House about the high cost of education for people who live in isolated parts of the State. Unfortunately, Governments have taken little notice of what I have had to say. This budget highlights the urgent need to have those decisions



redressed. As well as complaining about the lack of adequate money for isolated children, I have in recent times during my visits around my electorate been concerned at feelings that have been expressed to me by parents and people involved in kindergartens and preschools about the Children's Services Commission, which was one of the pacesetting arrangements of the first Bannon Government—brought into this Parliament with great gusto. Strong warnings were given about how efficient it would be and about the manner in which it would affect this section of education. Those warnings were given by the then member for Torrens, Michael Wilson. Every warning and comment that he gave and made at that time has now come true. It is a pity that the then Minister (Hon. Lynn Arnold) did not take heed of that sound advice. There were real concerns about the administration and about the people who had been appointed to service these facilities.

I gave an example some weeks ago in the House of problems at the Murat Bay preschool, where the person who was coming to check the teachers and the people running the preschool was not qualified; she was a nursing sister. That sort of operation points to deficiencies in administration. The problems that we have had in getting clear and precise dates for the commencement of work to improve that facility at Leigh Creek leaves a lot to be desired. It is about time that the Government addressed these problems, because the staff and parents are very concerned: they are concerned that they will no longer be part of the education system. Under the previous arrangements, when this was administered by the Kindergarten Union, they were regarded as part of the education system. Attempts have now been made to isolate that system.

Preschools that were previously part of the Education Department have been able to maintain their association as part of the Education Department. If the Minister is concerned to ensure that the right thing is done with these teachers in order to maintain the good staff in the section, the Government had better quickly redress these problems. From information I have received there is great dissatisfaction with the staff and a likelihood that they will lose a number of people from that part of the Education Department. That would be unfortunate.

I have not yet heard from the Minister whether he has rejected the expressions of concern that were made some months ago in the South Australian Institute of Teachers magazine about the location of the new Roxby Downs school. I sincerely hope that there will not be any delays in the construction of that school because of irresponsible comments made by the radical left wing of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. While I am talking about the project, which was once described by the Premier as a mirage in the desert, I would like to say that it was interesting to listen to the Premier performing in the House today, claiming that the Opposition would damage the likely future development investment in this State when he and his colleagues did everything in their power to pour ridicule and scorn on that project.

I wonder, when he goes up there now and sees all the tremendous amount of work taking place, with the McMahon Company constructing all the roads, with the town laid out and the pipeline coming down from the Artesian Basin, whether the Premier will still think that it is a mirage in the desert. When he sees the ramp that will be 1 500 feet underground and that is about to be linked up so that trucks will be able to drive down to the ore body, will he still think that it is a mirage in the desert?

If the Minister and his Minister of Education want to improve the situation, they ought to quickly and construct

a school. About 80 children are being transported to Andamooka and, because the Highways Department used poor material when it resheeted the road, it takes about five points of rain for the road to become like a skating rink. It is unsafe for the school buses, and the parents at Olympic Dam are most concerned that their children recently have not been able to get to school because of the poor condition of the road. It needs urgent resheeting with suitable material.

There is about to be a new school bus put on that road, and once again we have to go through another hardy annual that I have raised in this House on many occasions, namely, the fight to get the school buses airconditioned in these isolated parts. I understand that the new school to be put on that route will not be airconditioned. So, we will have one bus airconditioned and one not. Surely within some of those Government departments there must be an ounce or two of common sense. In that part of the State where small children must be transported long distances twice a day, obviously the buses need to be airconditioned. I hope that the Minister of Education will do something about it, because I believe the complaints of the parents are quite justified and that they are entitled to express their annoyance and concern at again having to bring the matter to the Government's attention.

Previously in this House I have talked about the problems of people in the Flinders Ranges having to put up with instant experts from outside passing judgment on the Flinders Ranges and advising people how they should live and on the sort of operation that they should carry on in that part of the State. My constituents at Hawker who organised a seminar on the future of the Flinders Ranges are still waiting for an adequate reply from the Minister for Environment and Planning, Dr Hopgood, and other Ministers, in relation to his decision to cancel the right of public servants to attend that seminar.

As I am reliably informed, that decision was made because a person with strong Labor Party connections expressed her annoyance at comments made by the Chairman of the District Council of Hawker. It would appear that this individual has more influence than those people who have lived in that part of the State all their lives. I call upon the Minister for Environment and Planning to state publicly why he refused those public servants the right to attend and participate in that seminar, which was a constructive attempt by the people in those areas to come to grips with the problems and answer some of their critics. Unfortunately, that has not taken place.

I would say that the Government, before proceeding with any further plans to implement controls or restrictions in the Flinders Ranges, should first consult at great length with the people who live there, the people who have had to make a living—the people who have grown up there and understand it far better than anyone else based in the metropolitan area, particularly those environment minded people who may be well meaning but rather naive or do not understand the relevant facts, including the fact that some people have to take a certain course of action.

During the Estimates Committees, I raised with both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands a number of matters which affect rural industry in this State. Unfortunately, we were not particularly satisfied with the answers that we received. It would appear that the Government does not place a very high priority on agriculture: it received scant attention in the budget. Some \$53 million was allocated to it, but the Government failed to really demonstrate any strong support for those areas of concern. We have had some discussion in the House today concerning the operations of the wharves and of certain people: I wonder if the

Minister of Marine has had drawn to his attention the following statement which appeared in the *Business Review Weekly* of 8 August:

In the container terminals, this situation has created a 35-hour week with five weeks annual leave, a 27.5 per cent annual leave loading and an unsackable workforce. When you deduct meal breaks, smokos, shower time and walking time, the figure can be reduced to a 27-hour week for waterside workers. Additional pay, stooping money and dirt money comes with doing 'abnormal' or difficult jobs.

That is an amazing situation. The article continues:

But observers from all parts of the waterfront say the unions would not be doing the best for their members if they failed to chase gains that are so readily available. They say the blame must be laid 50-50 on the unions and a management that has always capitulated.

I agree that management has to be prepared to stand up and reject some of these quite irresponsible claims that are made. The article details the actual salaries that some of these people receive. The actual amount of work carried out is quite amazing when one considers that we are attempting to compete with overseas markets which have cheaper labour costs. Surely, commonsense should prevail and we ought to be doing everything possible to keep our costs down. In particular, we do not want unnecessary holdups and we certainly do not want the sort of nonsensical work practices outlined in that article.

There are many other matters which I could bring to the attention of the House on this occasion, such as the lack of provision in this budget for adequate funds to at least deal with some of those uneconomic water schemes currently listed with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I could bring to the attention of the House the urgent need for maintenance in certain of the schools in my electorate—and I understand this is not just a problem that affects my electorate but all electorates in South Australia. I could certainly bring to the attention of the House the need for the National Parks and Wildlife Service to improve its public relations, particularly its attitude to allowing the Country Fire Services to patrol bushfires that break out in the parks.

I could give a lengthy spiel about how the State Government is spending a great deal of its time helping valuers go around valuing schoolteachers' houses for the purposes of the fringe benefits tax. It is unfortunate that this Government has not properly represented the issues of South Australia. It was a party to that tax deal which allowed this situation to come into being. I could go on and relate the unsatisfactory situation currently applying in parts of my electorate where teacher housing costs are out of control, where in some instances teachers occupying small flats have to pay more than is paid for the houses occupied by principals, but I will save those comments for a later occasion.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that the commercial loans scheme, about which the Minister gave some information during the Estimates Committee, operates in an effective manner and that people who wish to avail themselves of these funds are given adequate information and are not merely given the run around. Constituents of mine have complained that, because they live in an area which was not classified as badly affected by drought, they have not been able to participate in the benefits of existing funds. That is a matter that I intend to follow up.

I also sincerely hope that the Government proceeds rapidly with its review of the administration of the Vegetation Clearance Authority. As things currently stand, I would say that that scheme is a complete waste of time, because at least two members of the authority have an absolutely closed mind on future development and do not seem or want to understand that many people have a genuine need

to further develop their property. If the Government of South Australia does not want land to be developed, there is only one alternative, and that will be a very expensive alternative: it will have to pay adequate compensation, and that compensation will have to be based on total market value of the land. Otherwise, that land will have to be developed. In many cases where people have purchased properties or have areas of scrub, because of the downturn in commodity prices they have to increase production to survive, and the authority is displaying an unrealistic attitude.

Whether it is acting under the guise of Government policy or has taken this stance on its own initiative, I am not sure, but I can say to the House, the Minister and the Government that, if they want large tracts of native vegetation to be maintained in South Australia, there is no alternative but to have to supply large amounts of money. I am not talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars: millions of dollars will be involved if the Government wants this land set aside. Therefore, it had better act fairly quickly, and those people who are advocating that farmers should put this land aside had better clearly understand the cost involved in that exercise.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I wish to address myself to the estimates. I will leave the painters and dockers for a later time; it is an issue that will not go away and one on which the Government will not be able to continue to duck and weave, because the matter is too important for South Australia. In the time available, I wish to talk about some of the findings resulting from the committees, and to express some concern about the way the Government is operating on a number of fronts. Obviously, the Government has very little confidence in the Minister of Labour, and this was borne out during the Estimates Committee when the Minister failed to reveal why that part of his portfolio involving employment and training had been taken away from him. As we are all aware, it is an essential part of South Australia's future that the best possible training and staffing facilities are needed to take this State forward.

Therefore, the employment training section is an important component of Government action. There is no doubt why it was taken away from the Minister: not only was the Minister incapable of handling the extra responsibility but also the unions were creating difficulties because of their intervention in the schemes that were operating. The unions have made a mockery of the Commonwealth Employment Program by insisting that participants in the program become union members and then taking them out on strike. These practices have done little for the Commonwealth Employment Program, for its associated training schemes, or for South Australia generally.

It is interesting to note the decreases in certain allocations for the Department of Labour. One decrease of considerable concern involves the limited funding that is now available for the section of the Department of Labour that deals with occupational safety. During the estimates debate, the Minister said that resources had been transferred from one section to another because much of the groundwork connected with the Matthews report had been completed and resources were therefore being transferred. In real terms this year's allocations for occupational safety are not much more than last year's. One item of extreme concern is the reduction from \$107 000 last year to \$100 000 this year in the allocation for the National Safety Council. I am not sure of the Government's motives in this regard, but I do not believe that such a reduction is a positive step in the interests of the council. More importantly, I am concerned about

the grant of \$50 000 for the United Trades Labor Council's worker health centre and, in this respect, we must question the Government's priorities seriously.

**Ms Gayler:** Don't you believe in worker health?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If Government members want a speech on occupational health and safety, they must wait for the debate on the appropriate legislation, and that will not occur this week. That is the Bill that the Government was going to introduce as a matter of high priority, but again we see that priorities have slipped, and I think I know why: the Bill is totally unacceptable to almost everyone out there except militant elements in the trade union movement. The people of South Australia, especially employers, understand that in its current form this Bill will do untold damage to employment prospects in this State. Many employers will say that enough is enough and close their doors because it will not be worthwhile employing people under the terms of the legislation.

The member for Newland asks whether I am interested in worker health. Of course I am interested, but I prefer to call it 'employee health'. I get a little tired of Labor Party dogma about workers, because I believe that we can all classify ourselves as workers in some shape or form. The proper terminology is 'employer' and 'employee', so I ask members opposite please to talk about employer safety and employee safety. Then the Government may do far better in its relations than it has done hitherto.

Not only are the budget allocations in both the capital and recurrent areas limited but also the Minister is not providing extra resources for the training of inspectors. The Matthews report made some valid observations, one of which was that inspectors were inadequately trained for their job. That point was made very forcefully in the report. It was said that many people had joined the inspectorial staff with trade qualifications but had not been able to acquire those skills that are necessary for them not only to go out and inspect equipment but also to advise employers on the best way to operate machinery and manpower in their premises. Yet the Minister said that training would have to take its place in the priority list. Given the limited budget allocation and the lack of training for inspectors, it is quite apparent to me that this Government is not committed to implementing an occupational safety program in this State to the benefit of its citizens. It will abrogate its responsibilities, and it will abrogate them quite severely.

It appears to me that the Government will put in place provisions that have considerable recourse to the law in relation to employers not doing the right thing, but that there will be very little assistance to help employers adjust to the new requirements. It is of great concern to me that the Government is in that 'do as I say, not as I do' mode. No doubt during the debate we will hear more on this subject. I refer now to the estimates that were provided during the Estimates Committees.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask members to lower the level of conversation. It is very hard to hear the honourable member.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I asked the Minister of Labour to provide an estimate of the unemployment rate for 1986-87 and he produced from a number of other documents a document which indicated that, on the estimate of his Labour Market Research Section, the rate would be 8.5 per cent. All I can say is that the Minister should immediately abandon that section, because its sheer incompetence defies description. In March this year I put out a press release indicating that, unless the Federal and State Labor Governments came to grips with the needs of the economy of this nation and this State, we would suffer extreme levels of

unemployment. At the time I said that we were likely to hit 10 per cent unemployment before Christmas. Unfortunately, I will be right. I do not necessarily like to be right when I am talking about young people in this State, but in this case I will be right: unemployment will exceed that figure before Christmas, because the Federal and State Labor Governments see no apparent need to put in place the policies that are necessary to take this State and this nation forward.

We have talked at length in this House about strategies to increase our competitiveness overseas, to indulge in import replacement, and to export our produce. We have heard a number of speeches from members opposite about the future of technology, and I agree with many of the comments made but, unless we get the basics right, we simply will not have the opportunity to provide employment. Members opposite can talk about technology until the cows come home, but the simple fact of life is that we must build on what is already in train here in South Australia. The pay-offs in the system of technology are well down the track.

I commend those who are making the effort to get us out into the wider world, but we must think about today. Today is about our manufacturing section; it is about our tertiary section; it is about getting goods off the wharves and getting ships into and out of Port Adelaide. But, nothing is being done on any of those fronts. Our unemployment level is going through the roof because the policies of the State and Federal Governments are not assisting in any way whatsoever to improve our situation.

The situation will become worse. I attended a seminar organised by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. I do not know who prepared the forecasts, but it was said that 1986-87 would be a year of improvement. It was suggested that the economic downturn would trough in about March next year. Indeed, they are wrong, because the economic downturn will not trough that early. Some of the inadequacies of the economy will simply not adjust.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** How do you know?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** It is a simple matter of deduction. The newspapers tell us that it is too costly to invest, that the fringe benefits tax has taken away any incentive whatsoever to provide what is necessary. The dollar is declining: while it is stable at present, it has done us no real favours, because the pick-up or the J-curve has not taken effect to this stage. There are enormous problems in relation to our consumer price index, which is again on the rise.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** What is your policy on all this?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Our policies have been made quite clear. If members opposite bothered to read the newspapers, they would know that the Federal Liberal policies on elements of deregulation, policies to take this nation forward, have been laid down very carefully. Policies have been laid down in the taxation area: promises have already been made as to what the Liberal Government will implement when it gets into office, and let me assure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member not to respond to interjections but to address the Chair.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Certainly, Sir. Let me assure members opposite that the Leader of the Liberal Party indeed will implement his policies. That is of great concern to the Labor Party and the union movement—and I can understand why members opposite are concerned, because there will be a Liberal Government in Canberra that will be able to show the way to Australia. It is about time, because we simply cannot afford to live off our rural produce as we have in the past. It is important for members opposite to understand

that we can no longer expect our mineral resources and our rural produce to provide our standard of living. It must be the people of this country who provide the standard of living to which they aspire.

For those members who are interested, I point out that, until we get rid of the nefarious work practices in the workplace, until we get rid of the boss/worker syndrome, and until we start to get rid of the intransigence that is being perpetuated by the UTLC and the ACTU on so many important issues, we will continue to see higher levels of unemployment in this country and particularly in this State. If members opposite are quite happy for our young people to have no chance of obtaining a job, let them say so in the public arena. They can all see where unemployment is headed. Nothing that has been put in place by the Federal or State Labor Governments has had any impact on this situation.

**The Hon. T.M. McRae:** Get back to business!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Certainly. Regarding business accounting principles, members opposite should recall that in South Australia, leaving aside the rural sector, there are about 30 000 employers, but on the national scene there are 300 000 employers, 299 999 of whom are totally disillusioned by the policies of the Federal Labor Government. How can we expect employers to have the confidence to invest and to employ people when they have no confidence in the Government that is administering this country?

**The Hon. T.M. McRae:** Try BHP.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Playford suggests, 'Try BHP', but if one looks at its profit record over the past 10 years BHP has had a very limited return on capital.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I know the member is responding to an interjection which is out of order, but the profit levels of BHP need to be connected to the budget papers. We are discussing the budget papers, and I will ask the member for Mitcham to come back to that topic.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I have just been informed that the State Government assists BHP at Whyalla.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Under the indenture we know that BHP actually makes a contribution, but it does not in any way meet the total costs of its operations. We know that BHP has to be assisted in this State because the union movement destroyed the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Fraser Government destroyed the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla.

*Members interjecting*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** That is an amazing statement. The fact is that we could not build ships in Whyalla at three times the cost of importing them. A fair share of the blame lies with the union movement which continues to say that it needs more and wants to work less. Some members opposite have actually been to Whyalla and have talked to BHP officials. Those members would realise that the work practices that were in place at the Whyalla shipyards led to its rapid decline, and that even the steelworks still has practices that should be removed.

**An honourable member:** Like what?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If the honourable member wishes to discuss it with certain members of the unions he will find that about one-third of the work force in the BHP shipworks is being carried by the company.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! This debate is to be conducted in the appropriate manner, and I will not tolerate the interjections that have been going across the Chamber.

The member for Mitcham has the floor. I ask him not to rise to the bait of the interjections, to address the Chair, and to come back to the budget papers.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Thank you, Sir, for your protection. Over a period of time members on both sides of the House have been particularly concerned about problems at the ASER site. We know of problems on other sites around Adelaide, yet again the Government wishes to push them under the carpet. More importantly, the ultimate cost of the ASER project to South Australia and the South Australian Superannuation Fund will be quite extraordinary. The Premier has been remarkably silent about the ultimate cost of the project; indeed, he has wished to evade the question on every occasion this matter has been raised. It is not good enough that we allow the practices that have occurred on this and other sites around Adelaide to continue. They continue only because the Government takes no action on them.

*The Hon. T.M. McRae interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The problems in the building industry are deep-seated. They relate to certain union elements which have been with us for many years, probably back before I was born. I am not aware of how long these practices have continued and it is probably part and parcel of the nature of the industry. However, if any Government gives its imprimatur to union action aimed at disruption, turmoil and for its own specific benefit, to the exclusion of South Australians, then I think that that Government should stand condemned.

The Labor Government here in South Australia must stand condemned for its lack of action. It does no good to say—

**The Hon. T.M. McRae:** What claptrap! If you are aware of crimes, produce evidence. Get on with it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Playford to order. I do not need any assistance, thank you.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The evidence in relation to the building industry has been well documented over a period of time. We had the steel fixers dispute before the public of South Australia; we have had the current problems in the building industry before the public of South Australia. The Minister has waxed long about the virtues of the troubleshooter on the ASER site. During the Estimate Committee hearing last Tuesday week the Minister said what a wonderful job the troubleshooter was doing on that site. However, we found out on Thursday that he had been sacked that afternoon. So, I wonder about the ability of the Government.

**Mr Duigan:** Not sacked.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If he was not sacked, perhaps the member for Adelaide could inform the House what actually happened to that person. If he was doing such a marvellous job of bringing the builders, the subcontractors and the unions together, why indeed was he removed from the site? I can tell members why—it was because the union movement did not want him on that site. As I have said, the problems that have occurred at the ASER site have been well documented. Matters in relation to other sites in Adelaide will come to the public's attention in the near future.

I now wish to refer to the Data Processing Board. During the Estimate Committee hearings, the Minister of State Development and Technology explained that the Data Processing Board had been split into two units, with one part to go to the Office of Government Management in the Premier's Department and the other to go with the Ministry of Technology. Again I ask, what is the wisdom of making that change? Why indeed has it been made? The Data Processing Board, for all its faults, has done a considerable

job at bringing data processing in the State Public Service into a reasonable format, to the extent that all major purchasers of software and hardware have come under its scrutiny. The great strength of the Data Processing Board was that it had not only the expertise available to provide technical information but also the board which could make the decisions. Now, of course, the board has been hived off to the Premier's Department, with the other part of the unit staying with the Ministry of Technology.

Perhaps Government members cannot understand the need for a watchdog role in relation to the purchases of data processing equipment in the State Public Service. However, it has been my observation over a number of years that control is needed, and such control is needed more than ever now. If members opposite went back through documents pertaining to purchases made in the 1970s, they would find that hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars were wasted because of poor purchases being made on behalf of individual departments. Just to mention one: we remember the Flinders Medical Centre fiasco, where not only was the computer equipment inappropriate but also they did not have the expertise to run it, and eventually, of course, all the equipment and personnel had to be changed. There was a case in relation to the Survey Unit at the Department of Lands, from which a person went, I think, to Germany to buy a piece of equipment, which he knew little about. I think at that stage the applicable sum was about \$500 000, and no one could work the machine when it got here. I do not know whether the machine is working today.

**The Hon. R.K. Abbott:** When was that?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** It would probably have been about 1980. So, we do have a number of examples where machines have been bought ill advisedly. I am saying not that people have been incompetent but rather that we need a higher authority so that, when an agent comes to the door and says that he has a machine that can do all these things, that it has got computing power and software packages that can do everything in terms of the payroll, staffing and ongoing processes, we can determine whether the promises made are able to be kept. The Data Processing Board provided a good intermediary in the process in that it had the technical ability to be able to sort out the quality of machines and the product so that some wise investment decisions were made. Certainly under David Tonkin that happened. A number of propositions were put up and rejected on the basis that they could not interlink with other computers or were inappropriate to the needs of the department. Now the Government has seen fit to split off the technical part of that board from the board itself.

One of the great strengths of the Department of Technology when it first came into being was the fact we had a number of skilled individuals who put in an enormous amount of effort to come to grips with some of the applications of high technology in this State. They produced a range of reports, one of the first of which was on scanning. Members opposite may well remember that in Clare the first scanning device was introduced in South Australia. There was considerable uproar and disquiet about the impact that that device would have on retailing here in South Australia. The department did a sterling effort in coming to grips with the new technology and came up with a report which was one of the best produced of its type in this country. It laid the foundation for further use of that machine in an environment where people could understand its capacities and limitations.

They have addressed a number of other areas over time, but I do not wish to mention them, as I have only two

minutes left. However, they had a strong application type of approach to technology. That again has now been lost and we find in the estimates that we have a number of navel gazing exercises that will chew up South Australian resources. These will not produce answers but will simply look at the quantum leaps that must be taken without looking at how we will get there.

We must understand that South Australia has to upgrade continually; otherwise it will be left behind in the process. Also, technology has to be updated and embraced. To take away the expertise that existed within that section is a counter-productive step. With the time available, I cannot sufficiently expand on a number of other matters that I wish to raise.

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

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** In concluding this budget debate as we are, I wish to draw members' attention to one very important factor. If any members on this or the other side of the House have aspirations to the Treasury benches, then they will have to seriously consider this matter over the next few years. I refer to the rapidly increasing state of indebtedness in South Australia. One has only to look at the Attorney-General's papers for the last two decades or at least for the two decades from 1960 to 1980 to realise that the annual increase in indebtedness in South Australia was approximately \$100 million.

Irrespective of which Government was in power, year after year the increase in indebtedness was \$100 million per annum. Over the past three or four years the Premier, each time the budget papers have been handed down, has boasted that he is aiming for a balanced budget. I suggest that most families, if they had access to unlimited borrowings, would be able to make such a claim. One only has to look at what has happened over the past four years to realise that the pattern of borrowing in South Australia has changed quite radically and that the rate has accelerated tremendously. In fact, the increase for the three years preceding this budget was over \$300 million per annum, which is \$1 billion additional debt accumulated by South Australia in the past three years.

I believe that for 1986-87 it is estimated that the increase in the State's indebtedness will be \$450 million which, over the past 4½ years under this Labor Government, gives a total of about \$1.5 billion increase, compared to an increase of about \$100 million per annum for the preceding 20 years from 1960 to 1980. When the Premier was asked about this during the budget debate, he claimed that it was quite all right to increase the extent of the State's indebtedness because, after all, other States were heavily in debt. Bear in mind that South Australia's indebtedness is coupled with the highest unemployment rate in Australia and it is still rising. As the member for Mitcham commented, the chances are that, before Christmas this year when the school leavers will look for work, South Australia's unemployment rate will rise to 10 per cent.

*The Hon. T.M. McRae interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The member for Playford asked for honest business accounting and it was on that basis that I thought here was a Government that was telling us that it had balanced the budget, but it borrowed \$1.5 billion in order to do that. That is something that he ought to think about. I suggest that, because South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment (which is rising steadily) in Australia, the Premier and the Treasury should look seriously at the way in which they are increasing the State's indebtedness and they should do something about diminishing it instead

of pushing it over the top in the way they have been doing. South Australia could be in a worse position, because I understand that at the moment there is an agreement (I do not know whether it is a gentleman's or a written agreement) between the State Governments and the Federal Government with regard to the vexed question of superannuation payments and the accrued debts in relation to that.

In South Australia the Auditor-General said that there is an accrued debt of about \$127 million in the tertiary superannuation field alone. Fortunately, the tertiary superannuation area is covered by the Federal Government. As people retire, the Federal Government picks up the Bill, but I believe that statutorily the South Australian and other State Governments would be responsible. Obviously, this is one reason why the Federal Government would like State Governments to be responsible for tertiary education and that is something that States should resist with all the power that they have. That superannuation question is common these days to almost everything that Governments touch. No matter what one looks at, Governments seem to be running into higher and higher debt instead of trying to work towards balanced budgets.

Even something as small as the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority has a debt which has increased to \$7.2 million, which is an increase of \$1.4 million from last year. Everywhere that we look, the Government is encouraging departments to go deeper into debt and these debts will be millstones around the necks of South Australian taxpayers and their children for decades to come. So much for a Government which claims to be balancing its budget. It is a big borrowing budget with a massive increase in indebtedness and certainly not a pattern to be followed.

It is not many years ago—four or five years in fact—since the present Premier and Treasurer was on the Opposition benches claiming that any Government which led itself into increased indebtedness was heading the wrong way. I am quite sure that everyone would agree, but that is not the philosophy he has followed while in power. Of course, the increase in indebtedness has not necessarily been met by an increase in performance on the part of this Government. For example, prior to the 1982 State election when the Government came to power, and prior to the 1985 State election, promises were not only made but also remade. For instance, Mount Gambier was promised an upgraded hospital, and not simply a physical upgrading of the premises, because it does need upgrading as the building is a prewar design with a number of handicaps which planners and designers have addressed.

There is a wonderful new plan which has been approved by the hospital board and by the Government, but prior to 1982 the Government promised an upgrading of the hospital to teaching standard. Between 1982 and December 1985, that promise simply had not been met. Instead, extensive plans were drawn up and, just prior to the 1985 State election, the Minister again went along to Mount Gambier and said, 'Yes, we will upgrade your hospital and this time we have the plans ready. We are all ready to swing into action immediately after the election.' But what do we have? We have had an election and a budget, but there is very little in that budget for the Mount Gambier Hospital upgrading other than the completion of boiler and lift upgrading, both of which were promised not only by John Cornwall and the present Government but also by the previous Liberal Government just before it lost power. So, those issues have taken some four or five years to reach finalisation. I simply say that before the next State election, which may not be until 1989 or 1990, the Government had better have a look at the performance which one would

think would be concomitant with heavy borrowing—the heavy borrowing would be in order to meet promises. Before 1989-90, the Government had better meet some of its promises, particularly those it has made for the South-East.

Another issue relates to Finger Point. I recall that back in 1973, some 13 years ago, the then Minister of Works (Hon. Des Corcoran) said that it would be some considerable time before a sewage treatment works was provided for Mount Gambier so, for the time being, disposal of effluent at sea would seem to be the best option. So, for a decade and a half, the people at Port MacDonnell have been inconvenienced by that effluent being discharged raw into the sea. However, before the 1985 election, the Premier visited the district, went out to sea in a fishing vessel and inspected the Finger Point sewage discharge. He then came back to shore and made a commitment which he put into his election advertisement to the effect that the Finger Point sewage treatment scheme would go ahead should the Labor Government be re-elected after the December election. The Liberal Party was also firmly committed to that scheme, as it had already spent \$750 000 on forward planning, so there is really no reason why the scheme should not have proceeded full speed ahead. But, lo and behold, what do we have? Nothing in 1985-86: no change of plan when the Government came into office, and in 1986-87, nothing in the estimates to set the Finger Point sewage effluent disposal scheme in progress. This is disappointing.

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

#### HAWKERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Debate on motion resumed.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As I was saying, I express some disappointment but also considerable surprise that there was no allocation for the Finger Point project during the current budget estimates. I say 'surprise' because over the past few months the Premier wrote to me personally on two occasions, on the first of which (on 30 May) he said:

I have publicly stated my commitment to the construction of the Finger Point sewage treatment works and this commitment stands. Design and estimate preparation is continuing uninterrupted so that a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works can be expected during July 1986. Given the time required for committee and Cabinet deliberations, the tender call for construction is likely to occur in the latter half of 1986.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is continuing negotiations with the Port MacDonnell District Council in an attempt to reach agreement on the price of the land required, despite council's reticence to accept the department's offer as determined by an independent valuer. No delay to the Finger Point project has occurred because of the protracted negotiation period, nor do I expect any delay, even if negotiations are further extended.

That is only part of the Premier's letter of that date. Again, on 31 July, in response to further inquiries which I made of the Premier, he said:

Dear Harold,

I refer to your letter of 17 June 1986 concerning the Finger Point sewage treatment works project. I have previously stated my commitment to the construction of this project, as you would be aware from my letter to you of 30 May 1986, and this commitment stands. Work on this project is to continue as scheduled



and in this regard design work and the preparation of estimates are proceeding as are negotiations for the purchase of land required for the works.

Although delayed somewhat, a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the project is in the final stages of preparation with a view to submitting it in August this year. This delay has not altered the programmed completion date of the plant.

I accepted those two letters in good faith as being confirmation of the commitment made by the Premier prior to the last election. I raised this matter in the House during debate on 23 September 1986, at which time the relevant contents of the two letters were read into *Hansard* and can be found at page 1074.

The Premier and his Minister of Water Resources were questioned, I believe, during the Budget Estimates at which time the Minister simply reaffirmed the Government's commitment to the project. I ask members what strength has a statement like that when a similar commitment was made, as I said earlier, back in 1973 by the Hon. Des Corcoran. A 13 or 14 year time lapse with another questionable period facing us in the future is far from satisfactory. I repeat: I believe the Premier to be an honourable man and I believe he made this commitment in good faith. I simply now ask the Premier why he has not responded to letters of inquiry that I have addressed to him since 31 July and why he has not responded to correspondence addressed to him by either the Chairman or the Clerk of the District Council of Port MacDonnell.

I have discussed the matter as recently as the past couple of days with the Port MacDonnell District Council Chairman, who is perplexed as to the Premier's reason for simply not acknowledging our recent correspondence with him. I suspect that the Premier—quite understandably—is very embarrassed over the whole issue because, after all, he has made a very firm personal commitment, which was received extremely well in the South-East and now, to use the worst of bridge terms, he is renegeing on the deal.

Another issue I wish to refer to is the matter raised recently by the Electricity Trust of South Australia, where one possible reaction to bushfires in South Australia in future might be the complete cutoff of power in the State—a complete State blackout. It begs the question what would happen in cases similar to that which took place at Tarpeena during the 1983 bushfire, when that township's electricity supply was cut off because of damage to the lines by the bushfire which swept across from the west and then up from the south and which, of course, caused considerable damage, burning about half the houses in the township.

I recall that I with others spent some considerable time in the late hours of the night and the early hours of the morning trying to contact senior officials of the Electricity Trust and the E&WS Department in Mount Gambier. Telephone and power lines being down necessitated driving between Mount Gambier and Tarpeena to relay messages, the essential message being 'Please restore the electricity so that we can get the water pump working again with water reserves to extinguish other fires which are still breaking out.'

I recall that at about midnight I returned after one of the trips to Tarpeena, just as the primary school library was bursting into flames. Fortunately, the SAPFOR Tarpeena Fire Brigade was on to that very quickly and managed to save the rest of the school, although not the library building. It was a great credit to the Electricity Trust and E&WS people that power was restored not too long after that to enable water to be pumped into the overhead storage tanks in the township.

What happens if the Electricity Trust cuts off power across the whole of South Australia? I can foresee one

disastrous result: water supplies across the State would be unavailable in townships such as Tarpeena. One of the suggestions which the Liberal Party made, and which it had intended to carry out after the last election, was to make available mobile generators of sufficient capacity to link in directly with power lines in townships such as Tarpeena so that the water pumps could have been operating even while the bushfire was raging and power lines elsewhere were down.

The Government should give serious consideration to making mobile generators like that available to be driven to areas across the State where bushfires are likely to happen. It would not mean that every district had to have a generator, I am sure, but if we had several situated at key places across the State they could be made available in emergencies such as that which took place in 1983. It could have been far worse had other townships been similarly affected.

I also wish to raise the question of taxi and transport services for the disabled. I congratulate the Government on moves it has made in Adelaide to make available 10 Ford Falcon vehicles which have been stretched slightly and whose roofs have been raised so that disabled people can have access to a slightly larger than normal taxi. As I say, 10 of these have been made available in Adelaide and, although I am not sure what method will be used for subsidising or paying for these taxi services, I would remind the Government that in Victoria there is the provision of a cab card for disabled people which enables them to claim a 50 per cent subsidy on taxi services similarly provided.

There is very little of this type of transport available outside metropolitan Adelaide. This is a pilot scheme which the Government has in train. I understand that the Attorney-General in another place or the Premier during the budget Estimates Committees said that a new company might be formed in South Australia called Access Cabs with a full year cost of about \$750 000 in this financial year. I know of only one venture in country areas that in any way parallels this initiative, and that is in Mount Gambier, where a taxi bus has been provided with a hydraulic hoist on which a wheelchair can be raised and moved quite quickly and efficiently into the body of the bus. There is no provision for taxi or other subsidies for the disabled.

I believe that Mount Gambier would have a higher proportion of disabled people than most other country centres in South Australia, because Mount Gambier has a number of agencies that cater specifically for the disabled, and the town attracts the disabled from a wide radius not only in South Australia but also from Victoria. The Heritage Sheltered Workshop is one of these agencies, and schools and other organisations cater for the disabled in Mount Gambier. That would be an obvious place in which to start a country pilot program, and I ask the Government to seriously consider extending the metropolitan pilot project to the South-East.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I want to make a few comments about the Estimates Committees. I was a bit disappointed to read that one of the journalists thought that they were a waste of time. The only occurrence that would lead me to that conclusion would be a lack of cooperation from some Ministers. I firmly believe that the Estimates Committees afford a very good opportunity for obtaining information first-hand from public servants. Unfortunately, it seems that one or two Ministers are loath to let the public servants have their say.

I must confess that I felt a bit drowned by the words of one Minister on occasions when I would dearly have liked



to hear from the senior public servants for a number of reasons, first because some of them were new to me. It is very useful for members of Parliament to make their own assessment of the abilities and talents of senior public servants when of course we are all well aware of the talents and predilections of the Ministers of the Crown from their daily perorations in this place. I was a bit disappointed that, although the Minister was trying hard to provide information, he did not turn the senior public servants loose on more occasions to answer questions. I recall from our period in Government that during the Estimates Committees public servants in the departments I administered were keen to show what they were made of. They took the Estimates Committees seriously; they did a bit of homework before they fronted up, and I never felt that it was a waste of public money, as this journalist, unfortunately, felt. I thought that if the system was used properly it provided a very good opportunity for public servants to give information at first-hand and for us, as members of Parliament, to see public servants under circumstances where we could not normally do that.

We all appreciate the fact that Ministers are responsible for their departments and that the buck eventually stops with them, but nonetheless I do not think that letting public servants have a bit more to say in some cases is in any sense denying the responsibility of the Minister. The Minister of Mines and Energy, unfortunately, on a number of occasions followed the tedious habit developed by the Premier of just not answering questions.

No matter how one approached the question, from whatever angle, the Minister would just refuse to answer if he thought the answer would be in some way embarrassing to him. That is a technique refined by the present Premier to the ultimate degree. I asked Minister Payne what was his view on uranium sales to France and he said that he did not need to have a view. I asked him what was his attitude to uranium sales to Sweden and I was told that he did not need to have a view. I found that a fairly strange answer coming from the Minister of Mines and Energy charged with the health of the mining industry in this State and with seeing the Roxby Downs mine, from which we are keen to negotiate sales to overseas countries including Sweden and France, was accommodated as best it could be.

I would have felt encouraged if the present Minister had been able to assure the Estimates Committee that he would do what he could to ensure that that mine developed and was healthy. In answer to those questions, which he might have found embarrassing, he said that he did not need to have a view. I quote that as a simple example, because if the Estimates Committees have in any sense been a failure it is because members of the Opposition who were seeking information were not able to extract it from a Minister who, if he did not like the question, would not answer it.

Ministers are ultimately responsible for Government policy and should have the courage to enunciate that policy. I found that aspect of the Estimates Committee rather disappointing, particularly from a Government enjoying a second term in office, I thought the Ministers would have the courage to stand up and say what they thought, but unfortunately that was not the case.

The question of ETSA policy was a matter of continuing interest to members. It so happened that the ETSA annual report was tabled in this House a day or two before we went into the Estimates Committees. Also, a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* from the Acting General Manager of ETSA propounding one of the policies which had been spelt out in the annual report. That involved the undergrounding of power lines in high bush fire risk areas. The idea was, again,

promoted in the ETSA report that Hills dwellers, via local councils, should bear a considerable proportion of the cost of undergrounding power lines. That theme was taken up by the Acting General Manager in the *Advertiser* a day or two later. The argument that he used was that, if residents in Glenelg decided to under-ground power lines for environmental reasons, how much more reason was there for Hills dwellers to pay the cost of undergrounding in the hills for safety reasons.

I said that the statement in the ETSA report was simplistic to the point of being simple and, indeed, it was. I point out to the House, as I pointed out then when asking my questions, that if people choose to bear a cost for some perceived advantage, good luck to them. If people in Glenelg do not like the look of stobie poles in their street and have the money to underground power lines, then they should have that right. But when there is a hard pressed rural community in the Hills where people have lived for generations and where power is delivered by a reticulation system (and it is not a power supply to one street but is a reticulated system that runs for many miles across open paddocks to individual houses), and when it is suggested that, because of some change of ETSA or Government policy, these people should bear that cost of undergrounding power lines, it is a completely different kettle of fish.

The power authority, of its own volition, decided to reticulate power in a certain way, and that was to put up stobie poles from the high tension lines and break them down via a series of transformers, until eventually the power got to the individual household, whether a farm or a dwelling in a rural town in the Hills. No-one else had anything else to say in the matter. To suggest, all of a sudden, that because of some perceived bushfire danger it has suddenly become desirable to put all these power lines underground and that the people who receive their power have some obligation to pay the cost is, I believe, an absurd proposition.

To equate that to people who voluntarily for environmental reasons decide to pick up the tab, if they have enough money to do it, and suggest that there is a more compelling argument for people who live in the Hills and whose families have lived there for generations to pick up the cost of undergrounding, which runs into many hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars, is absurd.

I point out to metropolitan dwellers that the taxpayers of this State, including those in the Adelaide Hills, pay a subsidy through their rates and taxes to support a \$100 million deficit in the State Transport Authority. The idea that because these people live in the Hills, and because someone outside their jurisdiction decides that they will underground these power lines, at a cost, on my estimation, if it is to be done properly throughout the whole of the bushfire area of more like \$500 million, is clearly unacceptable.

The member for Mount Gambier mentioned shutting off power for days on end, perhaps during the high bushfire risk periods. That seems to be equally ill conceived. It would cause havoc. I think of the fruit processing and cooperative cold stores in the Adelaide Hills. What would happen to the season's crop if power was denied those facilities for days on end? One thinks of all the industrial concerns and hospitals. I guess many hospitals have auxiliary power, but some may not. One does not have to think very deeply to realise that it would create havoc, let alone the loss to individual households if their deep freezers are off, for argument's sake, for days on end.

I wonder whether the suits that would then be brought against ETSA for damages may approach those experienced

as a result of the damage caused by the fires. I do not believe that the undergrounding of power lines will make anything like the impact on bushfire incidence that the advocates are suggesting. By far the majority of bushfires in the Adelaide Hills are lit by human hand—many deliberately, unfortunately. That is a fact of life we have to live with in this day and age as the suburbs spread right to the base of the Hills and encroach on the hills face land. I was not impressed by the suggestions of ETSA, supported initially by the Minister of Mines and Energy. However, I was pleased to see that the Premier, in his only public statement that I detected, tended to down-play the suggestions.

I want to comment on a couple of other matters. First, I refer to the Minister's announcement, made with some flourish, in relation to mineral exploration in South Australia. The announcement was made at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Mines and Energy, and it was featured in the morning daily, under the fairly substantial headline, 'New policy increases exploration access'. The most illuminating part of the article were the two maps, which indicate that in 1975, only 4.5 per cent of the total area of South Australia was not available for mineral exploration, whereas 10 years later, in 1985, 50 per cent, a half, of the State was denied to the mining industry in terms even of exploration, let alone development. The environmentalists have had their head. In 10 years, the increase from 4.5 per cent to 50 per cent of the area of the State not available for exploration explains the frustration and downright concern of the mining industry as to what future it has in this State and, considering the national scene, indeed around Australia.

The Minister's announcement that, before any new national park, for instance, or any further restriction on land use was proclaimed, an opinion would have to be sought from the Department of Mines and Energy did not strike me as being a very big deal. It generated some interest in the media and, of course, some people in the mining industry heaved a sigh of relief. However, the fact is that during the Liberal Government Administration any proposal to proclaim a new national park in South Australia was sent first to me, as Minister of Mines and Energy, to see whether there were any subsurface indications of mineral riches in the area which would be of benefit to the public as a whole in South Australia.

So, there was nothing terribly new about this supposed sudden flash of insight on the part of the Minister that maybe we ought to do something about not precluding from any future development areas in South Australia possibly containing mineral riches below the surface. I was not terribly impressed by that announcement but, as I say, the mining interests heaved a sigh of relief, that at least a bit of commonsense seemed to be creeping into the Labor Party in relation to this matter of 50 per cent of the State having been sterilised against any future development and that at least the Minister had had the courage to put his toe in the water—and that pleased me.

One can see a parallel, of course, with the gyrations and the difficulties of the Labor Party in just what it is up to with the Kakadu National Park. I make no apology for saying that, when we are dealing with vast slabs of this country where any mineral wealth contained therein (whether it be gold, uranium, oil or gas) belongs to the nation as a whole and to all its citizens, it is absolute folly to lock up great slabs of this country so that we cannot even find out what is there, let alone develop it. I am quite sure that it will become more apparent as the economic malaise that has spread over this country deepens and as it becomes necessary to generate export income from the two areas

which have borne the brunt of earning our export income, that is, primary production and mining, economic necessities dictate that some changes are made.

So, it was not surprising but a little worrying to see the convolutions and gyrations of the Federal Labor Government in what it would do with Kakadu National Park. The business of uranium sales to France is what knocked on the head this idea of joint use of our national parks and other large tracts of this country. The Labor Party in South Australia has no problem in building a great chairlift and glass hotel on top of the Cleland National Park, running counter to and abusing in 50 ways the development plan for the hills face zone. However, it has no trouble in floating, with great pomp and ceremony, the building of such a chairlift to carry people to the summit to feast their eyes on the Adelaide Plains. That runs completely counter to at least 50 tenets of the hills face zone regulations. There is no problem at all in doing that.

**Ms Gayler:** Are you opposed to the Mount Lofty development?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am pointing out the hypocrisy of the Labor Party in these matters of multiple use of some of these park areas. As always I read with interest the fortnightly newsletter from the Conservation Council in which the new Director for the Environment sought to explain the concept of the multiple use of parks. One needs to get a right sense of perspective in looking at a relatively small area of national park, such as Cleland, which is close to metropolitan Adelaide. The Labor Party has no trouble at all with this massive development encroaching on that park. Yet, when we get the suggestion that in an enormous slab of this country, a long way from any capital city and where we have 1 600 square kilometres of virgin land, a major mine will use about six square kilometres, it is an affront to our environmental instincts. I suggest that they have their priorities quite wrong.

The panic reaction of the Prime Minister and those others who were seeking to do in Kakadu what the State Minister has done so haltingly here in South Australia, not trying to sterilise great slabs of this country so that any mineral wealth below the surface was locked up for ever, when it tried to put its toe in the water, the sales of uranium to France dictated that they had to back off fast. They had a revolt on their hands, when the Kakadu proposals were put up, from a significant number of Caucus in relation to uranium sales to France. They therefore had no option but to bang shut the doors and toady to the conservation lobby, which said that it would be absolute sacrilege to do anything in relation to stage 2 of Kakadu.

The final decision runs quite counter to what they had previously decided. That has not sunk into the consciousness of most people around the country, although it certainly has with mining interests and those who want to earn income from overseas to help our balance of payments situation. Such people would be well aware of the situation. They had a management plan but came up with a new one. The Prime Minister is going on television, saying (and I heard him in ringing tones from his soapbox in Canberra) that in no way in the world would we allow anyone to lift a finger in regard to stage 2 of Kakadu National Park, although only a fortnight earlier he had been trying to get exploration going so that we would know what potential existed in that vast part of this nation.

I think that there can be multiple use of land. I think also that the chairlift will have far more impact on Cleland than will some mineral exploration in 50 per cent of South Australia which is now sterilised from all activity. That newspaper report contained a map which showed that 10

years ago 4.5 per cent of the State was not available and now 50 per cent is not available, and that would cause some concern I would have thought to the whole community and not just to those who are rather keen to develop the nation's resources and to do something about our balance of payments.

I am quite confident that economic necessity will reverse this situation, but the trouble is that, with Labor Governments, it takes so long. They will not give a lead in the community. We have had the fiasco of the uranium debate and we have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in overseas sales because of their gyrations and policy changes as they have timidly sought to come to terms with reality on that question. That situation is rather frustrating for those who have a national perspective and want either to grow or to produce something and sell it overseas so that we do not become the coolies of Asia, which we surely will if we continue on the path of the past 10 or 15 years.

The other matter that arose from the Estimates Committee that was of some interest to me was that the Minister of Mines and Energy still clings fondly to the view that there is some hope of a petrochemical plant being established in South Australia. One of the officers had to tell him (he did not know) that the Asahi Chemical Company had closed its Adelaide office not long ago and had packed up and returned to Japan.

One of the tragedies of the 1970s was that the Labor Party sold the bulk of South Australia's gas to New South Wales and one of the reasons for doing that was to throw off as a by-product enough ethane to act as a feedstock for a petrochemical plant. Last year a Bill had to be passed to ensure that that ethane would be reserved in order to trickle it into our gas stream, because we had no gas. The petrochemical plant will require not only ethane but also gas. It seems not whistling in the wind, but quite silly for the Minister to cling to the hope that some day we will get a petrochemical plant.

He said that the Government had no plans to develop the uranium enrichment facility, which is probably the safest part of the whole uranium fuel cycle. That facility also has been sacrificed on the altar of this Labor Party's incomprehensible uranium policy. However, the Minister is not a bit interested in that. Unfortunately, once an opportunity has been missed, it is not easy to just pick it up and run with it. Despite the enthusiasm of Premier Dunstan in 1973 when he sent people overseas to study the establishment of uranium enrichment plants, the tide turned again in the Labor Party, it turned its back on that, and that opportunity is lost. In doing that, it has lost a \$1 billion project which this State could have had for further processing some of our mineral wealth. The Government has sacrificed that on this phoney altar of a so-called uranium policy. I intended to refer briefly to State development but, as I have only three minutes, I will save that topic for another occasion.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** While I have consistently supported the concept of budget Estimates Committees and have done so ever since they were introduced and while I believe they are a very effective way of presenting the Government's programs, particularly for departmental use and for the benefit of members of Parliament and the public at large, some of the allocation of time provided in various portfolios is patently absurd. Looking at the Deputy Premier's portfolios, I point out that only one day was allocated to cover areas including police, emergency services, Auditor-General, environment and planning, national parks and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, with the multitude of legislation associated with that department and the individual irrigation boards

and developments throughout South Australia. It is just not humanly possible to cover effectively all of those areas in one day, and justice cannot be done to the system.

Where one day is allocated for a Minister with only one portfolio, a reasonable opportunity is provided to look effectively at the operations of that department and its objectives and what the Government is trying to achieve or what it is not achieving. However, in the case of the vast portfolio area for which the Deputy Premier is responsible, quite obviously the system breaks down. If we are to continue with the program performance budgets, which as I say provide an effective way of examining the budget—and there has been some criticism of it by various members—then the Government will have to allocate additional time.

For the first six months of this year, the Government was actually in session for only three or four weeks. Quite obviously, more time could be made available in the budget session if much of the Government's legislative program was dealt with during the first six months of the year. It is quite absurd to sit only for three or four weeks in the first six months of the year and then try to effectively look at the Government's budget and deal with its total legislative program as well. I believe it is an absolute waste of resources to have the whole of the Parliament virtually idle, as far as the legislative program is concerned, for almost six months of the year.

Many of the problems I have described could be effectively handled if an additional week was made available for the examination of the program performance budgets that are now presented in the form of the yellow books. As I said, they are valuable documents because they clearly set out the program, the status of the various programs within departments. Departmental officers as well as members of Parliament can examine those documents from time to time throughout the year and have a clear indication of just what is happening and what is not happening. For that reason, I would certainly suggest to the Government that it look very seriously at sitting for an extra few weeks in the first part of the year to enable extra time to be made available during the budget Estimates Committees stage. If that were done, then a great deal more could be achieved.

If we look at some of the areas raised during the Estimates Committees, we see that in many instances we were only able to barely touch some that we regarded as extremely important. By the time three questions were asked, there was no further opportunity for a member of that committee to ask any more questions. Referring specifically to the E&WS Department, a major department in the total line-up, I point out that we had approximately 2½ hours to examine a department which has a very large budget and somewhere between 4 500 and 5 000 employees.

Quite obviously it amounts to only a token gesture when one attempts to examine what is going on in a department the size of the E&WS Department. For that reason alone, I suggest that the Government should be prepared to allocate additional time. In fact, I suggest that the Government should look at extending the examination of the budget estimates by one week next year. That can be done easily by sitting an extra week or two in the first session of the year. There is absolutely no reason why the legislative program cannot be adjusted in that part of the sittings of the Parliament of this State.

I refer to some of the issues raised and, in particular, in relation to the E&WS Department. In that area there were many issues that we would have liked to raise but there was insufficient time to do so. I refer to the irrigation section of the E&WS Department. Numerous problems exist within the irrigation areas of this State, which are administered by

the Minister of Water Resources and the E&WS Department. These problems must be resolved. For example, in South Australia the Federal and State Governments provide a significant amount of money under the vine pull scheme because of the state of the wine grape industry. This was largely brought about by Federal taxes and it has placed the wine grape industry in dire straits. It is one thing to have a vine pull scheme because the crop is no longer capable of being sold, but what do you plant in their place? Under the irrigation system there is an allocation of water for various types of crops. One could replace 20 hectares of vines with citrus, avocados or whatever, but those crops use considerably more water than do vines, so obviously one could not plant the entire 20 hectares with the new crop. With the Government irrigation scheme or any major irrigation undertaking a massive amount of money is spent on the development of pumping stations and irrigation distribution systems (in other words, head works) to get the water to the rated area.

We now find with the current system that, unless there is some flexibility in the allocation of water per hectare within the irrigation areas, there will be dry land patches popping up here and there throughout the irrigated areas. Anyone who has had anything to do with irrigation would well know that, unless the total area is irrigated continuously, the salt from the irrigated part will be driven into the area of land not being irrigated. As a result, there will be a significant build up of salt in the land: that is not only to the distinct disadvantage of the whole district but is unsightly and makes the land virtually unproductive for any other future purpose. This is an area that the Government should consider very carefully. The Government should look closely at growers who find themselves forced into changing crops—not because that is their wish but because they are forced into it by circumstances completely beyond their control, largely as a result of Federal Government action: in other words, the Government should loosen up its tight control on the allocation of water per hectare.

If one is fortunate enough to have in the ground a crop that was a high water consumption crop when the present regulations were brought in, that land would now have a high allocation and, no matter what other crop one planted, one would still have that allocation of water. If we are forced to go in the other direction, quite obviously we do not have sufficient water to effectively produce the alternate crop. South Australian irrigation has probably the highest electricity charges in Australia, and I refer to the ETSA charges made for irrigation purposes.

In the other States we find that in off-peak periods, particularly over weekends, power is made available at a significantly reduced tariff for irrigation purposes. This seems absolute common sense, but it certainly has not been achieved in this State at this stage. One must recognise the fact that the irrigators in South Australia are producing crops in competition with their counterparts in other States. So, if they are paying a higher electricity charge, from the word go they are at a distinct disadvantage. It would seem very logical that a similar practice should apply in South Australia as applies in the Eastern States, whereby from Friday evening to early Monday morning a lower rate applies to the use of electricity for irrigation purposes.

Until the Government looks at these sorts of areas and makes it possible for producers in South Australia to compete on an equal footing with those in the Eastern States, we in South Australia will continue to suffer. Unnecessary and excessive regulation of any industry must add costs to whatever we do. When we look at regulating industries, we have merely to look at the boating industry. I have raised

this not only in the Estimates Committees but also on numerous occasions in this House.

Unnecessary regulations are brought down by the Government in the name of safety but, in fact, in many instances they are merely increasing the costs, reducing the opportunities for effective use of facilities within the tourism industry and, generally, putting South Australia once again at a distinct disadvantage compared with the other States. An example of that is one that I have raised here on numerous occasions: the requirement to have a boat operator's licence in order to operate an aluminium dinghy with a 5 hp motor.

As the law stands in South Australia, one can hire a \$100 000 houseboat without a boat operator's licence but, if the person who has hired that houseboat—which probably is 60 feet long and weighs 20 tonnes—starts the little outboard motor on the back of the dinghy which is towed behind that houseboat, he is in breach of the law and can be prosecuted for operating a boat without a boat operator's licence. One would have to stretch the imagination to believe that that was common sense. Obviously, the Boating Act was introduced in this State—and it was a piece of legislation that I totally supported—for the purpose of safety.

In most cases the legislation has done a good job but, as with most legislation, there are anomalies, and they are affecting crucial industries in this State. The example to which I have referred of the necessity to hold a boat operator's licence to sail a 12 foot dinghy with an 5 hp outboard motor has a distinct effect on the tourism industry. Many people go to tourist areas such as the Riverland, but they cannot hire a dinghy because of the law and the regulations. However, they can hire a houseboat that weighs 20 tonnes and costs \$100 000. It is high time the Government sorted out some of these anomalies and came to grips with the red tape that is stifling development in this State.

Another example is that boats built in South Australia for charter work must be built under marine survey, but imported boats are not subject to the same requirements, and that is a distinct disadvantage to the industry and the boat building industry in this State. The sooner the Government gives our people the opportunity to be constructive and productive and to operate effectively in the market place on an equal footing with imported products, the better. Those people are at a distinct disadvantage. We hear a lot from the Prime Minister about buying Australian, yet situations like the one to which I have referred exist in South Australia and they make it more difficult for people to buy South Australian products, things that are produced right here: it is easier to purchase an imported product. This results in numerous disadvantages for this State. While some of the examples I have raised might seem minor to certain people, they have a big cumulative effect on the total scene.

There are similar examples in relation to every department in South Australia. The Government must consider these issues seriously. It is the responsibility of the Government and senior officers of the departments to assist people who want to be productive and not to restrict them, because everything revolves around those in the community who are prepared to go out and be productive. Ultimately, everyone in the community lives off that productivity, whether in primary or secondary industry. Somewhere along the line everyone lives off those who get out and are productive. Until the Government is prepared to consider these areas to which I have referred and many other areas, until we implement a deregulation program so that we do not stifle the initiative of people who are prepared to get out and do something, the State will continue to go downhill.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I refer in broad terms to the Estimates Committees and their operation. As you know, Sir, we assembled for two weeks, three members representing either side of the parliamentary spectrum and a Chairman. On the floor of the House was the Minister accompanied by his advisers. On many occasions those advisers numbered up to 20 people. One can imagine how much it would have cost per day for those 20 advisers to sit in the Speaker's Gallery. On most occasions they were not called; nevertheless, they had to come here.

Not only did they come in for the day, but those advisers would have spent some weeks in their departments, at great expense to those departments, preparing for those Estimates Committees. Collectively, the whole exercise would have cost tens of thousands of dollars in the time of those public servants and their junior officers researching facts so that when questions were asked appropriate answers could be given.

We assembled and, as usual, the Opposition was given the first opportunity to ask a question. We asked questions in clips of three, got three replies, and then a Government member had a turn. The Estimates Committees have degenerated into what can only be considered a thorough waste of time. The attitude of the Ministers before the Estimates Committees can only be described as absolutely arrogant; there is no other word for it. They would answer questions at great length. Having done that, they would then ask the departmental officers to give replies.

I will give an example from the Estimates Committee which dealt with matters related to health. At page 439, *Hansard* records the member for Bragg asking a question and getting a reply. On the next page, the member for Albert Park is shown asking his first question. That question, plus the replies from the Minister and from departmental officers, plus the subsequent questions from the member for Albert Park, ran to seven pages of the *Hansard* record.

**Mr Meier:** Disgraceful!

**Mr OSWALD:** As the honourable member says, it is disgraceful; it is holding the whole Parliamentary process in absolute contempt when, as a Parliamentary tactic to stop the Opposition from asking constructive questions, a Government has its members ask Dorothy Dix questions that the Minister knows will be asked. We had to sit through a process that took seven pages of the *Hansard* record before the call came back to our side of the Committee; it took an hour for the call to come back. A similar situation occurred at every other Estimates Committee at which I had the unfortunate experience of sitting and watching in this Chamber. It was a tactic of a Government that did not want the Opposition to ask questions; it was designed to silence the Opposition, as one could see from the supercilious grins of members of the Government when they asked these Dorothy Dixers. It was painful to sit in this place and watch Ministers ask public servants to answer questions and develop answers further so that they could waste time.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** The honourable member opposite who is performing in her seat, and who has been only a minute in this House, would not know what has happened in the past. However, I can tell the honourable member that it is not getting any better; the government is becoming more arrogant and is moving down the track of stopping the Opposition asking questions. Members opposite cannot tell me that, when it takes seven pages of the record from when the member for Bragg asked his first question until he got to ask his second question, that was not a deliberate ploy put up by a Government in trouble trying to stop the Opposition asking sensible questions on budgetary matters.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** If the honourable member looks up the *Hansard* record on those pages he will see what was happening at that time. I make that protest about how the Opposition is stifled in this place in asking questions. The honourable member for Albert Park says I am wrong, and that he was not involved, but if it was not he all the time it was a Labor member who was asking questions as recorded from page 440 to 447. While members refer to those pages, I will look at some of the Committees in detail. Time will not permit me to go through every Committee, but I would like to spend a few minutes on some of the observations that I picked up from my reading of the budget papers and the *Hansard* record. The greatest difficulty we had when examining the Premier's lines was trying to get any information out of him whatsoever.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** The member for Bragg advises me that the member for Albert Park is the member in question on those *Hansard* pages. Later during the debate he can apologise for calling me a goose. I think the gander may be in more trouble than the goose. I will hear from the honourable member later after he sees that he has dominated seven pages of *Hansard*. Let us get back to the Minister of non-answers—the Premier—who during Question Time for weeks has been evading questions and ducking them sideways. During the Estimates Committee he did the same thing.

We tried to get information from him on the ASER project and we found out nothing. We tried to ascertain whether there were any cost overruns and found out nothing. We tried to find out information about the South Australian Financing Authority—perfectly proper questions about matters that anyone would ask during the Estimates Committees because that is what they are all about. We came up against a blank wall. All the Premier would say was that these questions infringed commercial considerations and that, therefore, it was none of our business.

We represent people whose money is in the South Australian Financing Authority. We have every right to ask questions. The Premier is displaying appalling arrogance when he refuses to answer. He can accept this label, if he likes, of being the Minister of non-answering of questions. It is becoming well known. Perhaps members opposite, when they are in their Party room, might like to tell the Premier to start answering some questions because the media and the people of South Australia are picking it up.

The Attorney-General's lines were quite interesting. For a long time now we have heard a lot about the waiting lists in hospitals. They are very real. A year ago the Minister of Health would not believe that he had waiting lists in hospitals and during the Estimates Committees he flatly denied it. He has now changed his tune since reality has caught up with him. It is interesting to look at the courts and their waiting lists. Once again we have the same problem—enormous build-ups in waiting lists. I remind members of what we were told during that committee. The major problem identified is a substantial blow-out in waiting times for cases to be heard in the courts. In the District Court the waiting time for civil cases has blown out from 32 weeks last year to 60 weeks at the end of August 1986. The silence is deafening.

**Mrs Appleby:** We're waiting for you to say something.

**Mr OSWALD:** The honourable member is treating this matter in jest. It is serious. How would any member opposite like to be sitting around for cases to come on and know that waiting times have blown out from 32 weeks to 60 weeks. In the planning area waiting times for country appeals are 206 days; for third party appeals it is 127 days; and for

applicant appeals it is 194 days. In the Adelaide Magistrates Court waiting times have increased from 11 weeks to 14 weeks for one day trials, and from 23 weeks to 24 weeks for two day trials. In the Children's Court the waiting times have increased by six weeks to 18 weeks. As I said before, we have heard so much over the past two or three years under the Labor Administration about how hospital waiting times have blown out. The Minister of Health has always said that hip replacement surgery, is not urgent surgery—and I would like anyone with a hip replacement operation to turn around and argue the point with him instead of me—and has turned a blind eye to the 12 month waiting list for elective surgery. This is now occurring in the courts. Where else are these waiting lists building up under the Labor Administration? I submit they are building up through the whole ambit of Government administration.

I had a personal interest in one of the matters raised in relation to the Marine and Harbors portfolio. The member for Price asked the Minister of Marine a very interesting question in relation to the problem of the sand bar at the Patawalonga channel—a question very dear to my heart. I can assure the House that the people of Glenelg and in the boating industry were very interested in the Minister's reply. The sand bar at Glenelg has always been a problem and it has entailed the ongoing expense of clearing away the sand, which then again accumulates. This has been an irresolvable problem. In his reply to the question that was asked the Minister of Marine stated:

The problem of the sand bar at the entrance channel has been a matter of contention for many years. Several schemes have been considered, but to achieve a permanent solution would have involved considerable initial expense, with very high annual maintenance costs. I think I have reiterated this time and time again in the past few years.

That is quite true. In referring to how the Government would overcome this problem the Minister went on to say:

The Jubilee Point development scheme, which it now appears will become a reality, encompasses the existing Patawalonga entrance channel.

Well, I suppose that that is the first time that a senior Minister—and bear in mind that the Minister of Marine is fourth in Cabinet ranking—has publicly come out and told the people of South Australia, in this case through the Parliament, really what is going on. We in the area have tried for years to find out what the Government has in mind, ever since this problem was floated. The Premier came out with a glossy publication on the project, *Jubilee Point News No. 1*. He praised the project but then dived for cover, and we had no idea of what was in his mind. The council has been trying to find out what the Premier has in mind in relation to this matter, as have other committees, environmentalists and resident groups in the community. We have been told behind the scenes that the Government supports the project, but I have asked questions publicly in the House and I have asked the Deputy Premier questions in the House, and on each occasion the issue has been ducked. Now, we have in the *Hansard* at last a little ray of honesty, a little lead in relation to what the Government is on about—and it is about time. The Minister made another comment, just to confirm, as follows:

However, provided all the concerns are answered in that EIS—that is, the environmental impact statement that has just hit the deck—

I am sure that the Government will support the development of Jubilee Point. As a consequence, that will assist in overcoming the problem related to the Glenelg sand bar. I have looked fairly closely at the model and the plans for Jubilee Point and I think that it will be great for South Australia and that particular area

and, hopefully, we will see it proceed and develop in the near future.

Thanks to the Minister of Marine! We appreciate at least having an indication now of what the Government is thinking. It also bears out his statement at the annual general meeting of the recreational boating industry in South Australia. When he addressed the gallery present on that occasion he said that he totally supported the project and would do everything in his power to bring it to fruition.

I again point out that he is the fourth ranked Cabinet Minister, a man who considers carefully his statements. He does not speak off the cuff with any remarks and I assume therefore that Jubilee Point is a goer. On the strength of that, at least it will help the Glenelg council and myself in trying to gain concessions for the various people who will be disadvantaged down there when this project proceeds, no doubt following the passing of the Indenture Bill, which has probably already been printed and is sitting in the wings of Parliament ready to be introduced in the next three or four weeks.

I refer now to matters pertaining to the water resources portfolio. It is well recognised that around Adelaide there is a vast network of trunk sewers, water mains, and the like, which in many cases have been down for 50 or 80 years, during which time they have gradually deteriorated: at some time they will have to be replaced. The question was asked during the Estimates Committee as to what sort of moneys have been set aside against this contingency. We were advised that in this case \$6.7 million had been set aside for the repair and replacement of trunk sewers, water mains, etc. in metropolitan Adelaide.

To put it another way, the Government has given no consideration at all in this budget to what it is going to do about the replacement of trunk mains and sewer mains because at the last estimate there was \$200 million worth of work to be done, although I understand that the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee has been working on a project to update that figure. If the investment figure involved is \$200 million, on the strength of that and on what the Government has allocated in this budget it will take 300 years for those mains to be replaced. I put to the House that, if the Government does not come to grips with this problem quickly, it will be an astronomical burden on the taxpayer. The taxpayer will not be able to handle it, it will break the Government, and nothing is yet being done to address the problem.

It is a criminal act on the part of Treasury that moneys are not being set aside and work not being addressed as to what will be done with these sewer and trunk mains. Because it is eight to 12 feet underground in many cases it is out of sight out of mind and the Government is prepared only to go in and support the glitter projects on which it can win votes. It is not worried about this problem, and it is building up. If we do not do something about it shortly we will be in diabolical trouble.

I refer now to the health portfolio. It was established during the Estimates Committees that the hospital budget had in fact been slashed considerably and there is going to be a reduction in real terms in moneys available to hospitals across the board. I refer to both metropolitan and city hospitals. For example, the Flinders Medical Centre has had its budget slashed by \$1.8 million and now has problems. Being an emergency hospital it should maintain about an 85 per cent bed occupancy rate. Any figure over that is considered highly dangerous. That figure is accepted around the health industry. Hospitals have to maintain a certain number of empty beds so that they can take emergency cases. In the case of the Flinders Medical Centre, it now appears that the occupancy is varying between 95 per cent



and 99 per cent. That means that the beds are full. If emergency cases come in the options are that they have to be sent home, or relocated to the Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth or whatever other hospital will take them.

With some elective surgery they are starting to shift patients to the Repatriation Hospital, and already the Health Commission is asking private hospitals to take Repat patients to allow for Flinders Medical Centre patients to be shifted to the Repat Hospital. It is a situation of musical chairs of patients and ambulances to obtain beds around the place. The administrator of the hospital system, the Minister of Health, at times borders on ego-mania with the way he performs in the health area. He is running the institution. He will not take any advice from anyone. He is about to off-load the Chairman of the Health Commission, as he off-loads anyone around him who criticises him, because he thinks that he is God himself, that he is the greatest.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** The member for Bragg is right. When first appointed the Chairman of the Health Commission was supposed to be the greatest thing that ever happened to the Health Commission in South Australia. He has now been given his marching orders. When they work out his payout figure that gentleman will be on his way. That is all because the Minister of Health thinks that he knows best.

The idea of musical chairs, with people being moved from hospital to hospital, I submit is not the way the public wants hospitals run in South Australia. At the same time the Auditor-General's Report shows that the South Australian Health Commission's central office staff jumped by 25—we saw during the estimates that it went from 298 to 323—and its operating cost jumped from \$13.2 million to \$14.8 million.

Despite the Taeuber report, which the Minister flourishes at every opportunity, the number of staff was allowed to increase. The report says quite categorically that the Health Commission Central Office could carry out a 10 per cent reduction of staff across the board without seriously impairing the provision of any services. The Minister holds up the Taeuber report as being his bible, because it contains a few recommendations which he probably likes and wants to implement, but that report still says that the Health Commission office staff can be reduced by 10 per cent without seriously impairing the quality of support services which the commission provides to the health industry. The Government approved the increases, so the monolith at Pirie Street continues. In the meantime, cuts occur at the hospital level.

I was told by the Minister that I was irresponsible when I suggested that there had been an 8 per cent or 9 per cent drop in real money available to country hospitals. I listed a few country hospitals such as Cowell, Cummins, Kimba and Streaky Bay, and I pointed out that their budgets had been reduced. The Minister asked one of his advisers, who said that I was only partly right and that the reductions were in fact only about 1 per cent. That is a 1 per cent reduction from last year's figure. He thought that I was irresponsible, because I suggested that in fact it was about 8 per cent or 9 per cent. In the eyes of the Minister, I was brazen enough to suggest that (and, like all Labor Ministers, if one criticises them, he believes that there is something wrong) some time between 1985-86 and 1986-87 there would be an inflation factor. Those hospitals will have to contend with that.

I accept that there is a round sum allowance to cover wages, and that that round sum allowance comes from a separate source, in its most basic terms, and the hospitals are reimbursed out of that round sum allowance. However,

the hospital budget has to contend with other expenses which are still influenced by inflation. These country hospitals will have to contend with about an 8 per cent or 9 per cent inflation rate. If members refer to the blue book of the estimates, they will find also that the receipts for those hospitals have decreased. So, not only have the gross incomes decreased, but also receipts from patients fees and other incomes for the hospitals have been reduced. Despite this, the Minister and the Government say that there will not be a reduction in health services. For the sake of users of South Australian hospitals, I sincerely hope that he is right. As the year progresses, we will watch that very closely.

A question was raised in relation to concessions in the Community Welfare Department budget. It was a good question asked, I think, by a Government member. The information supplied was that the Community Welfare Department budget was estimated at \$90.709 million, and the largest item was \$34.062 million, which is concessions to pensioners and beneficiaries, including \$5.89 million for electricity, \$12.54 million for local government rates and \$11.06 million for water and sewerage rates.

Ten years ago the subsidies were running in the region of \$4 million. They have now blown out to \$130 million. I am not saying that that should not happen, but the point that really came home to me during the Estimates Committees was the fact that the Minister actually acknowledged that he had been unsuccessful in pressing the Commonwealth Government to meet its responsibility for income maintenance support. There is just so much that the State can pick up, and there is a time when some responsibility should come from the Federal Government.

The Minister failed to reveal if he believed the State had reached the limit in its terms of concessions that it could provide to alleviate the plight of people living below the poverty line. It is a serious plight. I am not suggesting for a second that any of these subsidies should be cut off, reduced or whatever. I am however highlighting to the Parliament and to those members who were not at that Estimates Committee that we have gone from this figure of \$4 million 10 years ago to \$130 million, which is a subsidy to the underprivileged of almost \$100 from every man, woman and child in this State. In the long term, I fear for how the State will pay it. I urge the Treasurer to urge his Federal counterparts to do what they can to help the State meet those commitments.

In the last few minutes that I have available, I would like to return specifically to the section on the pensioner denture and spectacle schemes. It concerned me to find out in the figures for 1985-86 that the allocation for pensioner spectacles was \$1.897 million and that in 1986-87 it was \$1.825 million. In 1985-86, the allocation for the denture scheme was \$2.165 million and in 1986-87 it was down to \$2 million. The scheme was a Liberal initiative, as I recall, and it has been a great success, as acknowledged by the Minister.

I cannot develop the argument fully because I have only two minutes available to me, but that denture scheme comprises two aspects—the ordinary pensioner denture scheme and a new general denture scheme which the Government has initiated. If the two amounts are added together, we arrive at the figure allocated last year. Members opposite say that is fine, and I have no argument with that. However, the Government has not made any provision for any blow-out in costs. The advisers actually admitted that there was no provision for a blow-out in costs.

The waiting lists for both schemes still exist and, if they start to blow out, the Government has no latitude whatsoever to come to the rescue of those two schemes. The Government does not have large sums available to it. The



budget does not provide for the blow-out, and I fear for the future of those two schemes if we get into further tight budget restraints. I will watch those two schemes with interest as the year goes on, and I trust that I will not have to criticise the Government for a reduction in those very useful and valuable schemes. As they were Liberal initiatives, we certainly want to see them continue.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I have listened at various times to the debate, which commenced earlier this afternoon with the contribution by the Leader, and I have heard a number of members make the point that there can be no doubt that there is value in the Estimates Committee system. I genuinely believe that to be the case, and I believe that some of the information which is now on the record has been of value not only to members of the Parliament but also to those who look into the parliamentary system either via the *Hansard* or by following the debate in this place in other ways.

However, I must admit that the problem did exist and will continue to exist unless the Government takes stock of itself, of the Estimates Committees significantly failing through the intrusion of a number of dorothy dixers questions from the Government side—questions designed to foul up the free flow of information during the Estimates Committees. I am not denying that members opposite should have an opportunity to ask questions. That is their right and I support it. However, I suggest that there have been too many instances in too many of the committees held in recent times where a question prepared by the Minister or by one of the Minister's advisers and given to a member of the Government has then led to a lengthy, sometimes repetitious and certainly rhetorical (and not factual) answer.

I make these criticisms of what has taken place. The problems have existed in the past but I did not notice them intruding to the extent that has occurred this year (and I will explain that in a moment). I believe that the Opposition has shown a clear responsibility to the committee system which was not exercised by members opposite when they were in Opposition. I refer to the fact that there were no arguments requiring votes and no walk-outs of the type led, for example, by the Hon. Mr Hemmings when he was the shadow Minister of Housing. However, there was some banter between Opposition members of the committee and some Ministers because of a lack of performance perceived by the Opposition or because the Opposition believed quite sincerely that a Minister was failing himself and the Party that he represented in not making available the simple basic information asked for; instead, in a number of circumstances the Minister denied his officers the opportunity to fill the commitment and make that information available.

One observes over a period of time that you can get more by way of answer if you read the antics of the players than you can necessarily get out of the mouth of the star performer, and the star performer in this particular case in every instance had to be the Minister. However, the departmental advisers are completely bipartisan, have a pride in their vocation and are ready, willing and able to answer simple questions without in any way revealing important information which is the right of a Government to withhold from the public. A number of departmental advisers, in response to a question being asked, moved their heads just enough to indicate that what was being said by a member of the committee was correct; and on other occasions they would shake their heads to indicate that there was another alternative. As we have observed on previous occasions, there is an opportunity to understand precisely where one is in relation to the questioning without the voice being

used. The second point I make in relation to the activities of members opposite is that in many circumstances they asked quite frivolous questions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I ask the member for Gilles to identify where there was frivolity in the questions that came from members of the Opposition.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We can have a look at the questions asked by the honourable member's colleague, the member for Florey, on the police lines as to what the Police Force does with the manure from the police horses.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I thought that was a reasonable question.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It becomes a matter of opinion. I will not proceed along those lines. The other very serious concern that any Opposition would have—and I believe members opposite would have if they were in Opposition—is that the workload of some Ministers is so much greater than the workload of others that it is quite impossible to get a totally effective questioning of a Minister's portfolios for the purposes of the Estimates Committees.

I give the example of the very first day in Estimates Committee A with the Deputy Premier, who is also the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Emergency Services, the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister for Environment and Planning. In the period of time available—a matter of 8½ hours—the Minister had to fit in three major portfolio areas. It was quite impossible to develop all the questions relative to the Minister of Emergency Services, dealing with the Police, the rescue services, the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Services. Further, we could not adequately deal with the allocation for the Auditor-General. It was attempted in the two hours preceding the luncheon break and the 1¼ hours or thereabouts following the luncheon break before an opportunity was given to my colleague the member for Coles to look at aspects of environment and planning.

How, in the brief period of time between 3.30 and 6 p.m., can one effectively deal with all aspects of such a very vital and sensitive area of Government activity as environment and planning, when there is an intrusion of dorothy dixers from the other side? Other members could take this argument further. The sessional orders have been with us for so long now that they ought to be incorporated into the Standing Orders, because they have been tried and distilled to get to the point we have reached. Some members could be disruptive if there was no circuit breaker: the circuit breaker being the opportunity for the House to be called into session at 9.30 the following morning to censure a member who has been misbehaving and that there would be a cut-off of further debate on the day of the vote leading up to that action the following day if there were any problems. That has proved most successful.

It has applied to members on both sides of the House because it was included in the mark II or mark III phase of the sessional orders. So, it is possible to have a rational and proper debate, and those sessional orders can now, I suggest, be effectively put into our Standing Orders to cover the circumstances of the Estimates Committees. I am getting away from the other point I wanted to make which is that, associated with the presentation of estimates in the future, with the greater degree of information which is now available to members in the supplementary documents which are presented and available for the debate on the estimates—the so-called yellow book—we need to look at ranking the period of time during which individual Ministers

are before the Estimates Committees, having regard to the sensitivity of their ministerial responsibilities.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** How do we do that?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I believe it is competent for managers of both sides of the House to make that determination in a sensible fashion in the same way that sensible discussions have been held in the past to work out a solid program for the Parliament. But, that is another activity for another day.

I refer now to the fact that Ministers did not provide answers. I was a member of the Estimates Committee that examined the lines of the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for the Arts. The questions on the lines of the Minister for the Arts were answered in a forthright way, but regarding the vital area of the economic situation in South Australia, specifically in relation to SAFA and ASER, we failed to get from the Premier a response which the Parliament and, through the Parliament, the people of South Australia could and should have expected.

We do not know even now the ramifications of the Government's involvement and exposure in relation to ongoing costs associated with the ASER project. We have been able to gain, not with the help of the Government but with a lot of firm research work by members of the Leader's staff and interested parties outside, a better understanding of the ramifications of the SAFA project. We have found that the SAFA project entered into an area that was at variance with the Commonwealth Government's expectation, and that it was fit and right, even though it might be to some disadvantage to the State, that the collusion between the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia to beat the Commonwealth system was pulled into line, so that there was no longer an opportunity to benefit in that area against the true principles of a federation and the compact that exists between the Commonwealth and the States.

We were able to expose (and the Leader referred to this earlier this afternoon) the fact that we have mortgaged quite seriously the future of our children and our grandchildren by the activities involved in the most recent annuity deal associated with SAFA's operation. I suggest that we have not yet been able to obtain from the Premier the factual and necessary public exposure of some of the non-commercial aspects. I stress the word 'non-commercial', because I accept the argument that the Premier puts forward from time to time that he could not answer a certain question because it had a connotation of the commercial aspects of the deal. However, there was other information that should have been placed on the record but was not available.

I refer now to the lines of the Minister of Emergency Services. We were able to question the Minister, and he freely used his expert advisers, particularly the Commissioner of Police and the administrator of the Police Department, Mr Hughes. They provided succinct information to the Committee which is now on the record and which will form the basis for further questioning, actions or policy developments as time goes by. However, we found that the Minister, representing the Government (and I therefore lay this criticism against the Government as a whole), has seriously failed the people of this State by not allowing the police to enter into a phone tapping operation in conjunction with the Federal police which is an essential part of a concerted attack upon the drug scene.

The Minister made quite clear that there was a major Federal police involvement in such arrangements. He was at a loss to explain why, despite the degree of cooperation which could have been of benefit to the younger people, and to the whole community in South Australia because of

the social problems that inevitably follow the drug scene, the Government was reluctant to allow the police to cooperate effectively with their Federal colleagues in order to get the best possible evidence to bring to a stop as quickly as possible a number of the drug activities currently taking place in this State.

I have no doubt that further questions will be asked and that there will be further proof of the lack of determination or will in this area on the part of the present Government. I suggest that it is held back in this area by its radical left members.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the member for Gilles tell me that he is equally against giving assistance to the police to enable them to come to grips with the drug situation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I did not say that.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** No, the honourable member did not say that, but he fails to recognise a matter that is so serious that the fabric of our society, which we are privileged to represent in this Parliament, is crying out for assistance. This Government is not giving the sort of assistance necessary for a concerted attack upon the drug scene. There will be more said about this at a later stage.

A great deal of concern has been expressed by a number of country fire services, and by local government bodies closely linked with them, about statements made by the CFS administration in recent times. There can be no criticism of the general policy of the Country Fire Board to create a more equitable distribution of subsidy money for the purchase of necessary firefighting equipment. I was pleased to receive the Minister's assurance (although as yet there is no tangible evidence that this has been carried through) that there is to be a rethink by the Country Fire Board in relation to funds for major pieces of equipment for the Happy Valley and Onkaparinga areas where organisations were told to place the purchase of equipment in their budgets for 1986-87 but were subsequently advised that no subsidy money was available.

This matter requires close consideration, because if there was a proper expectation that that equipment would be funded then I believe that the Government should ensure such funding. This is identical to a situation which was discussed in this House previously and which was debated at another Estimates Committee hearing with the Minister of Agriculture involving funds available for the vine pull scheme.

A very clear expectation was built up in the minds of the people associated with the wine industry that there would be funds for them to quit the industry for the benefit of the State and industry so that they could be placed in a more equitable situation than currently applies. Many people who were given those expectations very positively had the rug pulled out from under their feet. While the Minister has indicated that he will look at various aspects of this area there is no public evidence that that rethink has had a positive result.

In relation to the examination of the Minister of Local Government's lines, we find that there was a degree of confusion in a number of areas as to the Government's real intent in relation to the rewrite of the Local Government Act as it applies to the financial aspects of local government. In the *Advertiser* this morning we can see that the Government has determined to move away from the minimum rate that has applied for many years in local government circles. The Minister said in the House that there would be very clear consultation with local government before decisions were taken. Local government has been asked to give

answers to 21 specific areas of concern in relation to finance as presented in a series of 10 papers circulated to all local governing bodies.

It is clear from the information that has been fed back from local government that in about five areas of those 21 questions it was very firm in its conviction about the course of action that should apply in the future. Councils were certainly very firm in their conviction that as far as minimum rates were concerned they should be able to continue in the manner in which they had in the past, or at least that they would be prepared to discuss the future of minimum rating with the Government. The press this morning shows that the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association clearly indicated that the Government, by its action in that area, has set itself on a collision course with local government in South Australia. There will be more said about that particular issue as the days go by. Suffice to say that it is yet another indication of the Government's acting behind the cloak of consultation but without what can be termed proper consultation. The delivery of a position paper to a body and asking for response in writing is not proper consultation.

As has been spelt out on many occasions in recent months, actions have been taken by the Government in relation to local government which have not been after proper consultation—and indeed, in some cases, with any consultation at all with local government. I will list them quickly. In the case of the subsidisation scheme relative to country fire services local government overall had not had complete consultation with the Government. There was no consultation in relation to the statement by the Valuer-General's Office that he was going to recover the cost of valuations in an escalating cost phase from local government. The Electoral Commissioner announced that the rolls associated with local government were to be recovered as a cost against local government. There was no consultation about that. Let me say to the credit of the Government that there is to be a retraction of that particular move during 1986-87, but it left local government wondering when this will be dropped on councils again. Will there be proper consultation before that action is again taken.

I could pinpoint a number of areas other than local government where people in volunteer organisations and business communities across the State are questioning very seriously what the Government means by consultation, because they do not believe that consultation is simply telling people what one has in mind and then going ahead and doing it, without getting around the table and thrashing out the pros and cons of taking a certain action. We learnt that there is concern in a number of local government areas—and this matter was raised in various Estimate Committee hearings—in relation to the matter of valuation. The member for Chaffey will lead a debate on that issue later this week.

While dealing with the local government area, I refer quickly to page 93 of the record of proceedings for Estimate Committee A held on 1 October. The Minister of Local Government was asked what action was being taken in relation to improving the terms of the Dog Act. The Dog Act, passed in this place under the careful gaze of the former Minister, the Hon. Geoff Virgo, has always had within it an inherent flaw. The Minister highlighted yet again that that flaw is curtailing the proper control of dogs in our community, whether in relation to dogs causing trouble in schoolyards, in urban developments, where they rush out at cars and motor cyclists, or in rural areas by attacking sheep or harassing cattle or horses. The legislation provides

that one can take action against an owner when one is able to identify a dog as belonging to a certain owner.

However, there is no way that by means of a disc attached to a collar around the neck of a dog one will be able to effectively identify that a dog belongs to a certain owner. It could be a very old disc that has been picked up elsewhere; it could be a blank disc; or the dog may be wearing a collar without a disc or be without a collar or disc at all. There is no way to identify who is responsible for an animal and, therefore, who should be prosecuted for the activities of that animal. The Minister acknowledged, albeit reluctantly, that the provision in the Dog Act which provides for tattooing, whether in the ear, on its flank or under its front leg, is really the only manner in which to positively provide identification of the owner of a dog, thereby providing an effective way to control the ravages of dogs, whether against humans or animals. My comments relate to some of the criticisms that I have about lack of Government information and activities. The Opposition expects some improvement in future.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** In the first instance, I wish to echo some of the concerns expressed by my colleagues regarding the Estimates Committees. There were certainly times when the Ministers present and sometimes their departmental officers tended to drag out the answers. I was perhaps fortunate that I was not present at too many of the committees when that happened, but I was aware of the proceedings through being either personally there or listening to them through the speaker system in this place.

It seemed evident to me that changes need to be made. If we are to continue to have Estimates Committees year after year without seeking to modify them then it reflects poorly on this Parliament. In the first instance a lot depends on how fluent is the Minister with respect to the English language. Some Ministers have a great gift of continuing to expand on their answers and going way beyond on what the questioner wanted anyway, and on top of that saying, 'Now that I have commented, I will hand over to one of my advisers for extra comment.' It is hard to believe what is being said.

On the other hand, we have a situation where some Ministers are burdened with too many major portfolios. They are portfolios where significant and important questions need to be raised but, because the Minister is available for questioning only during the one day, if you cannot get your questions in it is too bad, whereas Ministers with relatively minor portfolios may have more questions on things of lesser concern to the State of South Australia in general terms. I was satisfied with the three Ministers with whom I was working, namely, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Marine.

The Deputy Premier had too many major portfolios. Without doubt a lot of the questions that could have been asked were not asked. That was frustrating for me, not only in the estimates where I was officially scheduled to sit but also in the other areas, such as health and transport, where I had quite a few questions from my electorate that I wished to asked because they related directly to the yellow book and specific lines in the estimates, but the answer came back, almost without exception, 'Sorry, the time ran out—we were not able to ask them on your behalf.' I would hope that we can look at this matter for next year.

In the case of education, this year we got through many questions, and I compliment the Minister for the way he handled them. It compares to an earlier time on the education Estimates Committee when the previous Minister handled the situation. If my memory serves me correctly,

we got through relatively few questions in earlier years. That backs up what I was saying, that it depends somewhat on the Minister as to the answers given to the respective questions.

I have some reason to be happy with the outcome of some estimates answers. I commence first with the answers given by the Minister of Marine in relation to what money will be spent in upgrading facilities, especially jetties, in the electorate of Goyder and on Yorke Peninsula. I was very pleased to find that Marion Bay is to receive \$92 000 for the upgrading of its jetty; Stenhouse Bay \$82 000; Port Victoria, \$63 000; plus an amount of \$78 400 allocated under a Commonwealth Employment Project.

These are recreational jetties which are essential for the future of the tourism industry in this State. While the bottom end of the peninsula and therefore Stenhouse Bay and Marion Bay, have unlimited scope for the future and their development is really just beginning, Port Victoria has the potential for a boom in tourism and it is starting to experience the beginnings of that. Therefore, I am even happier that the Port Victoria jetty is to be upgraded to an acceptable standard, because it is an unusual jetty. It is an L-shaped jetty which was built that way because of the very rough seas in the area. The L-shape not only strengthens the main part of the jetty, but also, in the early days, it allowed the windjammers to tie up at an alternative angle. The winds have been so high that it has been reported that on one occasion a truck was blown off the Port Victoria jetty. I trust that the Commonwealth Employment Program funds will be forthcoming. As the Minister said, it is hoped that the project will be well under way, if not at the end of this year, at least early in 1987. In relation to the Marion Bay and Stenhouse Bay jetties, it appears that the work also will be completed this financial year.

While it may seem that the people of that area will benefit, in real terms that is not the case, because probably the majority of people who use those jetties will be outsiders or tourists from the metropolitan area, from other country areas, from interstate and also from overseas. South Australia will benefit in the long run. It was heartening also to be informed that Ardrossan will receive a \$40 000 grant for a boat ramp and timber walkway. Port Victoria will receive a further \$50 000 for its boat ramp improvements. The boat ramp is some distance from the jetty and it is very essential to the fishing industry of that area. Port Vincent is to receive money for some minor work on the local boat ramp.

While I thank the Minister for his consideration of these projects, it was disappointing to have to bring to his attention at the same time a matter which is of great concern not only to the residents of Wallaroo, but also to the rural area generally in South Australia. I refer to the fact that, although the port of Wallaroo has been singled out as the key port for consideration as a deep sea port, the harbor-master has been told that he will be shifted and at this stage a replacement still has not been appointed. In fact, he has been told that a replacement will not eventuate. Secondly, the pilot boat *Yorke* was taken to Port Lincoln and the *Tarooki* was to be sent to Wallaroo. Wallaroo has had to wait for years to get its new pilot boat *Yorke* and the last thing it wants is a substandard boat.

Thirdly, a survey was to have taken place on the waters off Wallaroo but it was cancelled. The Minister still has not come back to me with a satisfactory answer in relation to the harbor-master, although I acknowledge that he said that he could imagine the thoughts about the Wallaroo harbor and would have another look at the situation. In relation to the harbor-master, the Minister will evaluate the consequences that the lack of a harbor-master will have at Wal-

laroo. I raised this matter during the Estimates Committees, and I do not think it needs repetition here, although I believe—and many others agree—that it will add to the cost. I thank the Minister for reconsidering the situation, and I look forward to an early reply.

Concerning the pilot boat *Yorke*, it would appear that the Minister has already had second thoughts, because it is back in Wallaroo. Indeed, it came back the week after the Estimates Committees. I thank the Minister for this, assuming that it is there to stay, because Wallaroo has rougher water than has the Port Lincoln area. It had to put up with an inferior boat for so many years, and it is a significant port in South Australia. I think everything needs to be done to enhance an area and not detract from it when a deep sea port is being considered. Looking at a map of South Australia, one sees that the port of Wallaroo is the logical choice. Of course, that is not only my thought but is also in the report of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

The third matter, the fact that a survey was not going to be taken, disturbs me. Apparently, it has already passed. The survey was taken out from Port Giles and, according to Captain Pearson, who provided the answer on this matter, it related to the weekend that has just passed. We are all well aware that that was a somewhat rough weekend, both on land and undoubtedly out on the waters. That was done in association with the ship *Flinders*. If detailed soundings for Wallaroo are needed in the future, arrangements can be made for those soundings. Let us hope that that will be done and that we do not have to start pushing unnecessarily for it, because I believe that the appropriate channel needs attention so that work on the deep sea port can go ahead unimpeded.

I now turn to some matters concerning the Minister of Water Resources. I was pleased to be informed about COWSIP, the Country Towns Water Supply Improvement Program. It is important that all country towns that do not have reticulated water—and unfortunately there are still many of them—are aware of this scheme, because it is new in the sense that the Government is actively looking for local government initiative and help. It is also taking Commonwealth funds, meagre though they may be at this stage, to complement local government and State Government finance.

In other words, it is a tripartite arrangement. Therefore, if country towns wish to have reticulated water schemes, the first thing they must do is make sure that local government is well on side and is prepared to assist in evaluating the appropriate projects. The criteria for COWSIP funding are, first, the economics of the scheme; secondly, public health factors; thirdly, the possibility of bushfire risk; and, fourthly, the category of need. I believe that sometimes need would have to come as No. 1. As an example, I refer to the Moorowie water scheme in Goyder District which has been pushing for funding for an inestimable number of years. The need is there in the sense that, first, the farmers have to cart water every summer; secondly, in some cases the wells have dried up and in other cases are drying up (the results are available from the past few years); and, thirdly, and perhaps most importantly in a sense, the potential is there to increase the productivity from this land.

If we consider that in the past year the prices for lambs rank with the highest prices that we have seen for many years, why should not South Australian farmers have every benefit and be given every incentive to raise fat lambs, let alone other livestock? The markets are still available. It is not like the grain industry where conditions are very depressed and we do not quite know what the future holds.

However, in the livestock area there is considerable development and there is a future. Water would enable farmers in the Moorowie area to have a much better chance of competing in the market. An additional factor, of course, is the simple convenience for the people living there to have reticulated water through their homes at any time. Currently, it is quite possible that they can run out of rainwater.

The Moorowie area is adjacent to Hardwicke Bay, which again is a fast developing tourist centre on Yorke Peninsula. Because it is a developing centre, it is simply a matter of time before the people there demand, above all other things, the provision of a water supply. Currently the majority of people do not live in this area during the week. However, that is changing. I believe that the Government should see the writing on the wall before it is too late. Rest assured: I will be pushing for the COWSIP scheme and for water from Moorowie and the surrounding area without making any apologies on my behalf or on behalf of the people in the area. The latest correspondence I received from the Minister was most disappointing because it indicated that this scheme was not on the priority list of the first six or so schemes. It is disappointing because I believe that when the Tonkin Liberal Government left office this scheme was priority one. What a set back.

Another matter that arose from questioning of the Minister of Water Resources relates to the Windsor water supply. This water supply and the problems associated with it could create one of the biggest furores this State has ever seen in terms of health. It relates primarily to a water pipe dating back to 1908, which runs just north of Dublin through to Windsor. That pipe is so corroded that to look at it, one cannot understand how water flows, but I guess miracles occur all the time—and it does flow. However, the people in the Windsor area have no pressure in the summer months and things such as taking a shower are just not on. They have to wait for water to accumulate and then wash in a bath or something similar.

In addition, the impurities in the pipe have discoloured the water to such an extent that, in one case, a person's tiles have all changed colour. How would we like it if our water were that way? But there is hope on the horizon. The Minister, in dealing with a deputation I took to him recently, said that whilst funding is not available in this coming financial year—and I have not given up on that one—funding will be available in the next financial year, so the people may only have one more summer to go through.

Whilst that is a problem, the real problem is the health hazard. During my meeting with the Minister and some representatives from Windsor the following question was asked of an adviser: 'Is it possible to put chlorine into the pipe other than at the appropriate depots or storage areas, the closest storage area being Redbanks?' The following answer was given: 'No, you cannot put chlorine in anywhere other than at the recognised site—in this case, Redbanks.'

During the Estimates Committees I asked a question as follows:

I am aware that chlorine and other substances are put in at specific locations, for example, the Redbanks holding reservoir on the northern Adelaide Plains. To what extent can chlorine and other substances be put in further along the pipeline? Is it possible to do that?

The Minister allowed Mr Lewis to answer that question. Mr Lewis is the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the E&WS Department, and his answer read as follows:

Yes, we can boost the chlorine into any main as required.

He goes on and gives specific examples. The disappointing thing is that at Windsor there are 14 families, and at Windsor in the past year or few there have been 14 cases of cancer. You cannot tell me that those cancer cases are a

pure accident. I believe that excess chlorine—and possibly other chemicals—has been put into this section of pipe between Dublin and Windsor with the intention of trying to clear out the organisms which are not helping the water run, to try to help the people get a water supply, but the net result has been to create cancer for 14 people out of the 14 families. Whilst there is still insufficient evidence to prove this beyond doubt, I believe that in the next few weeks such evidence will be forthcoming.

I say to the Minister here and now that, while he says that the pipe can be replaced in the next financial year, that is not good enough. It must be done in this financial year—now—before other people suffer. When we are dealing with the health of South Australians or other people, there must be absolute priority. I will not let up on this issue: I want to see that new pipe installed forthwith. It was very revealing to learn, as Mr Lewis said, that it is possible to boost the chlorine into any main and, therefore, along this section of pipe.

In the same vein, one must also draw an analogy with the leukemia scare—rather, leukemia reality—in the Minlaton area some time ago that was brought before the public of South Australia through the press. At the time it was suggested that there could be a link between the spraying of crops and leukemia. However, the Minister of Health gave an undertaking that there would be an investigation, which apparently occurred, according to the Minister. The findings indicated that there was no correlation. However, I put to the Minister, the members of this Parliament and the residents of South Australia that some two or so years ago there seemed to be an excess of chemicals in the Minlaton water supply. I knew about that, because several people approached me at the time and said that their gardens were not growing and that they were being ruined. One person who approached me had tended several people's gardens. The excess chlorine in water supplies could well provide an answer to the excess of leukemia cases in the Minlaton area.

If that proves to be factual, we must analyse the State water scheme. We must ensure that the officers of the E&WS Department do not have a *carte blanche* on how much chlorine can be added: they must be given strict guidelines but, first, tests must be carried out, and quickly, to see whether there are any other negative effects from chlorine input beyond a certain level. There is the potential for serious problems. I hope that my accusations about the 14 cancer cases in the Windsor area cannot be related to a high chlorine input but, if anyone can come up with a more satisfactory answer, I would be pleased to listen. From the discussions I have had so far, it seems that this is the obvious answer. There are other matters to which I wished to refer.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** I take this opportunity to talk about the role of the New Right in this State and in Australia. During the past year or so we have seen the extraordinary rise of a new group in Australia described in the media as the New Right when what is really meant is the Extreme

Right. It is a group that has no parliamentary base whatsoever. It represents no broad strand of industry. It is made up of a small vocal group of those who are disaffected with mainstream conservative Parties or those who, like John Stone, are desperate for history to reassess their roles in previous Administrations; those whose academic, political or Public Service careers have come to a dead end; or simply those whose personal or corporate greed is placed before the national interest.

The New Right or, as I have said, more accurately the Extreme Right, poses a very potent threat to the legitimacy of the Liberal Party, and more particularly to the viability of leaders such as John Olsen and John Howard, and perhaps even Geoff Kennett in the longer term. Repeatedly over the past 12 months the New Right has upstaged or outflanked the Liberal leadership in charting the conservative agenda in Australia. Slowly but surely the New Right is nudging the Liberal Party towards policies that fall outside mainstream political traditions in this country.

John Howard has repeatedly assured Australians that he, and not these extremists, is leading the conservative side of politics in Australia. But the fact that John Howard has to keep making those assurances shows the nervousness within Liberal ranks and the direction that the New Right is taking them, dragging them down. I am sure that the member for Bragg will agree with me that the simple fact is that the vast majority of Australian voters in successive elections over many generations have chosen Governments of moderate persuasion and have rejected Parties that have either expounded extremist views or seemed to be in the grip of extremists.

The victors in Australian politics have always been those political leaders and Parties that not only captured the middle ground but also reflected that middle ground. That is why communists, racists, Trotskyites and loonies of various persuasions bit the dust in successive elections. That is why Liberal Party members, if they are honest rather than just smiling over there, really do fear the New Right—because it is a cancer within. It has the potential to goad and coerce a weak Liberal leadership into policies that would wreak havoc to our economy, divide Australian against Australian, maximise the gap between rich and poor and remove every safety net for small business and small farmers.

I know that the member for Alexandra would agree with me on that. Because they are too weak to make the running, John Howard and John Olsen have decided to jump on the New Right band wagon: they have decided to embrace the New Right because they have no ideas of their own. I have to say in the Leader's defence that they do this embrace, uncomfortably, because they have no option, because they have chosen to be the cheerleaders in Australian politics, and because they cannot lead the conservative charge themselves.

They do this even though they know that the extremism of the New Right threatens the unity and credibility of their Party. So the Liberal leadership is left in the position of pretending to offer a new, stark, New Right alternative while refusing to spell out just what they offer. We have seen this repeatedly in recent weeks over John Howard's tax policy, which seems to dissolve and regather on a daily basis. But, of course, they have to maintain the charade so as not to alienate either powerful right wing business allies or the floating voters whom they need to win Government.

In recent weeks much has been made of the New Right's demands that the arbitration system in Australia be scrapped, that the labour market be deregulated, that the annual leave loading be abolished and that the accord be abandoned. All

these policy planks are superficially attractive to a small cowboy element in Australian business and to members like the member for Victoria. But, implemented together or separately, these demands would deal enormous economic damage to our nation. Demands of the New Right to shatter the accord in my view pose the greatest single threat to continued wage restraint in this country.

If that pressure continues and we have repeats of the Peko-Wallsend episode, unions will be under intense pressure from their members to abandon a centralised system that has underpinned restraint. If that occurs we will witness one of the worst break-outs of industrial disputation in this nation's history. That will lead in turn to wage rises in key sectors, a demand for flow on, the collapse of the dollar, a steep rise in unemployment and a severe economic recession.

Of course, in attacking the accord and bashing the unions the New Right proposes to fix our industrial relations system so that private enterprise can flourish, but the truth is that the accord has reduced industrial disputes to less than half the level under the Fraser Government, despite the shonky statistics of the member for Mitcham. There has also been a fall of 5 per cent in real wages and of 7 per cent in real unit labour costs, something that no other country has achieved, and a return to more normal levels of corporate profitability.

Let us look at the facts rather than the rhetoric about who is making the sacrifices in this nation. Of course, the New Right formula is a glass and a half of pure industrial warfare during a time when our national economy demands stability, consensus and cooperation, but the New Right continues to lie about Australian work conditions compared with those in other nations.

A few weeks ago Ralph Willis pointed out that holiday conditions enjoyed by Australian workers were not more generous than those experienced in many Western industrialised countries where workers enjoyed similar length holidays and where the payment of a bonus for annual leave was relatively commonplace. I will quote some examples for the benefit of the member for Bragg about leave loading or its equivalent in other countries. Belgium has a 90 per cent leave loading equivalent, Denmark 30 per cent, France 30 per cent, Greece 50 per cent, the Netherlands 30 per cent, Norway 32 per cent, Portugal 100 per cent, Sweden 25 per cent, and Finland 50 per cent.

In countries such as Finland, Switzerland and West Germany, and even in the United States, agreements provide for various forms of additional leave money. In Japan loading is not paid as such but instead workers receive up to two months pay each year in the form of an annual bonus. We simply have to compare these facts with the distortions peddled by the New Right and their weak parliamentary fellow travellers.

We have also to reflect on the hypocrisy of calls by employer groups for wage earners and the general population to make sacrifices. Data collected in a recent sample shows that for the year ended June 1986 the total remuneration of senior management, including those celebrated fringe benefits, rose by 12 per cent compared with a rise in average weekly earnings over the same period of 6.9 per cent. However, even worse is the fact that directors' fees have risen over the past two years by 34 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

I admire the courage—and I use that word advisedly—of John Elliott in calling for workers to suffer reduced living standards. His company, after all, has just bought an \$11.5 million executive jet for his use, and it features gold plated seat belt buckles and other trimmings, an especially woven



carpet, plush chairs, crimson velvet inserts in timber panelling and what is described as a miniature of Elders' boardrooms around the world.

It is also disappointing to see that Mr Elliott, the Treasurer of the Liberal Party, is now advising Australian businesses and those overseas not to invest in this country. That is the sort of patriotism that the Liberal Party espouses. But, we did not hear a whimper from the Leader of the Opposition or his other lightweight members of the front bench. We need to look very closely at what we are talking about with the New Right. Let us look at its privatisation campaign. The Liberal Party let John Olsen lead disastrously the charge on privatisation at the last election. Now we hear Ian McLachlan and his cronies talking about privatising agricultural agencies such as the Wool Corporation and the Barley Board; these will be commercialised.

Is that what farmers want? Do they want a totally free market approach to our economy? How does that equate with continued agricultural subsidies, floor prices and guaranteed minimum prices? We must start asking the farming community.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** It is a clear indication that the Labor Party is rattled when the member for Briggs has to rise in this place and try to create a diversion by attacking this so-called New Right. Who are these people that the Labor Party is so frightened of? The member for Briggs had the audacity to attack the member for Victoria, when all that he had done, as the member for Peake would know, was to stand up and defend the rights of those people who had been victims of union thuggery. He stood up and defended his rights. They are the sort of people that the member for Briggs is campaigning against. Who comprises the so-called New Right? In a free and democratic society are not people entitled to form themselves into associations or groups and put forward ideas?

*Mr Rann interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** And they would accept that. However, instead of the honourable member participating in a smear campaign and quoting half truths and mistruths and making deliberate misrepresentations, which is the hallmark of the honourable member, why does he not clearly explain to the House what that organisation is all about. It is obvious that he is not game to do so and that members of the Labor Party are frightened that these individuals whom they are attempting to discredit are putting to the people a commonsense approach to many of the problems which this nation faces and which have arisen as a direct result of mismanagement and malpractices for many years. If that is not an appropriate course of action, and in the interests of this State, I do not know what is.

The honourable member went further down the track and talked about marketing boards. It is obvious that he is in complete conflict with the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister told the budget Estimates Committee that all statutory marketing in this State, including all marketing boards, were under review. That would include the Barley Board. For the benefit of the member for Briggs, I point out that the Barley Board was created by an Act of this Parliament, and any action taken by the Minister of Agriculture in relation to that will be interference with an Act passed by this Parliament. The honourable member should get his facts straight. It is no good getting up in this place and mouthing nonsense and expecting people to take some notice or to have some regard for his point of view, when his statements are not correct.

It is the present Government that has attempted to interfere with what has been accepted as being a proper role for marketing agricultural products where it has been necessary to have statutory marketing boards. It is the present Government that will attempt to abolish the Egg Board, although, fortunately, the legislation will be defeated in the other place. It is the present Government that will attempt to interfere with the rights of the egg producers and to downgrade the quality of eggs available in this State and to hand over the market to a few people in New South Wales. It is the exporting of jobs that the honourable member is talking about. He should get his facts straight before he gets up in this place and mouths prepared speeches. The whole exercise was designed to get a few lines in tomorrow morning's *Advertiser*. That was the purpose of the whole exercise. It is cheap, shabby politics. There was no substance to what the honourable member had to say.

However, I think that enough has been said tonight about the honourable member, and I want to refer to one or two matters of concern in my electorate. I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is in the Chamber at the moment. I am a very generous fellow, and I just want to say one or two things to the Minister so that his officers can investigate them. First, a problem that has been brought to my attention concerns the proposed reduction in the gang working on the Strzelecki Track. I understand that the gang size will be reduced from 12 men down to four.

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

**Mr GUNN:** I sincerely hope that there is no reduction.

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

**Mr GUNN:** I look forward to getting a response from the Minister in the next few days. Great concern has been expressed by many people in relation to this matter.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** Mrs Bell.

**Mr GUNN:** And there were many others. I have had many conversations with Mrs Bell. I am pleased that the Minister is aware of the problem, and no doubt the matter will be rectified and I will not need to spend any more time on that subject. I now refer to the second matter that I want to raise. A few days ago I received a letter from constituents of mine in the North-east of the State. I quote from a letter I received from the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated, as follows:

At the last meeting of zone 16 of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia members instructed that I write to you to please pursue a matter regarding the Highways Department.

As enclosed, I wrote to the Regional Engineer, at Port Augusta, expressing concern that where bypass roads traverse near homesteads the danger exists of the possibility of an accident with children in the area.

Also, as it was pointed out at the last meeting, station personnel are at risk too. The feeling of the meeting was such that it was resolved to ask for your assistance that if individual stations so desire to have signs for slowing vehicles down that this be implemented. The members felt that the reply letter was a negative approach to the situation, being fobbed off.

The engineer who wrote back stated:

Although I am sympathetic to the problem you have outlined, it will be necessary to assess each situation on merit. Obviously factors such as traffic volumes, sight distance and road geometry would have to be considered in each instance.

I hope that the Minister will ask the Highways Department to have another look at the matter. It has been drawn to my attention previously, and concern has been expressed to me that there is a danger of accidents whereby unsuspecting motorists could run over adults or children because many of the bypasses go close to the stations.

The next matter I want to again raise is the problem of isolated education. The situation currently in rural South Australia, as in most other States, is very grim. For some



time I have been advocating that either the Government should reduce the number of people who have to be in the area before they qualify for a school bus or that some real effort be made to increase the amount of money available to isolated parents so that they can afford to board their children either in large provincial towns or allow them to use the facilities of the private education system in Adelaide.

I refer to the difficult situation of constituents who had a school bus going past their place for a number of years. However, they had children going to Adelaide and also to the Penong school. Unfortunately, the Government last year said that at the end of the year there would be no more school bus, but the children still have to go to school. Either correspondence lessons have to be used, long trips made every day or board arranged at Penong or Ceduna. If anyone has experienced the problems of arranging boarding they will know that it is not only difficult to obtain but also expensive. Some system has to be evolved so that these people have the opportunity of allowing their children to use the facilities provided. Ceduna has excellent education facilities on which the State Government has spent millions of dollars. The time has come when a few dollars could be expended to allow these people to participate.

People who live in the northern parts of the State find that the cost to send their children to secondary education in Adelaide is astronomical. The current money available from the State and Federal Governments is quite insufficient. They should be entitled to at least \$1 500 to \$2 000 from each source each year to ease some of the financial burden with which they are faced. With the number of children in our school system dropping, the Government could allocate some money for this purpose and it would do a great deal to help those isolated families. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House on many occasions. I bring it forward again today as it has been brought to my attention once more. People want their children to receive a reasonable form of education. As taxpayers they are entitled to use the facilities provided for the majority of citizens. They rightly consider it unfair if they are denied the opportunity to provide their children with a reasonable form of education.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** The biggest single problem in my electorate is public Housing Trust accommodation and the many problems associated with that. The Government and the Housing Trust are doing an exceptionally good job in this area but, unless a vast amount of extra money is poured in or policies are thoroughly examined and changes made, the situation will get much worse. At the moment over 39 000 applicants are waiting for Housing Trust accommodation, and the number is growing rapidly. There are several reasons why more and more people are being forced to apply for this public accommodation. Economic circumstances, because of unemployment, uncertain employment, low wages or pensions, are such that people are just not able to support private housing mortgage payments. These financial restrictions, coupled with the drastic rise in the cost of housing and high interest rates, are taking a very heavy toll not only on the young people in our society, but also on people of all ages who require housing. Even people in their mid to late 30s who are employed are being forced out of the private housing market because of the escalating cost of houses and because they cannot borrow enough money to buy them.

In effect, what is happening is that these people will not be able to work long enough, or perhaps will not even live long enough, to pay off their mortgages. These are problems that are very difficult and almost impossible for Govern-

ments to rectify and, therefore, we must look at ways to ensure that only people who, because of their circumstances, find it impossible to go out and obtain private accommodation can have access to Housing Trust accommodation. The original aims and objectives behind the establishment of the Housing Trust must be re-examined and reapplied for the benefit of people who are in genuine need of housing and whom the trust was originally set up to cover.

At the moment there is no means testing of applicants and, while people who are quite capable of going into private housing are not put on priority lists, they nevertheless eventually get their turn and obtain Housing Trust accommodation. I am referring here only to Housing Trust rental accommodation and not Housing Trust purchase accommodation. Theoretically, a millionaire would be eligible to be placed in a trust home. I suppose that in good times this policy is quite all right, but in times such as now, with over 39 000 families waiting for a limited amount of accommodation, these policies must be changed.

An area of waste exists, for example, when a family of six people is reduced through the children (over a period of some years) getting married and leaving home, and then perhaps the husband or the wife dies, thus leaving one person living in a three bedroom home. The elderly widow or widower could be relocated in a single unit, and that would allow a needy family to move into the three bedroom house. I know that this happens—but not always—and it does not always happen very quickly.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr De LAINE:** Yes, even a granny flat. I realise that there could be some very complex problems associated with this type of relocation of people, but I believe that, if the matter were dealt with compassionately and with justice, most problems could be overcome for the benefit of all concerned.

Another area of concern is troublesome tenants. I have had some dreadful circumstances reported to me where Housing Trust tenants have been—and are continually—threatened with violence by other Housing Trust tenant neighbours. Some have been threatened with firearms and others with varying forms of physical violence. Other tenants are subjected to excessive noise, drunken brawls, barking dogs and, in my electorate, some have brothels established right next door. I emphasise that the vast majority of Housing Trust tenants are extremely good and responsible people but, if there is just one disruptive person in a street, it causes all sorts of problems. Both the Housing Trust and the police seem to be virtually powerless to take the necessary action to solve the problems. The apparent lack of police power is a matter with which I will deal at a later time but, where the offending people are Housing Trust tenants, then the Housing Trust must be given more teeth to deal with them.

Another area that costs the taxpayer a lot of unnecessary money is wilful damage to Housing Trust units. Where a trust house or property suffers damage which is inflicted wilfully, or if the damage is deemed to be inconsistent with normal everyday wear and tear, penalties should be added to the rental charges, or perhaps the converse would be more appropriate. If tenants look after the properties well, rental discounts could be looked at. Whichever way the situation is handled, it seems to me that financial incentive is the answer.

Some time ago I was talking to a Housing Trust maintenance man, who told me that he was sent to a house to replace a broken window. When he arrived at the house he found that the window in question was a large plate glass window in the lounge room. A very bored looking man was

sitting in a lounge chair in the lounge while drinking a bottle of wine. He said to the maintenance man, 'I tossed one of these bottles through the window. I wouldn't be too fussy fitting the new glass if I were you, because I will get drunk again and probably toss a bottle through it again.' This sort of attitude and behaviour should be penalised hard.

Many constituents who are Housing Trust tenants have complained to me that, when moving into new units, they have found that there are no screen doors fitted to either front or back. This means that in hot weather they either sit inside with the door shut and sweat or open the door and put up with the droves of flies, mosquitoes or whatever. Added to that, many tenants, especially women and elderly people, feel very insecure when answering their doors because of the absence of any type of lockable security doors.

One constituent complained to the Housing Trust about the lack of security screen doors on his unit. He was told that the trust was not prepared to fit them for him now or in the future. If he wanted them, he could have them fitted at his own expense. He did this and had good quality security screen doors made, because the doorways were not standard size. Four weeks later the trust fitted security screen doors to the front and back of all other units in this man's immediate complex. When he asked the trust to be reimbursed for the doors that he had fitted at his own expense, the trust refused his request. After my representations to the trust, it was agreed that this tenant would be reimbursed to the value of the regulation doors that the trust had fitted to the other units.

Because the doors fitted by the trust were of slightly inferior quality and were obviously supplied to the trust in large quantities, the cost was only about half that of the

privately fitted doors. After complaining again, the trust told the tenant that, if he was not satisfied, he should take his doors off and sell them. The trust would then fit the regulation doors to his unit. This suggestion was seen by the tenant to be wasteful of money and, because the doors were especially made to a non-standard size, he had almost no chance of selling them. Surely in this day and age security screen doors should be standard equipment on all houses and units, whether they be private or Housing Trust dwellings.

Additional expense is often incurred by tenants when they purchase an air-conditioning unit. They must have a 15 amp fuse added to their power supply to run the air-conditioning unit. It would cost only a minute amount extra to add a 15 amp fuse run when the new service was installed at the construction stage of the unit or house. These two items are examples of sensible and practical measures that I think should be added to the building specifications on all Housing Trust units and houses.

As I have said earlier, the Government and the Housing Trust are doing an excellent job, and my comments are not intended in any way to be critical of them. Likewise, in relation to the troublesome tenants and wilful damage, that constitutes only a very small minority of tenants, luckily. Nevertheless, a substantial amount of money is wasted each year. However, I believe that the Government must find ways and means to enable the Housing Trust to solve these problems.

Motion carried.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 October at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 October 1986

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## HOSPITAL COSTS

5. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health: What was the breakdown for the Royal Adelaide, Queen Elizabeth, Mod-

bury and Lyell McEwin Hospitals and the Flinders Medical Centre, respectively, for:

(a) salaries and wages, and fees;

(b) food supplies;

(c) medical and surgical supplies;

(d) special services; and

(e) pathology charges, for 1984-85, and how do these figures compare with each of the previous two financial years and what are the reasons for any variations?

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

Salaries Wages/Fees*	RAH	Modbury	Lyell McEwin	TQEH	FMC
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1984-85	76 427 000	16 818 700	12 108 000	52 870 579	50 313 711
1983-84	69 011 400	15 330 000	10 491 100	48 624 503	45 150 002
1982-83	64 831 600	14 025 200	9 476 300	44 693 769	41 432 908
% Variation					
1983-84—1984-85	10.75	9.71	15.41	8.7	11.4
% Variation					
1982-83—1983-84	6.45	9.30	10.71	8.8	9.0

\* The reference to fees was presumed to relate to fee for services payments made to medical practitioners providing services in a recognised hospital. Payments to medical practitioners in these nominated hospitals is only by salary or sessional/contract arrangements.

Private practice payments to doctors are not included.

RAH, Modbury, Lyell McEwin—Total salaries and wages including superannuation and terminal leave payments.

FMC—Total salaries and wages including superannuation and terminal leave payments.

TQEH—Gross salary payments excluding superannuation and terminal leave payments.

Reasons for Variation 1982-83—1983-84:

National Wages Increases 1983-84.

Carry over effect for 1983-84 e.g. the 33 per cent award increase to registrars and RMO's and 16 per cent to staff specialists effective from March 1983.

Approved initiatives, e.g. opening of satellite renal dialysis centre at North Adelaide.

Greater level of lump sum payments for long service leave on terminations of employment.

Greater commitment in employers superannuation contributions.

Transfer of School Nursing to Modbury in 1983-84.

Reasons for Variation 1983-84—1984-85:

Carry over effect of national wage increases.

National wage increase.

Introduction of 38 hour week to nursing and other areas.

At Flinders Medical Centre terminal leave payments are increasing as hospital reaches full decade of operation.

New initiatives—e.g. at Flinders Medical Centre:

establishment of pain management unit;

commissioning of the eighth operating theatre;

commissioning of Surgical ward 5B;

upgrade of the Anorexia Nervosa unit;

appointment of additional registrars to the accident and emergency department. Additional funding for emergency services and non-nursing duties.

RAH	1984-85	1983-84	1982-83	% Variation	
				1983-84—1984-85	1982-83—1983-84
Food Supplies	2 151 300	1 927 500	1 966 700	11.61	- 1.99
Medical and Surgical Supplies	6 198 600	5 349 700	4 890 700	15.87	9.39
Medical and Surgical Supplies	6 198 600	5 349 700	4 890 700	15.87	9.39
Special Services	712 880	544 200	636 300	30.98	-14.47
Pathology charges	81 400	8 668 000	8 427 600	-99.06	2.85
				% Variation	
				1983-84—1984-85	1982-83—1983-84
Modbury	1984-85	1983-84	1982-83		
Food Supplies	393 200	380 600	374 700	3.31	1.57
Medical and Surgical Supplies	880 600	653 200	613 500	34.81	6.47
Special Services	—	—	—	—	—
Pathology Charges	76 000	1 260 900	1 210 600	-93.97	4.15
				% Variation	
				1983-84—1984-85	1982-83—1983-84
Lyell McEwin	1984-85	1983-84	1982-83		
Food Supplies	246 700	259 600	250 700	-4.97	3.55
Medical and Surgical Supplies	443 300	367 900	320 200	20.49	14.90
Special Services	199 700	210 800	190 300	-5.27	10.77
Pathology Charges	-30.00	564 700	444 000	-105.31	27.18
				% Variation	
				1983-84—1984-85	1982-83—1983-84
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	1984-85	1983-84	1982-83		
Food Supplies	1 144 082	1 152 818	1 010 302	0.08	14.1
Medical and Surgical Supplies	5 353 108	4 815 356	4 100 417	11.7	17.4
Special Services	—	—	—	—	—
Pathology Charges	32 312	93 633	96 040	-65.5	-2.5

Flinders Medical Centre	1984-85	1983-84	1982-83	% Variation	
				1983-84—1984-85	1982-83—1983-84
Food Supplies	1 137 045	1 087 413	894 405	4.6	21.6
Medical and Surgical Supplies	4 842 818	4 318 194	4 099 929	2.1	5.3
Special Services Departments	—	—	—	—	—
Pathology Charges	11 869	92 319	52 340	-87.1	76.4

Variations are solely or wholly caused by the following:

- Food Supplies
  - General price increases
  - Increased activity
  - Higher stock levels
  - Implementation of tighter purchasing controls
  - Reduction in stock levels
- Medical and Surgical Supplies
  - General price increases
  - Increased activity operations
  - Devaluation effects
  - Increased number of CAT scans at Modbury
  - Changes in accounting policy re offsets
  - Change in patient mix
  - Introduction of hospital registrars and interns at Lyell McEwin in 1983-84
  - New Initiatives, e.g. pain management clinic at Flinders Medical Centre
- Special Services
  - Timing differences in bulk purchasing
  - New supplies
  - General price increases
- Pathology Charges
  - General price increases
  - Introduction of hospital registrars and interns at Lyell McEwin in 1983-84
  - Flinders Medical Centre operates a comprehensive in-house pathology service, however, some specialised procedures need to be referred outside which results in variations in expenditure.
  - Changes in accounting procedures—no IMVS charges included in 1984-85 for RAH, Modbury and Lyell McEwin. TQEH also reported a cessation in charging for tests performed by IMVS due to block grant arrangements obtained by IMVS.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FUND**

59. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government: What were the names and addresses of all organisations that received grants during 1984-85 from the Local Government Assistance Fund, what amount did each organisation receive and what was the nature of each project?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The information has been provided to the honourable member by way of letter dated 1 October 1986.

**NORTH-EAST BUSWAY**

62. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Highways Department received reimbursement for land valued at \$5.3 million (1982-83 prices) made available to the STA for the purpose of constructing the North-East Busway and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** This matter is under consideration by officers from the Treasury, Highways Department and State Transport Authority with a view to resolution in the near future.

**GORGE ROAD**

96. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government any plans to upgrade Gorge Road to Cudlee Creek?

2. Have drivers of tourist buses now using Gorge Road had any special training in driving on this type of road?

3. What accidents have been reported involving buses and large vehicles on this road?

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

1. The Highways Department has no plans for upgrading the Gorge Road in the foreseeable future.

2. Some of the larger tour bus operators provide special training for new drivers. This training involves bus handling on the Gorge Road and other Hills roads.

In addition, the Road Transport Training Committee offers adult bus driver training programs of six to seven weeks duration funded through the Commonwealth Employment Service. The courses cover aspects of tourism driving and include on-road exercises along the Gorge Road.

- 3. 1983—11
- 1984—10
- 1985—11

**NAIRNE SEWERAGE**

97. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the Government received any reports on the health hazards associated with the lack of a sewerage system in Nairne?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Government has not received any formal reports of health hazards associated with the lack of a sewerage system at Nairne. However, a number of pro-forma letters have been received by the Minister of Health from local residents alleging that overflowing effluent is creating a health hazard. Tenders have been called for the construction of the Nairne common effluent drainage scheme and, subject to Cabinet approval, construction should commence shortly.

**ROAD ACCIDENTS**

100. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many cases were there in 1985 of drivers failing to stop after an accident which caused—

- (a) property damage
- (b) personal injury; and
- (c) death,

and how do these figures compare with the previous four years?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Statistics maintained by the Police Department show that the number of prosecutions of drivers for failing to stop after accidents for the financial year 1984-85 and for each of the preceding four years were as follows:

Year	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Prosecutions—fail to stop	540	505	459	518	646

The information recorded by the Police Department does not identify the nature or type of damage or what injuries and deaths resulted from the incidents giving rise to these prosecutions.

### PERRY LEGAL COSTS

104. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: What has been the total cost to the Government for court proceedings and legal aid associated with the Emily Perry prosecutions and appeals?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The quantifiable costs to the Government for court proceedings and legal aid associated with the Emily Perry prosecution and appeals are as follows:

<b>SHERRIF'S OFFICE</b>		
Committal Hearing—Witness fees, etc.	\$10 920	
Supreme Court trial—		
Witness fees, etc.	\$20 280	
Jury fees	\$21 490	\$52 690
<b>COURT REPORTING BRANCH</b>		
Attempted Murder Charge:		
Committal—Magistrates Court 1 135 pages @ \$6.20 per page	\$7 037	
Trial—Supreme Court 4 599 pages @ \$10.36 per page	\$47 645	
Appeal—Court of Criminal Appeal 363 pages @ \$10.36 per page	\$3 760	
Extradition Proceedings:		
Application—Magistrates Court 560 pages @ \$9.51 per page	\$5 325	
Review of decision—Supreme Court 303 pages @ \$9.51 per page	\$2 881	
Appeal—Full Court 162 pages @ 9.51 per page	\$1 540	
		\$68 188

### FORENSIC SCIENCE

The costs to the Forensic Science Division of the Department of Services and Supply for time spent on analysis and court appearances (estimate only) \$38 000.

### LEGAL AID

There has been no cost to the Government for the provision of legal aid associated with the Emily Perry case. The total cost of legal aid was borne by the Legal Services

Commission. For the recent extradition proceedings and appeals the cost was \$14 250. In addition, the cost to the Legal Services Commission of the original trial and High Court appeal was \$49 750.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

109. **The Hon. B. C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons were employed at the South Australian Health Commission 3 months after its commencement and at 30 June each year thereafter?

2. How many hospital beds were available in rural hospitals at the commencement of the Commission's operation and at 30 June each year thereafter?

3. Have any beds in rural hospitals been lost from closure of any hospital and, if so, at which locations and for what reasons and have any been lost as a result of the Commission's direction?

4. What increases in beds at rural hospitals is contemplated in the next 12 months and, if any, where?

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

1. The following information in respect of the numbers of full-time equivalent employees as at 30 June each year has been obtained from the Auditor-General's Report for each respective year. It refers to deficit funded health units of SAHC and central office.

30 June 1978	16 321
30 June 1979	20 152
30 June 1980	19 516
30 June 1981	19 516
30 June 1982	19 951
30 June 1983	20 011
30 June 1984	19 963
30 June 1985	20 789
30 June 1986	24 163

Unfortunately information on the number of full-time equivalent employees three months after commencement of the SA Health Commission (i.e. as at 30 September 1977) is not available. The variation between June 1978 and June 1979 was mainly on account of country hospitals being brought into account for the first time.

The variation between June 1985 and June 1986 was mainly on account of work force statistics being collected and recorded for certain health units which were previously reported as grant funded but which are now reported in gross terms (e.g. Drug and Alcohol Services Council, Royal District Nursing Society, GROW, Windana Day Care, IMVS, St John Council, Julia Farr Centre).

2.	Non-Metropolitan Hospitals and Beds										
	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Recognised											
No. of Hospitals	61	67	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
Beds	2 796	2 847	2 934	3 013	2 946	2 907	2 771	2 773	2 773	2 773	2 773
Private											
No. of Hospitals	na.	12	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Beds	na.	na.	144	150	145	155	156	155	155	155	155
Commonwealth											
No. of Hospitals	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Beds	na.	na.	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
<b>TOTAL</b>											
No. of Hospitals	na.	80	76	76	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Beds	na.	na.	3 119	3 204	3 132	3 103	2 968	2 969	2 969	2 969	2 969

3. None.

The following is provided as background to question 3.

While the sectors have negotiated some reductions in bed numbers in country hospitals no beds have been lost from

the closure of any hospital as no hospitals have been closed. Any bed closures that may have occurred would have resulted either from a change in hospital activity level which made it uneconomical to maintain the number of beds or from an internal hospital rationalisation or re-organisation program. It is important to stress that hospitals are funded on activity levels and not on bed numbers as approved.

4. No increases in bed numbers in rural hospitals are being contemplated over the next 12 months.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST**

123. Mr LEWIS (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What was the South Australian Housing Trust's housing stock (in total numbers of units of all kinds) available for rental in the Murray Bridge district each year since 1970?

The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS: Details of the housing stock of the South Australian Housing Trust available for rental in the Murray Bridge district each year since 1970 (in total numbers of units of all kinds) are as follows:

Housing Trust Rental Stock June 1970—June 1986	
Year	Total
1970	175
71	175
72	187
73	236
74	271
75	305
76	389
77	525
78	568
79	589
80	606
81	636
82	689
83	700
84	781
85	833
86	890

**EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFF TRAINING**

127. Mr MEIER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. To what extent has greater emphasis been placed on staff training in the accounts payable section of the Education Department?

2. Has this staff training helped overcome inconsistent applications of procedures between officers in the various area units?

3. What initiatives have been taken in the past year in the employee welfare and safety areas of the department in an endeavour to reduce workers compensation costs?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Emphasis has been on 'on the job' training supplemented, where deemed necessary, by assistance from officers expert in a particular facet of accounts payable procedures.

2. Departmental management is unaware of inconsistent application of accounts payable procedures. Staff in each area office have been provided with a set of common pro-

cedures and Supervisors meet on a regular basis to discuss and formulate consistent solutions to problems.

3. In the past year initiatives in employee welfare and safety areas to reduce workers compensation costs have centred on the development of a broad systems structure to implement and manage the requirements of the S.A. Government's 'Code of General Principles—Occupational Safety and Health'. These include:

(a) The establishment of a joint management/union departmental committee to promote the requirements of the Code, and

(b) The establishment of a range of preventive, developmental and support activities, which include:

- ongoing support and crisis counselling.
- professional development and 'awareness raising' activities, particularly related to stress, with school principals and other senior staff, and the Area Office personnel (especially superintendents of schools) through the Employee Services Unit.
- development of a manual of 'safe work practice statements' to cover all employment and educational activities in schools.
- development of sound accident/injury/incident reporting systems from workplaces.
- meeting with the Government Workers Compensation Office to monitor and discuss workers compensation reports on a weekly basis, and distributing these reports to the Assistant Director of Education (Personnel) in each area for local follow up.
- planning for a major professional development initiative for future principals of schools, to consider the management of organisations (viz. schools) and the management of people under a range of tensions. Broader issues of occupational safety and health will also be included in these programs.

The above planned structures and programmes, together with established services and functions, have long-term implications for reductions in workers compensation costs.

**MINERAL EXPLORATION**

128. Mr MEIER (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What encouragement is being given for exploration for mineral and energy resources by private enterprise?

2. To what extent are research and specialist services still being provided by the Department of Mines and Energy in the geo-sciences?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The information has been provided to the honourable member by way of letter dated 26 September 1986.

**TEACHER HOUSING**

136. Mr LEWIS (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many dwellings does the Teacher Housing Authority own in Murray Bridge, how many are presently occupied by teaching staff, at which schools do these staff members teach and what is the range of rental presently payable according to dwelling classification, i.e. one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, etc.?



2. Who occupies any dwellings which are not presently occupied by teachers and is it permissible for any teacher to sub-let the premises to any other person?

3. Who is responsible for the maintenance of these dwellings, what money has been spent on such maintenance in Murray Bridge since 1981-82 and what money is it proposed will be spent during the current year?

4. How many teachers now working at Murray Bridge have applied for Teacher Housing Authority accommodation and been unable to obtain it?

5. Are there officers of the Education Department who are not teaching in schools at the present time occupying any of these dwellings?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The Teacher Housing Authority owns 39 houses at Murray Bridge and leases a further 19 from the South Australian Housing Trust.

(b) All are occupied by teaching staff (or by persons classified as teachers under The Teacher Housing Authority Act).

(c) The following table indicates the numbers of teachers in Teacher Housing Authority premises and the schools at which they teach:

*Teachers*

Murray Bridge Primary School	5
Murray Bridge South Primary School	6
Murray Bridge Junior Primary School	4
Murray Bridge High School	10
Murray Bridge Special School	3
Murray Bridge Special Education Unit	1
Murray Bridge College of TAFE	5
Murray Bridge Children's Services Offices	1
Fraser Park Primary School	4
Mannum High School	3
Mypolonga Primary School	1
Jervois Primary School	1
Mount Barker High School	1
East Murray Area School	1
Coomandook Area School	1

*Classified as Teachers*

19 Eastern Area Education Officers	54
1 Clerical Officer—Eastern Area Education Office	55
1 Groundsman—Murray Bridge High School	50
1 Contract Teacher	49

Note that one Teacher Housing Authority house is shared by two teachers, which accounts for the apparent discrepancy between total number of teachers and total number of houses.

(d) Current rental ranges are:

2 bedroom = \$44—\$48 per week

3 bedroom = \$43—\$68 per week

2. (a) No dwellings are occupied by people not classified as teachers under the Act.

(b) All teachers have the right to sub-let upon receipt of such approval from the Teacher Housing Authority.

3. (a) Maintenance is the responsibility of the South Australian Housing Trust.

(b) The South Australian Housing Trust advises that it has not maintained expenditure records on a house/town basis and that it is therefore not possible to advise what money has been spent on maintenance at Murray Bridge since 1981-82.

(c) As budgets are formulated on an area basis, figures are not available for Murray Bridge specifically for the current financial year.

4. All eligible teachers who have sought accommodation at Murray Bridge have been provided with housing,

5. Refer to 1 (c), above, where details are provided of the people concerned.

## TEACHER STRESS

137. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many school teachers have retired from the Education Department on workers compensation through claims of illness caused by stress during each of the past five years, what was the age of each teacher at retirement and what was the financial commitment to each by way of:

(a) lump sum; and

(b) weekly or annual payments?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** In the past five years 83 school teachers have retired from the Education Department on workers compensation stress related claims. Details as requested are set out hereunder.

Year	Age	Amount	
		Lump Sum	Weekly Payments
1981-82	39	25 500	—
	35	14 500	18 000.00
	47	18 000	—
1982-83	57	13 010	12 406.55
	42	5 000	18 000.00
	38	11 500	15 368.51
	30	11 500	18 000.00
	43	20 000	10 870.14
	30	16 000	268.20
1983-84	36	25 500	8 872.10
	38	28 000	—
	32	6 000	16 903.03
	36	43 500	16 789.53
	29	17 000	18 000.00
	36	18 500	—
	29	17 000	18 000.00
	45	20 000	18 000.00
	56	35 000	15 356.46
	61	35 000	—
1985-86	39	25 000	2 991.32
	55	39 000	17 567.90
	54	24 000	—
	55	39 000	—
	50	27 000	22 577.65
	49	23 000	2 866.50
	48	17 500	—
	33	6 000	—
	39	36 000	36 000.00
	40	37 000	36 000.00
	55	27 500	4 600.00
	60	25 050	26 120.94
	44	40 000	—
	59	20 000	18 000.00
62	36 681	9 931.68	
40	3 680	—	
56	35 000	19 868.88	
43	43 000	—	
42	7 900	18 000.00	
36	25 000	36 000.00	
51	33 000	—	
30	30 000	—	
62	29 255	36 000.00	
58	49 000	—	
39	12 500	—	
39	43 491	36 000.00	
49	35 000	36 000.00	
33	31 000	14 763.75	
51	35 000	—	
40	35 550	—	
40	35 000	—	
52	10 000	1 587.75	
26	40 000	17 822.28	
36	30 000	—	
54	12 000	—	
49	25 500	36 000.00	
42	33 000	36 000.00	
43	30 000	21 181.68	
53	21 000	4 328.39	

Year	Age	Lump Sum	Amount Weekly Payments
	54	35 500	36 000.00
	42	17 500	18 557.76
	52	38 000	—
	43	38 000	—
	46	40 400	36 000.00
	36	40 000	36 000.00
	65	36 850	36 000.00
	54	50 500	—
	32	26 000	—
	58	45 000	—
	33	32 500	21 787.84
	59	40 000	36 000.00
	55	40 600	36 000.00
	61	38 000	36 000.00
	44	45 000	10 190.62
	50	33 000	36 000.00
	31	15 000	—
	41	39 063	36 000.00
	37	11 000	36 000.00
	37	40 000	36 000.00

from the Public Service on workers compensation stress related claims. Details as requested are set out hereunder.

Year	Age	Lump Sum	Amount Weekly Payments
1981-82	34	10 000	11 459.10
	60	26 840	7 482.10
	54	19 250	—
	27	17 010	2 827.20
1982-83	50	12 000	2 781.10
	52	12 583	11 405.96
	61	22 580	14 914.83
	27	25 500	12 359.17
	29	17 000	17 111.19
	26	10 000	—
1983-84	28	7 600	2 811.07
	55	24 800	16 677.00
	42	31 680	—
	55	43 500	11 082.00
1984-85	44	50 000	—
	58	35 900	36 000.00
	54	30 000	14 863.99
	48	21 000	—
	60	38 810	—
	57	42 500	3 282.20
	35	22 000	22 262.37
	52	25 708	—
	32	31 031	16 288.42
	64	12 375	—
	46	27 000	17 111.13
	56	29 000	20 464.43
	46	30 000	10 268.24
	57	14 500	16 150.37
	56	117 000	33 452.37
	44	32 900	10 805.24
	42	24 500	19 242.84
	42	31 000	—
1985-86	56	35 000	—
	36	30 000	22 262.37
	57	35 100	—
	46	42 000	—
	40	35 000	—
	46	7 000	—
	51	32 500	—
	60	44 700	—
	55	40 000	—
	51	40 000	14 427.11
	55	35 008	22 946.55
	29	35 000	10 598.49
	59	35 100	—
	48	31 500	9 021.62
	55	35 500	428.76
	58	35 010	—
	40	26 000	12 957.80
	29	40 000	—
	38	38 000	23 459.04
	44	23 400	1 643.58
	53	35 000	27 576.29
	61	34 500	15 687.22

**POLICE RETIREMENT**

138. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many officers have retired from the South Australian Police Force on workers compensation through claims of illness caused by stress during each of the past five years, what was the age of each officer at retirement and what was the financial commitment to each by way of—

- (a) lump sum; and
- (b) weekly or annual payments?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In the past five years 14 officers have retired from the South Australian Police Force on workers compensation stress claims. Specific details as requested are set out hereunder.

Year	Age	Lump Sum	Amount Weekly Payments
1981-82	29	20 318	17 995.76
1983-84	44	25 000	24 315.33
1984-85	33	25 800	19 743.29
	36	21 290.37	19 448.22
	52	36 410	2 550.43
1985-86	35	35 000	26 524.78
	54	40 000	13 318.80
	36	40 000	25 942.78
	33	53 000	12 724.89
	45	35 000	—
	48	40 000	—
	57	30 000	—
	34	40 000	—
	45	40 000	12 020.97

**PUBLIC SERVANTS**

139. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Premier: How many public servants, other than school teachers or police officers, have retired from the Public Service on workers compensation through claims of illness caused by stress during each of the past five years, what was the age of each public servant at retirement and what was the financial commitment to each by way of:

- (a) lump sum; and
- (b) weekly or annual payments?

The Hon J.C. BANNON: In the past five years 54 public servants (other than teachers and Police Officers) have retired

**POLICE OFFICERS**

143. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. In relation to male and female officers respectively, in the South Australian Police Force—
  - (a) how many are currently in the force;
  - (b) how many have been recruited in each of the past 10 financial years; and
  - (c) how many have left the force in each of the past 10 financial years and what was the length of service of each officer who resigned?
2. What is the estimated cost of training a cadet to become a police officer?.

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

1. (a)	Male	2 993				Male	Female	Total
	Female	247			1982-83	63	31	94
		3 240			1981-82	57	43	100
					1980-81	59	55	114
		Male	Female	Total	1979-80	109	69	178
(b)	1985-86	235	83	318	1978-79	100	20	120
	1984-85	111	24	135	1977-78	237	17	254
	1983-84	64	20	84	1976-77	311	26	337
(c)		Resigned						
		Male	Female	Total	Age*	Invalidity*	Disability*	Deceased*
	1985-86	100	34	134	22	38	—	5
	1984-85	56	23	79	19	23	—	2
	1983-84	57	17	74	15	29	1	4
	1982-83	40	13	53	24	23	1	2
	1981-82	62	17	79	20	12	1	7
	1980-81	40	19	59	26	19	—	5
	1979-80	59	19	78	15	17	1	7
	1978-79	—	—	61	35	22	—	2
	1977-78	—	—	78	30	12	—	3
	1976-77	—	—	70	20	15	3	2

\* The breakdown of male and female officers is not readily available.

Length of Service (Years) 1985-86	No. of Members
Less than 2 years	13
2 years to 7 years	35
7 years to 12 years	31
12 years to 17 years	34
17 years to 22 years	15
22 years to 28 years	6
	134

Figures for previous years are not readily available and the time required to obtain the figures is not considered warranted.

2. The cost of training a cadet varies from \$17 000 to \$24 000 depending on the particular recruit program.

### MILK REGULATIONS

148. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Is it intended that regulations be introduced which will place further restrictions on dairy farmers wishing to sell raw milk to the public and, if so, why, what form will they take and when is it intended that they will come into effect?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The Food Quality Committee established under the Food Act 1985 to advise the South Australian Health Commission has been assessing ways of implementing the recommendation of the National Health and Medical Research Council that the sale of raw milk be prohibited. The committee has yet to advise the commission of its views. However, it is anticipated that the report will be released shortly. The National Health and Medical Research Council has, on public health grounds, recommended to all States that the sale of unpasteurised milk be prohibited.

It is understood the committee is considering restricting the sale of unpasteurised milk to premises on which it is produced, provided it is packed and labelled. This means it could not be delivered to householders. The committee is including in its consideration the effect its proposals could have on the livelihood of the present vendors of unpasteurised milk and the need to provide an adequate lead time for vendors to assess their future distribution arrangements of treated milk.

### GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

153. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. To which Government department or agency does a Toyota 4WD motor vehicle ULA 801 belong?

2. Why was it towing a boat, approximately 30' long, on a trailer registered TSE 974 down Black Road, Flagstaff Hill at approximately 8.30 a.m. on 24 July 1986?

3. Has the driver been reported for making a rude sign when rebuked by motorists he 'cut off' and, if so, what action will be taken and, if none, why not and, if there has been no report, what action will be taken to deal with the matter, and if none, why not?

4. What instructions are given to drivers of Government motor vehicles as to the proper conduct to be carried out whilst using such vehicles?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Motor vehicle ULA 801 is owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors and used by a Marine Safety Officer.

2. At 8.30 a.m. on 24 July 1986 the vehicle was parked at the department's head office in St Vincent Street, Port Adelaide. The vehicle frequently tows a trailer, registered number TSC 947 on which a patrol boat 17 feet long is carried. On the morning in question the trailer had not been towed by the vehicle.

3. The Marine Safety Officer has not been reported in regard to any incident. Therefore, no action can be taken and in view of the inaccuracies in Part 2 of the question, no further action is proposed.

4. Marine Safety Officers, who wear a uniform, are well aware of their responsibilities to the public and have been instructed on the necessity to conduct themselves at all times in a manner which would not attract public criticism.

### OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE

155. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts:

1. What was the amount of stationery, brochures, pamphlets, etc. and other material on hand in the recently renamed 'Old Parliament House' bearing its former name and logo 'The Constitutional Museum' and what was its value?

2. What will be the total cost of renaming signs, etc?

3. What advertising costs have been and will be incurred in the process of informing the public of the change?

4. What has been the expense of obtaining the services of the Hon. Donald Dunstan in publicly proclaiming the name change on behalf of the Government?

5. How much was spent on the arrangements for and the provisions used during the ceremony and afterwards to celebrate the occasion?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Stationery:	A4 letterhead	.....	none
	A5 letterhead	.....	4 000
	compliment slips	.....	none
	C6 envelopes	.....	3 500
	C4 envelopes	.....	3 500
Brochures:	.....		none
Pamphlets:	.....		none
Bookshop stock:	.....		none

The replacement cost of the A5 letterhead and C6 and C4 envelopes is approximately \$265. However, the Museum will continue to use the A5 letterhead for correspondence within the History Trust of South Australia, and continue to use the C6 envelopes for postcards through its shop.

2. The only sign on the building prior to the name change was one painted on the low wall opposite the railway station.

3. The bulk of the advertising of the new name of the Museum was done in the space already booked as part of the Museum's normal advertising programme, and all costs were met through the existing allocation. Specific expenditure included:

	\$
• printing of name change brochures:	240.00
• mailing of name change brochures	481.47
• press advertisements ( <i>News and Advertiser</i> )	1 068.00
	\$1 789.47

4. None.

5. The Museum incurred the following expenses relating to the arrangements for and provisions used during the ceremony and afterwards to celebrate the occasion:

	\$
• catering	650.00
• drink	48.00

The following were supplied free of charge:

- 5 dozen bottles of wine (Coriole Wines, McLaren Vale) plus champagne supplied by Coriole at cost price

Blanket and comprehensive coverage in all forms of media; a three times increase in attendance and a 30 per cent increase in takings for the audio-visual show and the Museum shop, all more than justified the expenditure apart from the long-term benefits.

### YOUNG DRIVERS

159. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government propose to legislate to prohibit young and inexperienced drivers from driving at night, as has been proposed by the New Zealand Government?

2. Has the Government considered legislation proposing a 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. curfew on drivers between the ages of 16 and 24 until they have had at least 18 months experience and, if so, what was the outcome of such consideration and, if not, is the Government prepared to examine this proposal?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The Road Safety Division is currently developing a proposal for a graduated driver licensing scheme which may include driving restrictions such as a night time driving curfew as proposed in New Zealand. The New Zealand proposal involves a curfew between the hours of 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. on drivers aged 16 to 24 years until they have had 18 months driving experience. The Road Safety Division is considering aspects of this proposal together with local issues, research and other interstate and overseas proposals. When the proposal for a

graduated driver licensing scheme has been developed, it will be submitted to the Government for consideration.

### TREASURY BUILDING

160. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What individual payments have been made to all contractors used in the recent renovation of the Treasury Building?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** To respond to the member's question would require the release of commercially confidential information. As the member would no doubt be aware, it is not normal tendering practice to release to the public details of tenders submitted or accepted. Therefore, it is not appropriate to provide a response to the question of the member for Hanson.

### MOUNT BARKER TAFE COLLEGE

162. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: At what stage is planning for the proposed Hills TAFE College at Mount Barker and when is it intended that it will be operational?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The proposed Hills TAFE College at Mount Barker was originally planned for a construction start in 1986-87. However, the available capital funding for this year does not allow construction to commence in the next 12 months. The commencement date for this project cannot be confirmed until the budget guidelines for 1987-88 are considered in December 1986.

### HOME SCHEME

164. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Does a partial owner of a South Australian Housing Trust home under the HOME shared ownership scheme receive title to the property and, if so, on what basis?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Tenants who purchase a share of their trust home under the Shared Ownership Scheme will receive a copy of the certificate of title for the property, which will register the tenant's and the trust's interest as tenants-in-common. Where there are two or more purchasers (say, husband and wife), their interest may be held either as joint tenants or as tenants-in-common between themselves.

### HOME AND COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM

165. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Have regional committees been established under the Home and Community Care program and, if so, what are their objectives and which committees are responsible for the Mount Barker council and the Stirling council areas, and who are the chairmen and the personnel of those committees?

2. If such committees have not been established, is it intended that this should happen and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The replies are as follows:

1. Seventeen regional advisory committees have been, or are being established in South Australia. Their primary objectives are:

- to identify gaps in local services for aged and younger disabled people
- to identify priorities within these needs
- to make recommendations on funding for new or expanded services.

The Mount Barker and Stirling council areas are the responsibility of The Hills Home and Community Care Advisory Committee. This committee is currently being formed and membership has not yet been formally established.

2. Following a number of initial consultations and discussions with various agencies, a meeting has been arranged on 24 October 1986 to form the advisory committee. Among those invited are representatives of Local Government, DCW, IDSC, local hospitals, non government organisations and consumer groups.

### CHILD MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

166. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Given that the Child Mental Health Service is now administered from the Adelaide Children's Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre, are there any plans to establish outreach services in the Mount Barker district and, if so, where will such a service be situated and when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** As a result of the reorganisation of Child Psychiatric Services, the Flinders Medical Centre is the hospital responsible for the provision of mental health services for children and adolescents in the southern region of South Australia. This region includes the Mount Barker area. The service is still in its planning stage, and is currently attempting to determine existing and future needs across the whole southern part of the State. As part of this planning process, a successful three-month 'pilot' service was provided in Mount Barker earlier this year. The service will be used to evaluate the likely need for child mental health services in the area. It is anticipated that a final service delivery planning document will be available by mid November 1986. Services will be delivered through community based multi disciplinary regional mental health teams. The number of teams will be dependent on resources available and will be located in the areas of greatest need.

### LICENCE DISQUALIFICATIONS

168. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many persons were convicted in 1985 for driving without a licence and driving whilst disqualified, respectively, and how many of those convicted of driving without a licence had had previous licence suspensions?

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

1. 2 619.
2. 988.

3. This information is not readily available and the time involved in obtaining it is not considered warranted.

### TECHNOLOGY PARK

169. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: What site plans have been prepared for the erection of a hotel-motel at Technology Park?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** As Technology Park is relatively isolated from established residential and industrial areas and their associated service facilities, the establishment of a restaurant tavern with accommodation facilities has always been considered a desirable element in the infrastructure of the park. In May 1986 a firm of consultants was invited by the corporation to undertake a feasibility study of the development potential for hospitality facilities on the park. Subsequently, the terms of reference were extended to include the preparation of a proposal for site acquisition and design resources of another consulting firm. The feasibility study has produced a positive result and the corporation is currently considering a concept plan as the basis for discussions with potential developers.

### ASBESTOS

171. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What Government departments or authorities are involved in oversight of handling of asbestos and which department is responsible for implementing the regulations with regard to asbestos?

2. When did the Government establish the Advisory Committee for the Removal of Asbestos from Government buildings and who are the present members of this committee?

3. Was this committee responsible for deciding what method would be used to deal with asbestos hazards and, if not, who was responsible and what alternatives to removal of asbestos insulation from buildings were considered and, in particular, was the method of deep-sealant encapsulation considered and evaluated and, if so, what were the reasons for deciding against this method and in favour of removal?

4. Does the Department of Labour or any other department check that private and public sector buildings purported to have had asbestos removed have in fact been dealt with and does the appropriate department then officially recognise that the asbestos has been removed and, if not, why not?

5. Can any Government department or authority guarantee that a building which has had asbestos removed is 100 per cent free of asbestos and hence totally risk-free as far as normal occupants and maintenance workers are concerned?

6. Will building maintenance workers be required to take appropriate safeguards against possible asbestos hazards after asbestos removal if no guarantee of 100 per cent removal can be given and will such building maintenance areas be required to be monitored for asbestos levels at regular intervals?

7. What sort of concentrations of asbestos in ambient air have been measured in public buildings in Adelaide prior to asbestos removal?

8. What is the natural concentration level of airborne asbestos fibres in Adelaide?

9. What concentration level of airborne asbestos fibres has been adopted as an acceptable risk for members of the public and building maintenance workers and from what international reference has this level been derived?

10. Does the Government require that outside monitoring take place at buildings undergoing removal of asbestos and, if so, what concentration of airborne asbestos have been measured outside such buildings?

11. What publicly owned or publicly leased buildings have been identified as containing asbestos?

12. What Government funds have been made available for the removal of asbestos from publicly owned buildings since the program started?

13. What is the estimate of how much money would be required to remove the asbestos from all publicly owned buildings?

14. Will the Government consider other forms of treating possible asbestos hazards if there prove to be equally effective and less costly methods available?

15. Has the Department of Labour requested a survey of private sector buildings which contain asbestos and, if so, who is to undertake this survey and who is to pay for it?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Departments of Labour and Housing and Construction, and the Waste Management Commission are involved with the oversight of handling of asbestos. The Department of Labour is responsible for implementing regulations to protect workers from the risks to health from asbestos fibres and to ensure the safe removal of asbestos.

2. The South Australian Government Asbestos Advisory Committee was reconstituted with revised terms of reference in 1986. Its present membership is:

Mr N.G. Ford, Department of Labour, Chairman.

Members

Mr C.L. Fisher, Chief Inspector, Department of Labour.

Mr G. Buckfield, Department of Housing and Construction.

Dr C. Grygorciewicz, South Australian Health Commission.

Mr M. Jackson, Master Builders Association.

Mr R. Metheral, nomination of BOMA.

Mr D. McMahon, asbestos removalist.

Mr J. Watkins, Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation.

Mr D. Quantil, UTLC nomination.

Mr A. Bush, Plumbers and Gasfitters Union.

Mr R. Pomeroy, Australian Telecom Employees Association.

Mr E. Broad, UTLC nomination.

3. The committee is only responsible for deciding the control method to be used when expending funds allocated to the committee. The alternatives to removal—encapsulation, enclosure and sealing—were originally considered. Sealing has since been prohibited by regulation. No recommendation against encapsulation or enclosure has been made. Each case is judged on its merits. However, relative costs of each process generally lead to a decision to remove.

4. After each asbestos removal project the Department of Labour assures itself that the area is safe to be reoccupied but does not check that all asbestos has been removed. When removal takes place from Government owned or occupied buildings, the Department of Housing and construction carries out a complete inspection to ensure total removal has taken place.

5. In Government owned and occupied buildings, the Department of Housing and Construction carries out an inspection to ensure that the area is asbestos free.

6. Building maintenance workers are required by regulation to take appropriate safeguards when asbestos fibres are likely to be released. Government owned and occupied buildings containing asbestos are reinspected and reassessed at regular intervals to ensure that fibre levels are below the specified maximum levels.

7. Readings of asbestos in ambient air in public buildings prior to asbestos removal are less than 0.01 fibres per millilitre.

8. Less than 0.01 fibres per millilitre.

9. 0.01 fibres per millilitre is regarded as an acceptable risk for persons employed in the area for 40 hours per week for a working life time of 40 years. This level has been

established by the National Health and Medical Research Council and is currently under review.

10. Monitoring is not generally required outside of buildings from which asbestos is being removed. The readings that are taken from time to time are invariably below 0.01 fibres per millilitre. Detailed monitoring is however carried out in occupied areas adjacent to the asbestos removal area.

11. Numerous publicly owned and occupied buildings have been identified as containing asbestos. See report of the State Government owned or leased and statutory authority buildings of 26 November 1985.

12. In each of the last three years the Government has made available \$500 000 to the Asbestos Advisory Committee for the removal of asbestos from Government owned and occupied buildings. It is however Government policy to remove asbestos from buildings when any major maintenance is carried out. A significant amount of asbestos is being removed each year under this procedure.

13. No detailed estimate has been made of the cost of removing asbestos from all publicly owned buildings. However, it is unlikely that this cost would be less than \$50 million.

14. The South Australian Government Asbestos Advisory Committee would assess and make recommendations to the Government on any new methods of treating possible asbestos hazards. The recommendations would be based on the cost effectiveness of such methods.

14. A recommendation has been made by an ad hoc asbestos committee which is supported by a draft asbestos management document from the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission to maintain a register of all buildings both public and private which contain asbestos. The Department of Labour is seeking comment from building owners to establish the feasibility of such a register.

#### SCHOOL UNIFORMS

172. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Minister provide support to the Principal of Henley High School in implementing the school's uniform policy and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The matter of compulsory uniforms in Government schools has been the subject of wide debate for many years and led to an exhaustive survey of opinions in 1984. The survey clearly showed that there are two particular aspects which militate against present policy being changed, i.e. cost and the legal validity of exclusion from school of a child, who is under compulsion to attend school, on the grounds of non compliance. The Education Act and regulations do not mention school uniforms, and there is therefore no legislative authority to enforce the wearing of uniforms. However, in accordance with regulation 122, Principals, in consultation with their school councils, can formulate school rules which may include the wearing of school uniforms; but neither the Principal nor the school council has authority to insist that any student should wear a school uniform against the expressed wishes of a parent.

#### URBAN ABORIGINAL SCHOOL

173. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the cost to date of maintenance and repairs to the temporary premises occupied by the Urban Aboriginal School at Elizabeth?



2. What is the anticipated cost for 1986-87?

3. What is the anticipated part year cost for repairs and maintenance for the permanent premises of the school for 1986-87 and what is the assumed date of occupation of the premises by the school?

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

1. The cost to date is \$992.

2. The anticipated cost for 1986-87 is \$1 200.

3. (a) The anticipated part year cost is \$2 500, which allows for expected normal wear and tear breakdowns.

(b) The expected occupation date is 24 October 1986.

### GOLDEN GROVE

174. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Has the Minister sought to implement a system of land use encumbrances on the properties sold at Golden Grove development through the South Australian Housing Trust and, if so, what are the conditions of the encumbrances and, if not, why not?

2. With respect to all other land at Golden Grove, has the Minister sought to have a system of land use encumbrances implemented by the respective developer and, if so, was the proposal adopted and, if not, why not?

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

1. No.

As the member would be aware, Golden Grove is being developed under a joint venture agreement between the South Australia Urban Land Trust (SAULT) and the Delfin Property Group Limited.

Pursuant to the joint venture agreement Delfin Management Services Pty Ltd (DMS) administer a memorandum of encumbrance in favour of SAULT to be registered on the title for each allotment sold at Golden Grove.

The memorandum of encumbrance requires the approval of the Vendor (through DMS) to any residence, structure of external fitting to be erected on any allotment. Guidelines are given on specific requirements such as dwellings, out-houses (garages, sheds, toolsheds etc), vehicle parking, setbacks for houses, garages, carports and outbuildings, fencing and courtyard walls, clotheslines and letterboxes, solar water heaters, airconditioners, signs etc. which require approval.

Division 6—Public Housing of the Golden Grove Indenture administered by the Minister for Environment and Planning, under clause 6.5 states:

The SAHT shall develop all vacant allotments purchased by it from the joint venturers in accordance with methods and practices designed to comply with the paramount objectives, and in particular paragraph 3 of such objectives. Such development shall be in accordance with standard requirements for development imposed by the Joint Venturers uniformly throughout any particular land division and in accordance with an encumbrance in favour of SAULT to be registered over all allotments in the development area.

Accordingly, specific encumbrances on South Australian Housing Trust allotments are established and no action by the Minister of Housing and Construction is necessary.

2. No.

See part 1.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

175. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Does the South Australian Health Commission own the land at Elizabeth Vale adjacent to Jarvis Road which was to have been the site of the now defunct Para Districts Hospital and, if

so, what are the plans of the Commission with respect to this site and are those plans consistent with the zoning of the land pursuant to the Planning Act 1982?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The South Australian Health Commission owns the site in Elizabeth Vale adjacent to Jarvis Road. The site will become the property of the South Australian Housing Trust as part of a land exchange for the proposed Noarlunga Hospital site. The site which is approximately 19.5 hectares, is zoned light industrial. Approximately 12.5 ha will be the subject of a rezoning application in the near future when the Housing Trust submits a supplementary development plan to the council and Planning Commission to develop this portion of the site for housing. Approximately 1.5 ha of housing portion will be developed for the South Australian Health Commission as a nursing home/hostel/day centre complex to replace the Magill Nursing Home complex which has been bought by the Housing Trust. This is a move by the Health Commission to redistribute nursing home beds to areas where they are needed.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

177. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the estimated capital income from the shared ownership scheme for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation for 1986-76 and how many separate properties does the trust planning for the scheme estimate will be involved?

2. What impact will the implementation of the scheme have on the availability of concessional housing loans from the State Bank for all other purposes?

3. How many trust properties fall within the initial eligibility criteria established for the scheme?

4. How is the value of the property to be determined for the purposes of—

(a) purchase; and

(b) sale of the property (assuming less than 100 per cent ownership and therefore resale to the trust)?

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

1. The estimated capital income from the shared ownership scheme in 1986-87 is \$7.5 million based on an average of \$25 000 being generated from sale of 300 properties.

2. Trust tenants seeking shared ownership are not eligible for State Bank concessional loans. Accordingly implementation of the scheme will have no impact on the availability of concessional housing loans from the State Bank for other purposes.

3. It is estimated that approximately 11 500 properties fall within the initial eligibility criteria established for the scheme.

4. (a) Purchase is based on the current market value of the property (as assessed by a licensed valuer) less the value of any tenant improvements.

(b) For the purposes of sale, the agreement between the trust and the purchaser provides that the trust will ascertain the current market value of the property and the value of any improvements made by the purchaser from the Valuer-General or a licensed valuer acceptable to both the trust and the purchaser. The agreement also provides for resolution of any disputes.

### COMMISSIONER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

181. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General:

1. How many of the 84 complaints to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity of discrimination against the aged related to the retirement age of 60 years for females compared with that of 65 for males?

2. What was the general tenor of other complaints by volume?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The replies are as follows:

1. Twenty-one related to anomalies in retirement age and pension entitlements for men and women.

2. The remainder related to—

- employment (44)
- entertainment and recreation (9)
- insurance (4)
- accommodation (3)
- education (3)