

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 August 1987

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. J.P. Trainer) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.10 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.45 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.46 to 2.16 p.m.]*

## GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

**The SPEAKER:** I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Mrs Appleby and Messrs Bannon, Duigan, Hopgood, and Tyler be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech on opening Parliament and to report today.

Motion carried.

## PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 1 362 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Bannon, Hopgood, Olsen, Allison, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, and Duigan, Ms Gayler, and Messrs Gunn, Inger-son, and Lewis.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: OVERSEAS ADOPTIONS FEE

A petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to waive the service fee imposed by the Department for Community Welfare for overseas adoptions was presented by Mr Keneally.

Petition received.

## PETITION: VERMONT HIGH SCHOOL

A petition signed by 456 residents of South Australia praying that the Government reject the proposal to close Vermont High School was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

## PETITION: COOBER PEDY LIQUOR CONSUMPTION

A petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to prohibit, within the township of Coober Pedy, the consumption of liquor in a public place was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

## PETITION: WALKLEYS ROAD EXTENSION FENCE

A petition signed by 251 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to erect a safety fence before roadworks commence on the Walkleys Road extension was presented by Mr McRae.

Petition received.

## PETITION: JUBILEE POINT PROJECT

A petition signed by 4 492 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop the Jubilee Point project at Glenelg was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

## PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 241 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to form a Neighbourhood Watch in the suburbs of O'Sullivan Beach, Christies Beach, Christie Downs and Noarlunga was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

## CLERK'S MARRIAGE

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to draw a matter to the attention of members, even though the Clerk did not see fit to draw it to my attention himself, namely, that he was married to his secretary, Jane Thompson, a week and a half ago. Members may like to extend their goodwill by way of acclamation.

## MEMBER FOR ALEXANDRA

**The SPEAKER:** I advise members that, in accordance with Standing Order 73, until further notice the seating position of the member for Alexandra will be where he is currently accommodated. Those members who have been present on many night sessions will be aware that is the position on which he more or less has a mortgage anyway. I am sure that we all welcome him back.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Department of the Public Service Board—Report, 1985-86.

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to Determinations—

Stipendiary Magistrate.

Occupational Health and Safety Commissioner.

Judiciary.

Stipendiary Magistrate (Adelaide Magistrates Court).

Government Management and Employment Act 1985—Regulations—Vacancies.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Land Tax Act 1936—Regulations—Exempt Body and Associations Exemption Revocation.  
Public Finance and Audit Act 1987—Regulations—Prescribed Public Authorities.  
Superannuation Act 1974—Regulations—Eligibility to Fund and Voting.

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

South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1985-86.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Planning Act 1982, Crown Development Reports on—Glenside Hospital Holiday House, Carrickalinga. Constructions, Normanville Heights. Scrimber Production Plant, Mount Gambier. Western Domiciliary Care (QEH), office.  
Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Licence Fees. Mining and Quarrying Premises.  
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Entrance Fees. Para Wirra Recreation Park.  
Planning Act 1982—Regulations—Definitions, Advertising Displays and Hoardings. Existing Use Rights. Prescribed Authorities.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Daylight Saving Act 1971—Regulations—Standard Time.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Sewerage Act 1929—Regulations—Fees for Examination and Registration. Planting of Trees in Streets. Scale of Charges.  
Water Resources Act 1976—Regulations—Meter Rent, Maintenance, Tests, Transfers and Licences.  
Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—Fees for Examination and Registration. Scale of Charges.

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

Bills of Sale Act 1886—Regulations—Fees.  
Crown Lands Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.  
Pastoral Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.  
Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—Land Division Fees. Registration, Lodgment and Examination Fees. Requisitions Fee. Strata Title Fees.  
Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Regulations—Registration and Deposit Fees.  
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Regulations—Survey Plan Fees.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott):

Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Hundred of Kongo-ron, County of Grey.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Director-General of Technical and Further Education—Report, 1986.

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

Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.  
Lyell McEwin Health Service Superannuation Fund Report, 1985-86.  
Building Act 1971—Regulations—Fees, Damp Proofing and Bushfire Areas.  
Cigarettes (Labelling) Act 1971—Regulations—Health Warning.  
Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—Declared Drugs of Dependence. Declared Poisons. Declared Prescription Drugs. Declared Prohibited Substances. Expiation Notice for Simple Cannabis Offence.

Expiation of Simple Cannabis Offences.

Dog Control Act 1979—Regulations—Fees. Roxby Downs Dog District Number.  
Food Act 1985—Regulation—Unpasteurised Milk.  
Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Vehicle Securities Register Fees.  
Libraries Act 1982—Regulations—Conduct, Traffic and Authorised Officers.  
Mental Health Act 1977—Regulations—Consent to Medical and Dental Procedures. Legal Representation.  
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulations—No-Smoking Sign (Amendment).  
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Licence Classifications. Registration and Licence Fees and Sundry Charges. Towtruck Fees.  
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Seat Belts and Braking Systems. Traffic Prohibition—Adelaide. Coober Pedy. Gawler. Hindmarsh. Light. Prospect.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—

Compensable Patient Charges. Health Development Foundation. Incorporated Hospital and Health Centre Fees.  
South Australian Waste Management Commission Act 1979—Regulation—Liquid Waste Fee.  
Tobacco Products Control Act 1986—Regulations—Health Warnings.

Corporation By-laws:

Burnside—  
1—Permits.  
2—Vehicle Movement.  
3—Street Conduct.  
4—Street Traders.  
5—Garbage Removal.  
6—Obstructions to Vision Near Intersections.  
7—Drains.  
8—Park Lands.  
9—Caravans.  
11—Animals and Birds.  
12—Bees.  
13—Library Services.  
14—Burnside Swimming Centre.  
15—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.

Mount Gambier—

1—Permits and Penalties.  
2—Vehicle Movement.  
3—Taxis.  
4—Obstructions to Vision Near Intersections.  
5—Council Land.  
6—Animals and Birds.  
7—Bees.  
8—Fire Prevention.  
9—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.

District Council By-laws:

Mannum—No. 10—Dogs.  
Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 42—Public Health.  
Warooka—No. 23—Caravans.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Administration and Probate Act 1919—Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities. Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Rules of Court—Local Court—Masters, Disability and Exhibits. Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Commercial Arbitration. Companies Rules. Listing Cases. Writs, Appearances, Pleadings and Bailees Charges.  
Acts Republication Act 1967—Schedules of Alterations made by the Commissioner of Statute Revision. Acts Interpretation Act 1915. Land Tax Act 1936.  
Directions to the Commissioner of Police under the Police Regulation Act 1952.  
Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report, 1986.

Judges of Supreme Court of South Australia—Report, 1986.  
 Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.  
 Bail Act 1895—Regulations—Forms and Pamphlet.  
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—Regulations—Fees.  
 Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Licensing and Insurance.  
 Business Names Act 1963—Regulations—Fees.  
 Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulations—Exemption.  
 Commercial Arbitration Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.  
 Commercial and Private Agents Act—1972—Regulations—Fees.  
 Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Fees.  
 Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Contract Ceilings.  
 Credit Provider Registration Fee.  
 Fees.  
 Consumer Transactions Act—1972—Regulations—Fees.  
 Co-operatives Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.  
 Credit Unions Act 1976—Regulations—Certificate of Incorporation.  
 Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978—Regulations—Levy Exemptions.  
 Education Act 1972—Regulations—School Accounting Provisions.  
 Fees Regulation Act 1927—Cremation Permit.  
 Places of Public Entertainment—Fee.  
 Stock Medicine Fees.  
 Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1986—Regulations—Exemptions.  
 Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.  
 Liquor Consumption at Glenelg.  
 National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act 1981—Regulations—Prescribed Acts.  
 Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Regulations—Fees.  
 Retirement Villages Act 1987—Regulations—Contracts, Disputes and Forms.  
 Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act—1983—Regulations—Fees.  
 Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.  
 Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulations—Flammable Clothing and Footwear.  
 Motor Fuel Price and Signs.  
 Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Licence Exemption.  
 Unclaimed Goods Act 1987—Regulations—Unclaimed Goods.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. G.J. Craf-ter):

Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981—By-laws—Control of Alcoholic Liquor.  
 Control of Gambling.  
 Control of Petrol.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1985-86.  
 Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Regulations—Fees.  
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Fees.  
 Explosives Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.  
 Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulations—Locksmithing.  
 Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act 1972—Regulations—Commercial Safety Code—Fork Lift Training.  
 Registration of Premises.  
 Construction Safety Code—Fork Lift Training.  
 Industrial Safety Code—Fees.  
 Fork Lift Training.  
 Lifts and Cranes Act 1960—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Correctional Services Act 1982—Regulations—Prison Admission Hours.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mays):

Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of Meetings, 6 February 1987.  
 Australian Soil Conservation Council—Resolutions of Meetings, 6 February 1987.  
 Pest Plants Commission—Report, 1986.  
 Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955—Regulations—Registration of Chemicals—Fees.  
 Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986—Regulations—Committees, Animal Control and Poisons.  
 Apiaries Act 1931—Regulations—Registration Fees.  
 Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Cremation Permit.  
 Places of Public Entertainment—Fee.  
 Stock Medicine Fees.  
 Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946—Regulations—Milk Prices.  
 Poultry Meat Hygiene Act 1986—General Regulations.  
 Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985—Regulations—Registration and Conduct.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mays):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—General Fishery—American River—Eastern Cove.  
 Powerheads, Spears and Set Lines.  
 Seal Bay/Bales Beach.  
 Gulf St Vincent Experimental Crab Fishery—Licence Tenure.  
 Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Southern Bluefin Tuna.  
 Marine Scale Fishery—Southern Bluefin Tuna.  
 Registration of Fish Farms and Returns.  
 Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Southern Bluefin Tuna.  
 Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Southern Bluefin Tuna.  
 Transfer of Licences.  
 Spencer Gulf Experimental Crab Fishery—Licence Tenure.  
 Tuna Fishery Revocation.  
 West Coast Experimental Crab Fishery—Licence Tenure.  
 West Coast Prawn Fishery Licences (Amendment).

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mays):

Racing Act 1976—Rules of Trotting—Complaints.  
 Fees.  
 Fines.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Gepps Cross International Standard Hockey/Lacrosse Facility—interim report and final report.  
 Kingston College of Technical and Further Education Redevelopment—report.  
 Lyell McEwin Health Service Stage II—report.  
 Northfield Security Hospital Conversion ('E' Division)—interim report and final report.  
 River Murray Interpretive Centre, Goolwa—interim report and final report.  
 Riverland College of Technical and Further Education (Berri Branch)—report.  
 South Australian Institute of Technology School of Nursing—interim report and final report.  
 Yatala Labour Prison 'S' Division (Segregation Unit)—interim report and final report.

Ordered that reports be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

**Mr OLSEN:** I address my question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the Premier's pre-election promise not to increase public transport fares by more than the rate of inflation, will the Government reject the application it has received from the State Transport Authority for an 11 per cent rise in bus, tram and train fares?

It was revealed today that the board of the State Transport Authority put to the Minister in May a recommendation for an 11 per cent rise in fares—a fact that the Government has kept concealed from the long suffering travelling public for some three months. That is almost double the rate of inflation, according to the Federal Treasurer. The Premier was reported in the *News* of 5 November, just before the last election, as having said:

I have promised a total freeze on State Transport Authority fares until next July and 'inflation only' rises after that, and it is a promise I intend to keep.

However, fare rises of between 14.3 per cent and 33 per cent occurred during the course of last year. In addition, a 20 cent fare increase was introduced last year for pensioners and the unemployed, contrary to another promise made by the Premier, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 8 August 1984:

The State Government would not abolish free bus and train travel for pensioners and the unemployed—it is simply just not on.

If the Premier's pre-election promises are broken yet again, the new fare—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader must surely by now be aware that he is straying into the area of argument and debate, and not simply expounding the minimal number of facts sufficient to explain his question. I ask him not to develop a debate. I intend to apply that particular guideline fairly strictly to members on both sides of the House. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr OLSEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was in fact giving the House statements of fact: they are, specifically, the Premier's broken promises. In relation to pre-election promises, the proposed 11 per cent increase, if applied to a fare for one or two sections, would increase that fare to 90 cents; if applied to one or two zones the fare would be \$1.35 (although the Minister's brand of mathematics might round that off to \$1.40) and if applied to three zones the fare would be \$1.80, each an effective doubling of fares since this Government came to office on a promise to keep the lid on fares. This would mean that a married couple living at Elizabeth, Morphett Vale or Noarlunga who wanted to bring their two children into town on a Saturday morning would face a cost in bus and train fares of almost \$9.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The Leader, like all his colleagues, will have to be patient until Cabinet has made its decision and that decision has been announced to the public. What impresses me about the Leader's hypocrisy is that, on the one hand, he complains about the STA's capacity to raise revenue while on the other he demands that the STA provide a better level of service for the community: those are two standards that the Leader and his colleagues cannot have. I have made it quite clear that fare increases will be considered by the Government and that they will form part of the new ticketing system, so there is a time lag available to us to make a final decision.

I am interested to know where the Leader gets his information. I suspect that if he had all the information and told the full story then another side of the coin would be revealed to everyone when the Government eventually makes that decision public. I am sure the people of South Australia

will acknowledge the reasonableness of the decision the Government eventually will make.

## SUBMARINE PROJECT

**Mr RANN:** Will the Premier say what action the State Government is taking to maximise South Australia's component of the \$4 billion submarine program? Does he share the view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition, who, on the day that the submarine project decision was announced, told the press he was disappointed that South Australia had not won more of this historic project?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I appreciate the honourable member's question, because it gives me the opportunity not only to outline, as the honourable member requests, what steps we are taking but also to perhaps give a message to our local industry. I must say that, after the high support this project enjoyed in the community—the cooperative work that took place involving the Chamber of Commerce and other employer groups, the United Trades and Labor Council, and so on—to actually get to the point where the construction site contract has been awarded (it is seen nationally and internationally as a significant feather in our cap and a cause for celebration) and to find the Leader of the Opposition saying that he is disappointed and throwing cold water on it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is what was said. There was the headline: 'Olsen disappointed'—a nice credibility factor. I would have thought that a more positive response was warranted and, indeed, we can make a more positive response. It is impossible at this stage to quantify exactly what South Australia's share will be, but we are sure that we will do better than any other State; and, depending on how we tackle it, we will get much more of that work than other people have anticipated.

To try to ensure that that happens, first, we are ensuring that, through interstate seminars, investment contacts and other quite vigorous activity being carried out by myself and by the Minister of State Development and Technology and his department, interstate business and industry understand our capacity and do things here. Secondly, and in some ways more importantly, we intend to repeat that exercise, particularly the investment seminar type of operation, here in South Australia and to point out to local business that the ball is in their court; the opportunities are there but they simply have to get going and take advantage of them.

Unfortunately, in too many instances local industry has come after the event and said, 'We think we could have done this; we put in a bit of a bid and don't seem to be doing too well.' Often in those cases the local industry has not tackled it with the same sense of purpose, the same energy or the same resources as those of some of their rivals interstate. It is vital that South Australian industry respond to the basic advantages being created, but they will not do so if they wait for contracts to drop into their laps. They have to get out there and chase them hard. The Government stands very ready to help them. The recently established Centre for Manufacturing will be a major source of work for local industry in the submarine area. It will be used by the Australian Submarine Corporation and others as a point of assessment of technology and will ultimately lead to contracts. In the Department of State Development we have recently established a Government Procurement and Defence Industry Branch which is, if you like, taking over the role the Submarine Task Force played in a specialised way,

and a director of that branch will be appointed shortly to head up a small team of four officers to exploit South Australian industry opportunities for this program. The industrial park at Woodville and other areas will reinforce this.

There is no question of the benefits that can come here. Work will begin shortly on the facility itself. There will be \$65 million worth of buildings and \$35 million worth of plant and equipment assembled at Port Adelaide. In October the ASC will move its offices from Sydney to Adelaide, and all of that will demonstrate that we are the centre of the project. I repeat: we should not be sitting back and, on the one hand, saying that we will just wait and it will all happen around us or, on the other hand, that we are disappointed, that we will not get as much as we thought, and isn't that too bad! We should be getting in there as a community, united, to get as much of that project as we can. The Government will do its bit. The challenge is there to local industry to respond.

### BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Minister of Transport's decision not to close the Belair-Bridgewater railway line have the support of all members of the STA board? At a meeting on Monday the Minister informed the board that he would stand 100 per cent behind the authority's decision to close the Belair-Bridgewater service. However, the following day, unbeknown to other board members, the Minister had some secret talks with one board member, Mr Lesses of the Trades and Labor Council, and made a deal which was later presented to the board as a *fait accompli*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Who's running it?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In fact, the unions are running it. Before last Monday's meeting I am informed that Mr Lesses had not attended a board meeting for a number of months. What particularly angers other board members is the fact that the Minister's about-face and the belated intervention of Mr Lesses again give the impression to the public that it is the union running the STA and not the board, irrespective of the merits of the dispute.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** It is nice to be back. It is interesting that, when there is something nice to be said about the STA, the board is running it, and when there is something nasty to be said, it is the Minister and the Government running it. Members opposite are selective in their criticism or praise. The final negotiations that resulted in the agreement reached were between the union and the Chairman of the STA and his General Manager and senior staff. Mr Lesses was there as Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. At the meeting I had in the morning with the unions Mr Lesses made quite clear at the start (he convened the meeting and I went along to see what they had to say) that, although he was wearing two hats in the sense that he was a member of the board and also Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, the meeting was exclusively within his role as Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council and that any further contact he had with the STA or the Government following up that meeting would be as Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council.

He made certain everyone understood that there was absolutely no conflict in his position. In fact, he is a ministerial appointee to the STA board, and I would welcome any check by members opposite with any of Mr Lesses' colleagues in the Trades and Labor Council, for without

doubt any such check would reveal Mr Lesses' honesty and his responsibility as member of the board. After discussions the union had with me, I convened a meeting between the unions, the Chairman of the board and senior members of the STA. The unions went along and negotiated with the Chairman of the board, and it seems strange that the Deputy Leader would want to criticise the authority of a very good Chairman, Mr Rump. As a result, extensive compromises were made by the union on its initial position. It put forward the proposition that we should have the Bureau of Transport Economics look at the viability of the service and I assure members that I would welcome such an inquiry as I know what the result would be.

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am interested that the member for Heysen interjects, along with the member for Davenport, who was also active earlier today. It so happens that I have a record of a meeting held on 28 November 1984 at which Messrs Evans, Wotton and (I am certain) Dean Brown were present. Five points were agreed at that meeting and relayed to the STA and the Government for consideration. First, the conclusions resulting from the involvement of the community were:

- (a) The Belair-Bridgewater train service should be removed and replaced, in part, by bus services.
- (b) Some poorly patronised bus services should also be removed.
- (c) Bus routes in the area should be reorganised.
- (d) Cooperative ventures between bus operators should be encouraged.

Here again, members opposite are very selective, and their historical perspective is very weak or their memory is defective. It is all very well for them to jump on the band wagon because the union movement in South Australia has dug its toes in.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask that the document to which the Minister has just referred be tabled, if it is a Government document.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is the document from which the honourable Minister has quoted part of an official docket?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** No, Mr Speaker. I have been around long enough not to fall for that, although members will recall that earlier in my career as Minister I did so. I suggest to the member for Heysen that it would be in his best interests not to have the document tabled. I am happy to let any member, including the member for Heysen, have a copy of the document, although there is no joy for the honourable member in that document.

In reply to the Deputy Leader, the final decision was made, with my knowledge, by the Chairman of the STA, who is the appropriate person with his senior officers to negotiate with the unions because, after all, the Chairman and those officers have the administrative responsibility for the STA and what contact the Chairman has with his officers is a matter that the honourable member can follow up if he wishes. The decision was made, and the service, involving one down in the morning and one back in the evening, should be running.

### TAFE EXPENDITURE

**Mr KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education say whether staffing numbers in the head office of the Department of Technical and Further Education will be examined as a result of the recommendations

of the Mills report? TAFE lecturers who have been to see me have complained that, although their conditions have changed, the number of head office staff has increased over the year and that, although the Mills report indicates that a reduction in such staff is possible, no action has been foreshadowed with respect to the size of the head office staff.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I appreciate receiving the question from the member for Todd, whose significant concern for the Department of TAFE and for the education offered by that department is well known and who I understand is a former PTI lecturer in that department. The Mills report on TAFE is being reviewed by the department, and I expect to receive recommendations on that. Indeed, most colleges in the system have already commented on it, and I have seen most of their responses. However, before the Mills report recommendations were being considered by the Department of TAFE, I had already sent a memorandum, dated 11 June, to the Director-General of TAFE requesting information on the strategies to be adopted to implement significant cuts in the central office budget. I have asked for strategy options on figures of both \$1 million and \$1.5 million for a full financial year. I expect to receive that information shortly, and I shall then consider what we should do in that regard.

I give this undertaking: to the extent in these tight financial times that cuts are implemented in the TAFE budget and other Government budgets, the cuts will be greater in the central office budget than in TAFE college budgets. Further, some furphies have been raised in this whole issue of the central office costs, especially by the Hon. Mr Lucas, a member of another place, who has quoted figures showing what seems to be an enormous growth in staff numbers between 1973 and 1987. He also quoted a percentage figure of about 16 per cent.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Mitcham says, 'That's right.' However, I ask members to look at the facts. In 1973, there was no staff in the central office to pay the salaries of TAFE personnel or to pay the accounts of the TAFE department, because such matters were under the Education Department salary figure, whereas in 1987 they are within the TAFE head count. Further, the Hon. Mr Lucas talks about 16 per cent of the TAFE budget being spent on central office administration. However, that 16 per cent includes a figure of \$8 million which is, in fact, college expenditure on items related to college operations: it is not a central office figure. If that sum is taken out of the 16 per cent, the result is a significant reduction in the head office component of the Department of TAFE.

Notwithstanding that the Hon. Mr Lucas and the member for Mitcham misled the community, we are concerned that any cutbacks within the Department of TAFE will affect all areas of TAFE. We will see a reduction in the head office budget and, as I have indicated, there will be greater reductions in that budget than in the operations of the TAFE college. That memorandum predates the statements made by the Hon. Mr Lucas; in fact, it predates consideration of the Mills report. It is a point of concern to this Government that TAFE is about delivering services in the field, not about supporting a bureaucracy which at this stage may be considered too heavy in the circumstances of the middle of the 1980s.

#### BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

**Mr INGERSON:** If the Minister of Transport says he knows the results of the study into the viability of the Belair

to Bridgewater railway, as he has just claimed, why is taxpayers' money being wasted on the study?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The Belair to Bridgewater service has been recommended for closure by the STA in each of the past four years. Obviously, at one time it had the support of certain people within the Hills area who had a leading responsibility—

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** If the member for Heysen wants to describe his support for such a project as rubbish, that is for him to say. All I am saying is that he is a bit inconsistent. I have stated quite clearly that the service between Belair and Bridgewater is amongst the most costly of the services of STA. The cheapest service is the Glenelg tram; the next cheapest is the bus service. People must understand that every service we run loses money—not one makes money. The dearest is the railway service and, of the rail services, the dearest is the Belair to Bridgewater service, because it is underpatronised. Logically, one would conclude that it is the most expensive service.

We have undertaken a number of internal studies as to the viability of that leg and for the past four years that recommendation has come forward. It might have come forward to Mr Wilson when he was Minister; I am not aware of that, but I would be surprised if that did not occur. On each occasion a political decision has been made by the Minister. My colleague the Minister of Marine made two decisions, and I made a political decision to continue the service despite the very good evidence that was available that there was no economic justification for its continuation. The figures and level of patronage have been made public on a number of occasions.

Therefore, when the request was put to me that the Bureau of Transport Economics should consider the situation, I was willing to write to the Minister for Transport, Communications, or the Minister for Land Transport and Infrastructure Support, whoever has the direct responsibility, and ask whether the Minister would direct the Bureau of Transport Economics to consider the viability of that line. I do not know whether or not that will occur. All I have been asked to do—and I have agreed—is to try to have the Bureau of Transport Economics consider the viability of that service. I am doing that, but I will not try to pre-empt what sort of economic assessment the bureau might make.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** For the benefit of members opposite I make clear that it would be fitting now for the Bureau of Transport Economics to undertake an independent review, so that when it presents its findings and South Australian people know how much they subsidise each passenger on that service, rather than me, the STA or the Government, it will be the federal body that independently advises South Australian taxpayers of the cost of that service. It will be an independent assessment or audit on the reviews that we have done and the decision that we have taken. If members opposite oppose that or if they feel that somehow or other it is not an acceptable thing for the Bureau of Transport Economics to do, one wonders why. I know and so does everybody else: they know that such a study will vindicate the decision made by the Government.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Heysen to order. The Chair was not impressed with the level of interjections during the question and the answer. Perhaps the Minister of Transport is fortunate in that he has a loud and clear voice and can be heard above inter-

jections: the member for Heysen is unfortunate inasmuch as he also has a loud and clear voice that makes it apparent where most of the interjections are coming from.

### SOUTHERN SUBURBS PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Mr TYLER:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether work within his department is proceeding to identify the long-term transport needs of metropolitan Adelaide? I have often been approached by constituents expressing their concern about the problem of public transport in the southern suburbs.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** It is amazing that members opposite laugh about something like that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Fisher will proceed with the question and will ignore interjections, which are out of order.

**Mr TYLER:** Many of these constituents have urged the Government to set up a wide-ranging review of the demands and role of Adelaide's public transport system that would take us into the 1990s. Although these constituents believe that the STA has served Adelaide well in the past, they argue that it is time for a review of this type to take place. The southern suburbs have changed drastically in the past four to five years. We have learned from the latest census figures and the latest population surveys from the Department of Environment and Planning that the population has grown, and that it is expected to continue to grow. This is particularly true of the Happy Valley council area and surrounding areas which comprise my electorate. My constituents understand the demands placed on the STA in trying to curtail its deficit. However, they believe that public transport should be justified.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The attention of the Chair was distracted for a moment, but I picked up the honourable member's argument (and again I use the word 'argument' deliberately), because it became clear to me as he continued that he was developing an argument that would be presented best in a grievance debate rather than in an explanation to the question.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question: as always he has gone to the heart of the matter. I welcome the question, particularly in light of the good editorial that appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser*, in that although it criticised the Government, it also drew to my attention, as Minister of Transport, the need for some comprehensive transport policy decision-making and some comprehensive transport policy research. The editorial quoted the recent PA Management Consultant's report, but I think, in fairness, the editorial should have reported that the Government has accepted the Collins report. The Government now is in the process of speaking to what one would term world experts in transport planning, so that we are able to ascertain those people whom we would like to take part in a future study in relation to Adelaide transport requirements for the late 1990s and in the twenty-first century, and that study will take place in the 1987-88 financial year.

In addition, the PA Management Consultants report recommended that the STA produce a business plan—I think that is essential—and work on that plan will start next week. So, work is being undertaken in those areas: first, the short-term recommendations that came out of the Collins report to make decisions that will impact upon the rapid growth in the size of the STA deficit; secondly, the need for a

business plan—Collins reported in the PA Management Consultants report that that should be available before the end of this year (we shall certainly try to achieve that timetable, and that is the Government's request of the STA); and the long-term study, which will consider not only metropolitan Adelaide public transport, but the total transport scene. All those things are happening and are of significant importance to the future planning of transport in South Australia.

However, while these decisions were being made I had already established within the Department of Transport the strategic planning group, which draws together planners from the STA, the Planning Division of the Department of Transport, and the Highways Department, to prepare a strategic plan relating to the key issues for transport in South Australia for the next decade. The process is well under way. It will involve discussions with the selected representatives of user groups and those affected by transport operations, investment programs, and cost. It will deal with transport all over South Australia in terms of economics as well as in terms of a commuter service. It will consider not only land transport but also marine and harbors involvement, and the involvement of our airports, etc. We hope to have some directions from that strategic planning group next year so that the Government can consider future strategies and decisions.

Those processes are under way, and thus we now have four very important procedures in train to study and to help in the decision-making process in regard to the public transport system. I want to reinforce what the *Advertiser* editorial stated, namely:

National and international economic trends must cause questioning of all Government spending, as the State is painfully realising. Not even the four pillars of State services—education, health, police and transport—can escape that questioning.

I think that that is a very critical point. The Government is committed to a viable, economic, relevant public transport system, but not at any price. Sooner or later a price barrier is reached, and I believe that the South Australian community feels that that has been reached. It wants the Government, the Minister of Transport, and the STA to run a more economically efficient transport system at less cost to the taxpayer. Every taxpayer in South Australia contributes to that shortfall in running costs and capital costs of the STA. What everyone in South Australia must understand is that, in trying to effect savings, one can do that by increasing fares, reducing services, or reducing overheads, or by means of a combination of the lot. When this happens one expects some criticisms—this always occurs, as everyone likes cuts in Government services so long as they fall on the other bloke. Well, in South Australia they are going to fall on all of us, and we are all going to have to take a share of the burden.

### METROPOLITAN RAIL SERVICES

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Has the Minister of Transport received recommendations from the State Transport Authority for major reductions in metropolitan rail services and, if so, which services are affected and when will the recommendations be implemented? A memorandum dated 22 June 1987 from the Chief Traffic Manager of the State Transport Authority to the authority's Chairman revealed plans to introduce major cuts in metropolitan rail services from May 1988. The memorandum stated that the recommendations to the Government would be finalised at the authority's July meeting. Since then proposals to cut services have been endorsed by the Premier, who was

reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* as having said that the State Government would have to consider phasing out the whole metropolitan rail system if Government subsidies to keep it going became too high, and Dr Scrafton, the Director-General of the Minister's own department, has said that the long-term future of rail passenger services in Adelaide lies with a concentration on two main routes—one to the south and the other to Gawler.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** As with the previous questions from the Opposition, this was a good try but it did not quite hit the mark. When we became aware of the very critical financial situation of the State budget, and when we became painfully aware of the rate of increase in the deficit of the State Transport Authority, the Chief Traffic Manager was asked to prepare some options that might be considered if we had to effect a certain degree of economy. This is a process that all departments go through.

The major decisions in relation to rail services have been made for the short term and within the resources available. The statement by the Director-General about railway services was in a philosophical sense, I suppose, or in a transport planner sense a reasonable proposition for him to put forward. Of course, the decisions will be made by the Government and the Parliament will then provide the funding. Any decision will be made on the basis of careful consideration, so I suggest that the honourable member should not worry herself unduly and, more particularly, should not try to worry commuters in South Australia by laying a few false trails from today's discussions.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** No, the Chief Traffic Manager has been required to give me, as Minister, and the board some ideas about what services would be affected to establish a certain level of savings. That does not mean that, once the board and I have looked at what those savings might mean, I will automatically pick them up. However, it is a very responsible move for the STA to continually review its services, to cost those services, to look at the budget available to it and at the overheads involved in running the operation and the capital costs, and to try to reach a suitable balance of all those things. If the honourable member selects one document from a whole series of documents which together give a full picture and tries to say that that is the policy of the STA, that shows what a negative Opposition we have and how long it is since she has been in government, because she has forgotten how the process works.

### SCHOOL SECURITY

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Education inform the House what steps the Government is taking to ensure that schools are reasonably protected from break-ins and vandalism? I ask this question following the recent \$40 000 vandalism damage to the Morphet Vale West Primary School in my electorate. The Chairman and Secretary of the school council and other members of the community have assured me that the very great efforts by the council, parents, staff and students have saved the Government considerable expense in relation to clean-up operations. The school now has a security patrol and a security system. However, there has been considerable comment in both the print and electronic media about current levels of school security. In light of the recent spate of attacks on school property, what steps is the Government taking to protect schools?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for raising this issue, which is of concern to all members.

I want to place on record my appreciation of the efforts undertaken by the school community, parents, friends, students and teachers of the Morphet Vale West Primary School following the recent acts of vandalism which received wide publicity indeed.

I can assure the honourable member and the House that the Education Department and the Department of Housing and Construction have embarked over recent years on a very substantial program to provide greater security for our schools. Obviously one cannot, unfortunately, eliminate acts of vandalism, arson and similar antisocial behaviour on school properties. The Education Department alone has 1 000 sites across this State, and the maintenance of security over those sites is a very substantial task and a very substantial cost to the taxpayer.

In 1985-86 the cost of vandalism to the Department of Housing and Construction was \$1.67 million, which, in 1986-87, was reduced to \$1.463 million. During the 1980s there has been a very substantial reduction in the number of acts of arson in our schools, but we know that there has been an increase in the incidence of vandalism, breaking and entering and similar offences against the property in our schools, and that is a very real concern.

Over recent years we have embarked on a program of installing silent monitor alarm systems connected to a central security control room, which is manned 24 hours a day. This has helped markedly to reduce vandalism in schools. We have also instituted overnight patrols of selected high risk schools. That is seven days a week, and during daylight hours on weekends and holidays. Surveys of schools have been conducted to determine the security measures required, including security lighting and secure rooms for valuable, attractive, resaleable items. We have also established one-off patrolling exercises. Further, we have provided security keying systems in extremely high risk areas.

So, a good deal of attention and resources have been allocated in recent times to this issue. However, the raising of this as a public issue in an irresponsible way seems, unfortunately, to incite others in our community to perpetrate similar acts of vandalism, and after the recent publicity given to acts of vandalism there appears to have been a spate of similar acts across the State.

One can never say that they are related, but it does raise the issue of how this matter is dealt with in the public arena. Obviously, public attention must be drawn in appropriate ways to the increasing incidence of this form of behaviour, as we have to eliminate it. It will not be simply by the measures I have mentioned, but by the changing of attitudes of young people, their parents, and the community as a whole to a range of leisure time activities and the like.

Finally, in thanking the people at Morphet Vale West, I mention that I phoned that school a couple of days after this incident and spoke to children who were staffing the school office whilst parents, teachers and others were repairing the damage that had been done. I spoke to those children about this, so I am vividly aware of the sadness that this type of incident brings to students, in particular, and I call upon the community of this State to do whatever it can to assist us in minimising acts of vandalism in our schools.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister of Transport reject STA recommendations that buses should have fewer seats and more standing room, so that patronage of metropolitan bus services does not decline even further? The latest official STA figures that are available show that



patronage of metropolitan bus services has declined since this Government took office—a fact that has been put down to escalating fares. However, the travelling public now face the prospect not only of yet another price rise but of much less comfort on the buses, with the decision of the STA to seek an agreement with bus drivers to have fewer seats and more standing room in return for a pay rise. Public reaction to this proposal has demonstrated that, if it is implemented, fewer people will use the buses, adding to the financial crisis already faced by the STA and putting even more pressure on the metropolitan road system at peak hours. As the Minister is required—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will not continue with a line of argument as part of his explanation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** One follows the other—it is a statement of fact, Sir. As the Minister is required to agree to any STA proposal for pay rises, it is assumed that he has endorsed this decision. If he has, I ask him to immediately reverse it.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** So that the honourable member is aware of the process that has taken place as a result of the national wage case decision, let me inform him that part of that decision is a second tier 4 per cent negotiated trade-off, if you wish, between the unions and the employer, so that we have a productivity gain for whatever increase the unions might get. This is the procedure followed by all employers in Australia in this negotiating process. Among the number of savings that the STA has identified and put on the table for negotiation with the claims the unions have put on is an opportunity to carry the same number of passengers with fewer vehicles.

The member for Light does not understand how public transport works. He suggests that, because we lose money on every passenger we take, particularly in the peak hour, with more passengers we have to have more buses, employ more people and therefore lose more money. One can justify that, but a whole lot of other benefits flow to the community as a result of a public transport system. That is why Governments strongly favour the deficit funding of public transport systems. In comparing the STA level of service here, as opposed to the level of service provided in other Australian cities and in cities in other parts of the world, anyone who has had the opportunity of looking at other transport systems would have to agree that we in Adelaide provide the highest level of service anywhere: that is, we provide more seats for passengers than are provided elsewhere.

If the honourable member wants to make a comparison, he will find that the ratio of seats to standees is greatly in favour of seats in South Australia as against other cities. The alternative to doing that, for the benefit of the honourable member, would be to look at taking buses out of service. That is the alternative, because the STA this year is faced with less funding to manage its operation than it has had in previous years. Difficult decisions must be made.

Members opposite are calling on the Government to reduce the level of services, to reduce the cost of government, but when they have an opportunity to support measures that will do that they complain. They cannot have it both ways. It is part of the negotiations taking place now. There is no certainty that that will come out of the negotiations, but there is no problem, in times of very difficult financial stress, in seeking to have South Australian commuters accept a level of service in public transport that is taken for granted elsewhere. We have traditionally had a better service.

Times are different now, and times are difficult, and we must look at South Australia providing the same level of service as is provided elsewhere. That may mean that in

the public transport system we will have more people standing and fewer people sitting. I hope that that will not be the case, but I point out that it is a possibility.

### METROPOLITAN MILK BOARD

**Mr GREGORY:** Has the Minister of Agriculture received a report from the Metropolitan Milk Board on the structure of milk pricing and, if so, what is the status of that report and when will the Minister be advising of his decision on the recommendations contained in it? Members will recall that in April this year Cabinet agreed to an increase in the fixed price of milk from 72c to 75c per litre and it was also agreed that the Milk Board should review the retail price mechanism and report back to the Minister. The Leader of the Opposition is telling the public today that the Government is going to deregulate milk prices completely.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am pleased to report to the House that the Metropolitan Milk Board has completed its review, which was originally to be completed by the end of June, but the board requested a further extension to the end of July, and that was granted. As a consequence, the extension of time has allowed for submissions from the public to be digested and prepared for the board in its review. The board's report will be considered by Cabinet, in accordance with protocol, and the details will be dealt with by Cabinet. On completion of that consideration the report will be made available.

Meanwhile, I make no apology for my position in regard to the debate that has occurred within the community on milk pricing and the issues of deregulation. I did so in the belief that some balance must be given for the community to see both sides of the argument in regard to the milk pricing structure that we enjoy in the metropolitan area. I find it rather surprising to hear the Leader of the Opposition state that his Party is going to take a view which, prior to the Milk Board's report being announced and its review being made public, indicates that it is not interested in the extensive review conducted by the Milk Board or the submissions received by the board over the past few months.

It is interesting to note that the Opposition has pre-empted any consideration of the review by the public. I also find it slightly hypocritical that a Party that runs on a platform of Government deregulation should adopt a position which indicates a narrow and blinkered view in regard to review of regulation before the Government has had an opportunity to put before the House or the community at large the Milk Board's review of these regulations. It is quite obvious that the situation the Liberal Party adopts ignores the facts and the debate—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Ignores the free market.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Yes, and ignores the free market. It wants a system that retains the regulations and does not bother to review them when they are being considered by an independent body. That is rather extraordinary, but I am delighted to say that the Milk Board review will be made available once Cabinet has considered it.

### MILK DELIVERIES

**Mr GUNN:** I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, and hope that he can make a better job of answering this one. Since Adelaide has the cheapest milk in Australia, and any action to interfere with the current pricing arrangement would jeopardise deliveries to 128 000 homes daily and put at risk the livelihood of more than 200 milk vendors, obviously the Minister—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Obviously, the Minister of Labour, who is interjecting, has no regard for the people who have milk delivered to their homes. That is the sort of arrogant attitude we have come to expect from this Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Eyre is fully aware that he is totally out of order.

**Mr GUNN:** I apologise, Sir. I was provoked. I will continue with my question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Provocation is not necessarily accepted as an excuse by the football tribunal, nor necessarily by the Chair.

**Mr GUNN:** Will the Minister immediately make public the report he has received from the Milk Board on milk prices and give an assurance that the Government will not interfere with current pricing arrangements? Many groups, companies and organisations are involved in the distribution and production of milk. Members on this side of the House believe that such people should have an opportunity to consider the report before it is made public so that they can make representations to the Minister if they wish.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I believe that I have answered this question, and I leave my answer as it stood in a previous answer to a question from the member for Florey.

### NATIONAL TOOLING CENTRE

**Mr De LAINE:** My question is directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham can ask a question later if he wishes. He should not interrupt someone else's question.

**Mr De LAINE:** Can the Minister indicate the probable effect of the General Motors-Holden's (Woodville) tooling plant proposal when that proposal is taken up and the plant becomes a national tooling resource? Some small tooling companies in the Woodville area have expressed concern about the possible impact on them when this national tooling resource becomes a reality.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question. At all stages of this proposal to develop the Woodville facility into a national tooling centre, consideration has been given to the impact of such a centre on other sections of the tooling industry not only in South Australia but in Australia at large. The national tooling centre proposal would certainly see not a diminution in the business available to other toolmakers in South Australia but an enhancement, as it would increase generally the demand for tooling capacity in South Australia. The tooling centre proposal, based on the tool room of GMH at Woodville, is worked on the premise that we have there the tooling skills, the equipment, and the demand, especially in the light of the lower value of the Australian dollar compared to that of previous years. We now have the capacity to see that tool room turned into a national tooling facility and not just a State tooling facility: indeed, even one that has a capacity to export.

In that context, certain options have been considered over the past 18 months or so and, in particular, one investor has been the subject of recent significant discussions. Those discussions have not been successful and the Holden Motor Corporation is making an announcement in that regard this afternoon. However, at all stages other options have been considered and those other options remain within the focus of our concern. It is the active concern of this Government, of the Holden Motor Corporation, and of others in the

South Australian industry to see the national tooling centre facility advanced. In that context, significant discussions have had to take place with key players, and I pay special credit on this occasion to the role played by the unions involved.

Tooling is a vastly changing area. As technology changes its sphere of activity, so do the skills and the nature of the employment requirements change. The way in which unions have entered into discussions on this matter over the past 18 months and come up with new flexible responses to the changing demands of the tooling industry has been especially noteworthy and has helped us reach the high level of interest that we have already achieved from overseas investors in this tooling centre proposal.

I hope to be able to advise the House in due course about further options that will be discussed. However, the Holden Motor Corporation has advised today that it has fully supported plans to keep tooling capacity in South Australia and that it intends to continue its Woodville tooling operations. Further, it has confirmed that it has substantial forward business and a forward workload for the time ahead.

### WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Can the Minister of Labour say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to amend South Australia's new workers compensation scheme even before it comes into operation and, if it does, why? I have been reliably informed that the Government is already considering amending this legislation even though the new scheme will not operate until next month. Considerable uncertainty and concern is now being voiced by many businesses which have found that they will be worse off under the new scheme than they were previously. Today, the Employers Federation has said that the Government has yet to clearly establish that the premiums to be charged will properly fund the scheme and it also fears that the massive liabilities, fraud and abuse already being experienced by Victoria's new compensation scheme will be repeated here. Members are well aware that the Victorian scheme is over \$1 billion in debt and has liabilities of that magnitude after less than two years of operation. In seeking assurances from the Minister that this will not occur in South Australia, I ask him to reveal whether our legislation is already under review and to be amended even before the new scheme starts to operate.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I should be surprised if a session goes by from now until we are all finished here when we will not be amending the Workers Compensation Corporation Act in some way or other, the same as we amend the industrial conciliation and arbitration legislation or any other legislation. This Act will be amended as required and, obviously, Parliament will have the chance to debate that amendment. Concerning the comments of the Employers Federation, because they are made by the federation I automatically discount them. The federation has a style of operation which certainly does not appeal to me and it is totally out of touch with the major employers of South Australia. The Workers Compensation Corporation board consists, in part, of six representatives of employers, of whom a prominent member of the Employers Federation is one. All the major decisions taken by that board up to the present have been unanimous, including the decision to establish the levies that comprise the premium rates.

Concerning Victoria, I trust that the honourable member will ask me a question on that matter next week, when I

shall be happy to go through the differences between our scheme and the Victorian scheme. Before passing our legislation, we had the benefit of 12 months experience of the Victorian scheme, so we have been able to avoid many of the problems experienced in Victoria. In two years operation, the Victorian scheme has saved Victorian employers \$2 billion in premiums and, to my knowledge, no employer in Victoria has requested a return to the previous system of workers compensation by private insurance. Indeed, although Victorian employers are asking that the present scheme be amended, none is asking that that scheme be abolished and that workers compensation revert back to private insurance.

Finally, the South Australian levies have been set by a unanimous decision of the board, which includes a senior representative of South Australian industry who is a senior official of the Employers Federation. Those levies will save South Australian employers \$30 million in workers compensation premiums. Without doubt, the legislation will be amended from time to time and, when it is to be amended, the normal parliamentary procedures will be followed.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY LINE

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Earlier today, during Question Time, the Minister of Transport referred to a meeting (I am not sure which meeting, but it was held in the Hills) and he said that at that meeting I, with other members of Parliament, had supported the closing of the Bridgewater railway line or a discontinuation of that service. As has been the case with the previous member for Davenport (Mr Brown) and the member for Heysen (Mr Wotton), on any committees on which I have sat over the years I have participated in order to make an input from a knowledge of the area and on the request and requirements of constituents. In my own case, at no time have I had a vote or sought a vote on any issue, because that was not the purpose of my participation.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** At public meetings, as the member for Heysen says, we were not given the opportunity. We were there to make a contribution if asked to do so, or if we desired. Proof to members that I have never, at any time in my career of some 20 years, supported the closure of that line is that, in fact, a trade union made a financial contribution to my campaign at the last election—and that fact was made public by the trade union involved and by me—because of my strong support for the retention of that line and the extension of the STA bus service to those areas of the Hills that were not provided with a service. Those areas suffer the worst climatic conditions in the State. The Minister is not present in the House now; he has decided to leave, but he might have achieved his goal of getting into print before I made a personal explanation and having the press say that Evans, Wotton and Brown support the closure of the line.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! For the last minute and a half the honourable member has been straying from the proper procedures for making a personal explanation.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** In explaining my position in this case I make the point that I was unable to correct the situation when the Minister made the statement. Standing Orders

denied me that opportunity, so I am taking that action now, pointing out to the House that my personal situation is such that I am disadvantaged by that procedure. I am not blaming anyone for that, but I make the point that the Minister's remark will work to my detriment, as an individual, in the press, because I could not correct his statement beforehand. I make the point again to the House: I have never supported the closure of the railway service for passengers from Belair to Mount Lofty or Bridgewater, and I never will, because I believe that that service will be an important part of the transport system for the Hills section in years to come, even though that is a narrow point of view expressed by others at present.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Earlier today I, too, was accused by the Minister of Transport of, at some stage, supporting the closure of the Bridgewater line. The first point to make—and again I emphasise the point that has been made by the member for Davenport—is that no opportunity was provided for me to explain the situation at the time. The Minister made that statement, and it is important that I set the record straight. Earlier today when I sought leave through a point of order to have the Minister table the docket that he was reading, I was told that it was not an official docket. I went across to have a look at it, and it was, in fact, a photostat copy of an official Government docket. I now formally request the Minister—who, as it happens, has not even had the decency to stay in the Chamber to hear points made about the statements he made earlier today—to provide me with a full copy of the material from which he was quoting and I will be happy to follow up the matter at a later stage.

I am unaware of the meeting or the meetings to which the Minister referred. I, like the member for Davenport, was invited to attend a couple of meetings that were held in the Stirling council area to discuss the STA transport policy relating to the Stirling Hills. At that time the STA was very strongly in favour of closing the Bridgewater line and made that very obvious. I point out that I became the member for that part of the electorate that covers the Bridgewater/Stirling/Upper Sturt area only at the last election in 1985, and since that time I have been even more supportive than previously of the need to retain the Bridgewater to Belair railway service. I was extremely vocal in support of the retention of the railway when the STA, in 1984 and 1985, wanted to close the line. It was at that time that the then Minister of Transport, Mr Abbott, reversed the decision of the STA, which meant that the service was retained.

It was rather ironic that at that time the present Minister of Transport was the Minister of Tourism, and he came out strongly in support of the Minister of Transport; in fact, he congratulated the Minister of Transport on the stand that he had taken and said that he would do all he possibly could as Minister of Tourism to promote the Bridgewater line. We all know that in fact they have not done a thing to promote that service.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Heysen is straining the tolerance of the Chair to an unacceptable degree. A personal explanation is merely supposed to set the record straight where a member believes he has been misrepresented, and the honourable member should confine his remarks to that area.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I want to make the point strongly, and to set the record straight, that I have always supported the retention of the Bridgewater line, and I will

always continue to do so. In fact, it was quite wrong of the Minister—and that is putting it very mildly—to stand up in this House and accuse me of taking action and promoting a point of view that I have never promoted with regard to the closure of that line. It is no wonder that the STA has a tremendous deficit if it expects its members to be spending so much time—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The remarks that the honourable member is making are remarks that could be made in a variety of other debates in the Chamber but not in a personal explanation.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister was quoting today from a ministerial document, and I presume that it was a ministerial docket that was provided to him through the STA. I do not know that; I will know that only when the opportunity is provided for me to look at it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, after it has been edited and everything else, I presume. The point I am making is that obviously the Minister has requested the STA to dig out that information. It must have taken a long time to sort through all those old dockets to find any way in which another member of Parliament could be implicated. In fact, all members opposite are trying to do is get themselves out of the very sticky situation in which they now find themselves.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I withdraw leave. That last remark was completely out of order. In a personal explanation, an honourable member is supposed to place on the record the true facts of the situation as to how he has been misrepresented and not to criticise or have a serve at any other member.

**Mr LEWIS:** I rise on a point of order. I was unable to attract your attention a little earlier, Mr Speaker. I rise to have you define or clarify for me—whichever you please—whether or not a photocopied page of a ministerial docket used by a Minister in the House, and from which he quoted directly, represents a breach of the Standing Order which requires him, on request of another member, to table the full docket.

**The SPEAKER:** I sought an assurance from the honourable Minister that the document from which he quoted did not constitute an integral part of a Government docket. I was given an assurance that it did not.

**Mr LEWIS:** Given that the member for Heysen, on examining that document, believed it to be a photocopy of a sheet from a Government Minister's docket, will you, Mr Speaker, undertake to investigate the truth or otherwise of the Minister's response, in that he might have mistakenly believed at the time that he had a way out by stating that it was not a docket when in fact it was a photocopy of a docket and therefore, in the case of evidence in court, it is accepted as being the same as the original?

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member can, if he wishes, give notice of a substantive motion in that regard, but I will not take it upon myself in these sorts of circumstances to question the integrity of individual members, which is what the honourable member for Murray-Mallee is suggesting that I should do.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, as I understood the request by the member for Murray-Mallee it is for you to rule whether a Minister is quoting, under the terms of the Standing Orders, from a docket that must be tabled if he is quoting from a photostat copy of the docket. By way of explaining the point of order, there is precedent where Ministers have been required to table material which copies official dockets. As I understood the situation, the Minister said that he was not quoting

from a docket but, rather, he was quoting from a photostat. Clearly, that is precisely the same as quoting from the docket: the material is precisely the same. It is a photostat and, in those circumstances, past precedent has dictated that that information must be tabled.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member would be aware that we are in a grey area here in relation to what constitutes and what does not constitute part of an official docket. Frequently members have briefing notes prepared. If a member of their staff has jotted down on a piece of paper some items of information that may have come from a Government docket, that does not constitute part of a docket. If, in the process of writing their summary, they have photocopied paragraphs or sections of a docket, I am not of the view that that constitutes part of the docket either. However, if a page of a document was taken out of the file or folder and physically brought in, I believe that that would constitute part of the docket.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** But a photostat of a page would not?

**The SPEAKER:** There is a very fine line here, but it is the view of the Chair (and it is my ruling) that it would not constitute part of the docket.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would not want the proceedings of this afternoon's opening to get to the point of a vote of disagreement with your ruling, but I would ask you to give due consideration to a decision of Speaker Hurst in this House in 1971 when the then Premier of the State (Hon. D.A. Dunstan) was quoting from a consolidation of documents (it being a review of all of the documents that related to the previous Government) being put into fixed page folders relative to specific subjects. For example, land tax was the issue and every document that had been handled by the Liberal Party in government between 1968 and 1970 had been put into a general land tax document. Everything that related to transport had been put into a transport document.

The Hon. D.A. Dunstan, standing in this House and quoting a document in that consolidated form, was challenged from this side of the House and, much against his own grain but with the support of the then Speaker, he was advised that any full document consolidated and quoted from in this House was an official document. That file was tabled and remains part of the record of this House. I believe that that is a form of decision that is totally consistent with subsequent decisions that have been taken in this House. I ask you to give due consideration to those events when you review the activities of today and the questions that have been put to you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I thank the honourable member for Light for his contribution. The Chair is not directed by the rulings of previous Speakers. However, the Chair is in a position to be guided by them, and I do not wish on this occasion to be at variance with those rulings of previous Speakers. I propose that this matter be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, where it can be dealt with at greater length than can be the case today.

## SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, Mrs Appleby, and Messrs Eastick, Ferguson and Oswald.

Printing: Mrs Appleby, and Messrs S.J. Baker, De Laine, Ingerson, and Rann.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I move: That for this session a Library Committee be not appointed.

Very briefly, following the proclamation of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act and the assumption of responsibility for the Library staff by the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, the continued appointment of a Library Committee would create a duplication of responsibility. I understand the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee has appointed or will be appointing a subcommittee to oversee those policy matters which rightly will continue to require attention, and has therefore requested that the House repeal the appropriate Standing Order. In due course the Standing Orders undoubtedly will recommend that course to the House. However, in the meantime Standing Order 406 provides an 'out' in that the House may order that a Library Committee not be appointed, and that is the purpose of my motion.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier)** brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In doing so, I add my regret to that of the Governor in expressing my condolences on the passing of Don Simmons and Ron Loveday, two fine members of Parliament, two fine South Australians, and two men who made a fine contribution to their local communities and to the Australian Labor Party. Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have, during the previous session, expressed the sympathy of the House to the families of Don Simmons and Ron Loveday. I endorse the sentiments that were expressed at that time.

Also, may I welcome back to the House two members who have been ill over the break. First, the member for Playford returns to the House after a serious operation, from which I understand that he has recovered well. I wish him well in the weeks and months ahead. Secondly, I wish the member for Alexandra well after his unfortunate accident; he is with us again today, although on one leg.

Today I wish to speak about the South Australian economy, and I begin by making some reference to daily newspaper headlines: for example, 'South Australia out to capitalise on successful navy tender', the *Australian*, 28 July 1987; 'Singapore companies may invest millions of dollars in residential and commercial development in Adelaide', the *News*, 7 July 1987; 'Bannon uses subs to lure investors', the *Australian*, 17 July 1987; 'Firms record interest in South Australia', the *News*, 22 July 1987; 'New South Australian envoy sees big Europe market', the *Advertiser*, 2 May 1986; 'Bannon signs Japanese investment pack', the *Advertiser*, 9 May 1987.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Adelaide to resume his seat. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to observe the courtesies of the House, and to allow the member for Adelaide to address the House uninterrupted.

**Mr DUGAN:** Further, a headline in the *Australian* of 3 February 1987 stated 'ACT endorses proposal to boost for-

eign investment through industrial agreements with the trade union movement'. One can contrast these positive, energetic, and optimistic views of the future of the South Australian economy with what we have heard from the Opposition. On 29 July 1987 the Leader of the Opposition said that South Australia was 'suffering from an alarming investment drought'. He said that Labor's policies were acting as 'a major disincentive to investment'. On 18 June 1987, in commenting on media speculation on the Entertainment Centre, the Leader of the Opposition talked about 'the emptiness of Mr Bannon's promises'. On 9 July 1987, when making a comment on the Federal election, the Leader of the Opposition talked about 'the Government's blank cheque approach to the South Australian economy which will end up in it being crushed'. He said that Labor's policies discriminated against industries such as the motor vehicle, manufacturing, wine-making, and tourism industries. He said that South Australia was 'lagging behind the rest of Australia'. Those are pessimistic and gloomy predictions of an uncertain future with no hope, no promise, and no confidence.

Having referred to individual news items in our daily papers, I now turn to what the magazines are saying about South Australia. For example, the *Overseas Trading Magazine* of May 1987 stated, under the general heading 'South Australia sets high goals':

South Australia, by far Australia's worst geographically placed State for freighting goods overseas, is fast getting its export act together, and this is happening despite its not having the broad industrial base of New South Wales or Victoria, the tourist potential of Queensland, or the high flying entrepreneurs of Western Australia.

Further, on 20 March 1987 the *Engineering Industry Review*, published by the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia, heralded and applauded what it called 'Two important developments for the manufacturing industry': first, the establishment of the Centre of Manufacturing at Woodville and, secondly, the establishment of Manufacturing Week. In its newsletter of June 1987 the *Engineering Industry Review* congratulated the South Australian Government for pursuing the submarine project so vigorously. The following is a quote from that review:

But the facts simply are that the ability of employers and unions (and Government) in this State to work together has been an implicit strength of ours for many years, far more explicit in the case of the submarine project.

I now refer to comments about South Australia that some other journals have recorded. The *Business Review Weekly* of 3 April 1987 contained a whole series of articles about South Australia under the heading 'Industrial program to restructure economy'. The subheading to that story read: 'A good business climate is helping them move away from a dependence on agriculture and low tech manufacturing.' There were other optimistic headlines to articles, such as 'High hopes on the waterfront' and 'Deregulation brings dynamic financing'. Again, one should compare those with what the Leader of the Opposition has said over the period since Parliament went into recess, such as, 'Investment drought in South Australia', 'Bannon to crush the South Australian economy' and 'Bannon full of empty promises'—nothing but doom and pessimism. Not one optimistic thing at all has been said about the South Australian economy or about what has been achieved over the past four or five years or about what is in store for South Australia.

In going back over the press clippings in the Library and referring to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, and in analysing a little more closely his scaremongering assertions, it was very interesting to note that over the past 12 or 18 months there have been newspaper reports

of the Minister of State Development and Technology having been involved in—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! One can hardly hear what the honourable member is saying because of the barracking that is going on across from one side of the House to the other. I hope that we are going to start off this session in the right and proper way. I ask honourable members to show the normal courtesies; I will extend that courtesy to both sides of the House so that a member can be heard in relative silence. The honourable member for Adelaide.

**Mr DUGAN:** Newspaper reports of the past 12 or 18 months indicate that the Minister of State Development and Technology has been involved in major promotional seminars: for example, in Singapore in July 1987, March 1987, and December 1986; in Hong Kong in October 1986 and January of 1987—

**Mr Lewis:** You are not reading this, are you?

**Mr DUGAN:** Extensive notes—the honourable member ought to go to the Library and have a look at them. Further, the Minister of State Development and Technology was involved in a major promotional seminar with banking, defence and high technology industry leaders in Los Angeles in June 1986, and with Japanese industrialist investors in June 1986, and he is further reported as going on a visit to China in September 1987 followed by a further trip to Hong Kong.

In February 1987 I noted a changed thrust given by the Government to the South Australian Agent-General's Office in London to further open up and develop trade links between South Australian companies and the markets of Great Britain and Western Europe and, in particular, to develop the links with the countries of the EEC. I also noted the intensive investment, advisory, and promotional tours that have been undertaken by the Premier in Japan. On 9 May 1987 the *Advertiser* reported that the State Government and the Long Term Credit Bank of Japan had signed an agreement to promote Japanese investment in South Australia.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Adelaide will resume his seat. I warn the honourable member for Murray-Mallee. I take this to be absolutely serious. I am sincere when I say that the affairs of this House will be conducted properly. I point out to the honourable member that this is his first warning. The honourable member for Adelaide.

**Mr DUGAN:** In April 1986 the *Advertiser* reported the Premier's having signed a major agreement in Japan aimed at boosting trade and investment between South Australia and Japan through the Bank of Tokyo. These activities were in addition to the promotional lectures given to the Japanese Investment Mission that was here in South Australia in February 1987.

At the end of July 1987, that is, last month, the benefits of South Australia's major investment thrust into the Chinese market began to bear fruit, with the Premier being involved in the opening of the Email factory in Tianjin. We must not forget the two promotional investment visits made to Sweden in June 1986 and May-June 1987 by the Premier. Furthermore, in Australia, representatives of 350 firms in Sydney and 250 delegates in Melbourne attended major seminars on investment potential in South Australia. Both seminars were sell-outs.

In contrast to that active and energetic promotion of South Australia and its investment opportunities in Central and Northern Europe, in East, South-East and Southern Asia, North America, and on the eastern seaboard of Aus-

tralia, I point out that I did not come across one single reference in the Library to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition or by any member of the State Liberal Party of South Australia in relation to South Australia's being involved in any promotional campaign for this State or in relation to trying to engender interest and participation in South Australia's economy, either now or in the future. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes—in my opinion quite wrongly—to go around as a purveyor of pessimism and a prophet of doom in relation to the future of the South Australian economy, then at least he ought to follow up his negative and carping criticism of the State's economic performance by going out and actively promoting and encouraging those people who he believes could make a major contribution to the South Australian economy to do so.

I am sure that he would find great difficulty in getting any audience at all because of the way in which South Australia is being viewed on the national scene for its economic management, its economic revitalisation, its restructuring, and the soundness of its economic management. As many members would be aware, in recent months special features on South Australia have been featured in the *Financial Review* and the *Australian*, and I have already referred to the special feature that was published in the *Business Review Weekly* in April 1987. All of those articles have been optimistic and positive about the encouraging growth in South Australia, the encouraging employment growth and the Government's commitment to restructuring South Australia's manufacturing base. The lead article in the special South Australian feature in the *Financial Review* of 16 March 1987 said:

The Bannon Government's initiative to improve the underlying structure of the economy is beginning to bear fruit.

It concluded by saying:

The economic gains being made in South Australia are resulting in a structurally healthier economy than existed prior to the 1980s. While wishing to spend much of the time that is available to me today in considering what has, in fact, been happening in terms of the restructuring of South Australia's manufacturing industry, it would be inappropriate for me to just gloss over the other major areas of economic activity occurring in this State as a result of major investment by local, national, and international companies that is making a significant contribution to the revitalisation of the South Australian economy.

In the same *Financial Review* special of earlier this year under the heading 'Tourist industry hits a new high', it reported nearly \$200 million worth of investments in places throughout South Australia as diverse as Victor Harbor, Porter Bay, Goolwa and the Clare Valley. A lead article by Peter Ward, which appeared in the *Australian* in March 1987, states:

South Australia is poised to capture a big high-tech industrial development and is making a dramatic bid for national and international tourism dollars to an annual value of \$1 billion.

The *Australian* article on tourism indicated that in the 1985-86 financial year 3.7 million people travelled to and within South Australia, generating a staggering \$800 million worth of economic activity which supported 27 000 jobs and, as the South Australian tourism plan has indicated, that encouraging experience of 1985-86 simply demonstrates that South Australia is capable of achieving strong growth and that further development of the tourism market and an enhancement of its market image is required for the State to remain competitive.

The *Australian* article also spoke about investment in the fishing industry and the fact that South Australia's processing companies are entrepreneurial and have pioneered what is called 'niche marketing' in the United States, Japan and

other Asian countries. Niche marketing is an example of the 'thinking smart' strategy which is being urged on the managers of all Australian businesses to identify export markets and to fulfil orders for those export markets with quality goods in a fast and efficient manner.

The point of referring to these articles is that over the past 12 or 15 months there has been one positive story after another about the effort and initiative being taken by the South Australian Government, by groups of businessmen, by industry leaders and by public officials in promoting South Australia and in encouraging the development of opportunity and investment in South Australia, all of which is bearing fruit. In that time we have either heard nothing from the Opposition or (as in the case of the statement made at the end of July by the Leader of the Opposition in an article which probably deserved about as much space as the *Advertiser* gave it) that the South Australian economy was in the doldrums and there was an investment drought.

A more recent article in the *Advertiser* concentrating on the Leader of the Opposition indicated his desire to establish new policies and to re-invigorate the Opposition. I would suggest that the first policy that he could examine and consequently discard is his policy of down-playing and talking down the South Australian economy. His statements about an alarming investment drought in South Australia are about 18 months too late and put at risk the continuing business confidence that South Australia is now experiencing. It is a confidence that the business community wishes to see displayed on both sides of politics.

All the Opposition will do with these sorts of statements is undermine the major economic restructuring task which confronts the South Australian Government and which will confront any South Australian Government faced with negative statements about lack of opportunities. It simply does not stack up against the facts, against the perceptions of people, or against the optimism abroad within the South Australian business community that South Australia is doing well, has got a bright future, can improve and that there are opportunities here. Neither does it stack up against the confidence that overseas and interstate investors are displaying in South Australia.

The Leader's statements have nothing to offer in terms of encouraging investment in this State. Nothing he has said is likely to encourage investment here. Why the Opposition wishes to paint this picture of South Australia as an economic backwater has me baffled. They should, like all South Australians, be rejoicing in the new confidence that is being expressed in South Australia as an excellent base for the export industry, expressing confidence in the increasing value of our exports and the wide range of manufacturing products which come from this State, in the massive investment that is going on in the tourism industry, in the substantial investment that is going on in the minerals area of our economy and the extraordinary investment that is going on in the non-residential building areas of the State's economy (particularly in the Adelaide City Council area), and the substantial investment that is being made by the South Australian Government and by a variety of firms in trying to improve South Australia's industrial base by gearing it up for a technology-based future.

I have been referring to a variety of articles that appeared in daily newspapers and various journals. I turn now briefly to the South Australian economy and statements prepared by the State Bank. Every member of the House receives the quarterly notes on the Australian and South Australian economy prepared by the State Bank: they deserve very close reading. Before doing so, there is one other reference which I wish to bring to members' attention, which appeared

in the *Business Review Weekly* of 3 April 1987, and which was a lead article by Tony Thomas, as follows:

South Australia has embarked on a transformation of its economy so it meets world competitive standards of manufacturing and research. With the expansion of mineral output to more than \$1 billion turnover in the latest financial year, and a new industrialisation program, the State is rapidly moving away from its former dependence on agriculture and low-tech manufacturing operations.

The State has two main attractions for business: a low record of industrial dispute makes it a tempting location for many businesses that have been hurt by strikes and bans in other States; and the Bannon Government is also noted for having good rapport with business, for its eagerness to help with infrastructure for start-up enterprises and its dislike of red tape.

That was the introduction to what ended up being a series of articles about the way in which South Australian business is confident of its future, is investing in its future, both in optimism and with real money, and a whole series of articles talking about the high level of cooperation between business and Government in investment in South Australia.

One of the articles in the *Business Review Weekly* series acknowledged that there were four main features of the Government's attempt to revitalise the manufacturing infrastructure of the State's economy. They were as follows:

- (1) constructing a centre for manufacturing to encourage companies to embrace new management philosophies and process technologies;
- (2) the establishment of a number of specialised industry support mechanisms such as an industrial laser application centre and an electrical testing area;
- (3) the establishment of a state of the art tool manufacturing shop referred to earlier during Question Time by my colleague, the member for Price, to rebuild some of the infrastructure which has run down over the past 10 years; and
- (4) training to provide skills necessary for competitive manufacturing industry.

The point of referring to the *Business Review Weekly* article about South Australia is that it paints not a picture of pessimism and gloom, not an environment of investment drought, not an area lacking in business confidence and optimism about the future, but quite the reverse. The only people who have that pessimistic and negative view of the South Australian economy are the Leader of the Opposition and those with him on the other side of the House.

Let us now turn to the March quarter reports on the Australian and South Australian economies prepared by the State Bank. In its introductory notes on the South Australian economy in its March quarter document the State Bank stated:

Surveys in business confidence and expectations indicate that the bottom of the current economic downturn in South Australia has been reached. Respondents to the latest Chamber of Commerce survey of South Australian industry are now more optimistic about future economic prospects than at any time during the last 18 months.

So much for the Opposition being up to date with the major statements being made by South Australia's biggest and most successful financial institution. This sentiment was confirmed by the February 1987 survey of the Metal Trades Industry Association which showed that South Australian based firms in the metal and engineering industry expected to increase employment during 1987. The State Bank report continued:

Job growth in this industry is expected to be stronger in South Australia than in any other State . . .

Another welcome piece of news is that residential building activity has improved slightly in recent months and non-residential building activity remains very strong.

As I have said previously, non-residential building activity is particularly strong in the City of Adelaide. Figures I have from the Adelaide City Council for development over the past 18 months amount to about \$125 million. There are current approvals for about \$230 million worth of building

activity, including Citycom stage II at \$19.1 million, Centrepoint for \$40 million and the SASFIT building in Pirie Street for \$23 million which could go as high as \$40 million. Government projects add another \$320 million to the total of development projects in the city, and that does not include any development at all for the tram barn site. Adelaide City Council projects are costed at about \$27 million.

This summary also does not include projects in the planning stage like the REMM Myer development, the Ausland project or the My Fair Lady project which, together with others, are estimated to be of the order of \$700 million to \$800 million. In summary, all the projects that have been completed, are being started or are being planned in the square mile of Adelaide are valued in excess of \$1.5 billion. The State Bank, in expressing these statements, said that this was its considered judgment as of 25 March 1987.

However, here we have the Leader of the Opposition, two months later, continuing to talk down the South Australian investment climate and the optimism that is abroad in the general community. The March State Bank report also stated:

A notable feature of the local economy is the apparent strength of employment despite the downturn in major sectors such as housing and motor vehicles. This suggests a growing diversity of employment which is not yet reflected in the broad data.

When speaking in that March report about non-residential building activity—and I have just given the examples from the City of Adelaide—the report stated:

The high level of on-going non-residential building activity is good news for the South Australian economy, both for the work that it generates and because it implies a high level of longer term business confidence.

While it is true that there were statements in the report which were based on the survey of new capital expenditure which in itself was based on the actual expenditure in the September quarter of 1986 and which showed that the new level of capital expenditure in South Australia was not as high as it had been in Australia, the point is that there was a general slowing down of investment in that September quarter of last year.

What the report did indicate was that there was substantial investment in the manufacturing sector which was a direct result of the strategies being pursued by the Government as well as in the non-residential building area which itself was as a direct result of the deregulation of the Australian financial system. Everyone acknowledges that the South Australian economy does not exist in a vacuum and, as far as the national economy is concerned, there have been a variety of deliberate policies pursued as a result of fiscal and revenue decisions made by the Australian Government designed to alter the investment decisions that are being made in Australia.

Therefore, it was hardly surprising to find a slowdown in investment in the latter part of last year while the impact of some of those decisions was being analysed and reviewed, and that process has continued right through to the May statement of 1987. One will find that, as a result of the analysis of the May statement and of the restructuring of the Australian economy, investment decisions will start to be made in those areas, where over the past nine months they have fallen off.

For too long it has been more attractive to invest in real estate in Australia than it has been to invest in productive manufacturing. The strategy that has been adopted by the Federal Government now is, first, that investment in manufacturing and, particularly, in the high technology areas of manufacturing, must be equally as attractive as other sorts of investment, including real estate.

The second major strategy being pursued by the Federal Government is that investment in the manufacturing sector must be directed towards export oriented industries and must be accompanied by better marketing and better management decisions and control systems within industry in order to effect greater productivity. There has, admittedly, been some acknowledged sensitivity and caution about the whole of this policy because it is something that has not been tried before on such a macro-economic scale in Australia's history.

As a consequence, though, of the changes in policies at the Federal level—the changed taxation policies, changed investment policies and the changed interest rate policies profits are, firstly, starting to trend upward and, secondly, there is going to be a transfer of those increased profits into reinvestment for the purpose of greater productive output in the industrial sector. Some people do not like that. Some people want there to be a continuing incentive for investment in the real estate industry. As far as national economic recovery is concerned, investment in other areas of the Australian economy must be made equally attractive. Going along with these macro-economic policies about fiscal adjustment has been the deliberate policy taken by the Government to restrain wages so that it continues to fall as a proportion of total production costs and, secondly, that Government expenditure, both at the national level and the State level is cut considerably in order that all of the available resources, both of Government and the private sector, are going into the productive activity of the manufacturing sector.

As a consequence, it looks, from figures provided in the June quarter report of the State Bank, that there will be a growth in the gross domestic product at the national level of 5 per cent for 1986-87 compared with 4.2 per cent for 1985-86 and 5 per cent for 1984-85. This compares more than favourably with the growth in real GDP for most of our major trading partners. For example, the USA has a real growth in GPD for 1987 of 2.3 per cent; Japan, 2.7 per cent; West Germany, 1.9 per cent; and the United Kingdom 3 per cent. We exceed a number of the Asian nations and are only exceeded by South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand and Hong Kong.

One of the indicators that has often been seized upon by commentators to indicate the sluggishness of an economy is a fall in retail sales. The fall in retail sales can be attributed to a low growth in household disposable income which, itself, is attributable to a restraint in wages which has produced a net fall in the disposable income of most families as well as both a decline in the range of Government services and an increase in their cost which is, again, reducing private disposable income, which is a direct and deliberate macro-economic policy to reduce national indebtedness and to reduce individual indebtedness. So, the fact that people are spending less is also (looked at another way) a fact that they are borrowing less and getting less into debt.

It is part of the overall economic strategy to get a large shift of several billion dollars out of domestic expenditure, both at an individual and family level as well as an enterprise and firm level, out of expenditure on consumption and into investment growth, based on the belief that a sustained improvement in reducing both the current account deficit and reducing the overseas debt is to be able to capitalise on an improvement in international commodity prices which can be brought about by a sustained export orientated approach to investment in Australia's manufacturing industry.

It is this pivotal point of the whole national economic strategy and debate—the move and the shift of financial



and real resources from the public to the private sector and from consumption to investment—that will determine the direction of interest rates. And what have we seen over the last couple of weeks? We have had the example of a shift downwards in domestic interest rates.

The ABS March quarter 1987 estimates of new capital expenditure by State, published on 24 July 1987—four days before the Leader's pessimistic 'investment drought' bleatings—showed that \$343 million had been spent in South Australia for that quarter. That was higher than for three of the four quarters of 1985-86 and higher than for each of

the first two quarters of the previous year. Taken together with the December quarter new capital expenditure of \$399 million it represented a 10.5 per cent increase over the first half of the previous year—hardly a drought. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of private new expenditure State by State.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that the information is purely statistical?

**Mr DUIGAN:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1—PRIVATE NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BY STATE (a)  
(\$ million)

State	1984-85		1985-86			1986-87		
	1984-85	1985-86	Dec. Qtr	March Qtr	June Qtr	Sept. Qtr	Dec. Qtr	March Qtr
New South Wales	r 5 489	r 6 215	r 1 600	r 1 372	r 1 753	r 1 632	r 2 257	1 648
Victoria	4 110	r 5 048	1 316	1 058	r 1 431	r 1 552	r 1 675	1 241
Queensland	2 676	2 958	874	641	714	r 762	r 850	611
South Australia	1 249	1 311	335	313	352	r 314	r 399	343
Western Australia	1 917	2 789	733	691	774	r 895	r 928	803
Tasmania	263	356	97	77	92	r 81	107	98
<b>Australia</b>	<b>r 16 093</b>	<b>r 19 336</b>	<b>r 5 115</b>	<b>r 4 304</b>	<b>r 5 305</b>	<b>r 5 381</b>	<b>r 6 353</b>	<b>4 831</b>

(a) Estimates for N.T. and A.C.T. are not available for publication.

**Mr DUIGAN:** The June 1987 State Bank report on page 13, when still dealing with the national economy, said this:

Further cuts in public spending at the August budget and increased wage restraint are necessary if interest rates are to decline. This is to ensure that overall expenditure in the economy is constrained and the monthly current account deficits stabilised while investment spending is encouraged by lower financing costs. Surely that sort of sentiment would be endorsed by the Opposition. The report on the South Australian economy is far more positive than that for the Australian economy in general. The opening statement in the March quarter notes was this:

The South Australian economic performance in general has remained subdued in recent months but has given the indications that an upturn could occur through 1987-88.

The biggest problem for the South Australian economy now, apart from the pessimism of the Leader of the Opposition, is the mismatch between job skills and job availability. The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates that the number of jobs vacant in South Australia was 28 per cent greater in February 1987 than in February 1986.

This has occurred, according to the State Bank, despite an increase in unemployment. Furthermore, it went on to say that the additional vacancies were in the private sector, and that one-third of them were in manufacturing. This mismatch of skills leads the report to suggest that both Government and industry will have to give greater emphasis to training, retraining and apprenticeships than they have in the past. That point was picked up by the Premier this afternoon in response to a question by the member for Briggs.

The report of the State Bank could only be described as bullish when it went on to talk about non residential building activity in South Australia. It concluded that there is no sign yet of the end of the boom—not a drought, a boom. It referred also to the March quarter survey of South Australian industry by the Chamber of Commerce, in which it noted:

Most firms remain generally optimistic . . .

So, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and its major members are generally optimistic about the future of the economy. The only person who is not optimistic about the future of the economy is the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps he looked at this statement as the basis for his

comment that there was an investment drought in South Australia, with people having no confidence or optimism in South Australia's future. This statement appeared in the June quarter report:

The results of the Chamber of Commerce survey can only be described as moderately encouraging. Most disappointing is the still relatively small number of firms looking to increase their capital expenditure.

Perhaps he looked to that statement, but he should have read the next paragraph, which states:

It is our view however that the Chamber of Commerce survey, principally because of the aggregated nature of its results, may possibly be understating the changes that are occurring in the South Australian industry. South Australia, we believe, has the potential to out-perform most other States over the next year or two.

Let me now jump from that March quarter report on the South Australian economy to the June quarter survey of South Australian industry by the Chamber of Commerce. It contains an even more optimistic and positive result than did the March quarter survey.

The June quarter 1987 survey of South Australian industry prepared by the chamber says in its summary that the survey indicates an economy once again showing signs of having entered a recovery phase. It is optimistic in nearly every index of economic activity, including sales, while expressing some of its traditional caution about whether or not this very optimistic outlook will be translated into concrete results.

Let us look at some of those concrete results reported in the June quarter survey of the chamber. Referring to sales—and this is very interesting—the strength of the upturn, it said, rivalled the traditionally buoyant December quarter. As to inventory, there was a trend, it said, to stock reduction which is a consequence of the 'get smart' attitude to business management which has been brought about by the JIT and other inventory control systems. As to prospects for sales, the survey reported respondents being far more optimistic for the future and indicated that optimism had established itself as the major characteristic for a majority of respondents. Referring to prospects for employment, it mentioned a greater level of stability. It also said that capital expenditure plans have shown an improvement amongst respondents for the June quarter, reflecting the more buoyant level of sales.

As to constraints on expansion, which is one of the other indicators that the chamber uses, it stated, interestingly, that the cost and availability of finance was no longer seen as a constraint on expansion or investment. The business expectation index from the period since the September quarter of 1981 reveals some interesting features indeed. The point at which business expectations were at their lowest was in the last quarter of the Tonkin Government. One year later, after the Bannon Labor Government had been in office, the business expectation index, as reported by the chamber, peaked at a level in excess of any of the quarters of the former Liberal Government and stayed at that very high level until it began to decline in the March quarter of 1986. However, since the March quarter of 1986 there has been a continuing upward trend in that business expectation index and is headed again for the high point reached in the September and December quarters of 1983.

To return to those factors that are seen as a constraint on expansion, I advise the House that between the June quarter of 1986 and the current June quarter of 1987 there has been a 10 per cent reduction in the number of respondents who saw high labour costs as the most significant restraint. That is hardly surprising to members on this side of the House, given the cooperation between the Government, industry and the unions, brought about as a result of the accord. Also, there has been a 2 per cent reduction in the number of respondents who saw Government regulation as a significant reason to restrict expansion—again a direct translation into reality of the policy decision taken at the State level.

Interestingly, the availability of labour is seen by more people than ever before as the most significant restraint—not high labour costs, Government regulation, availability of finance, but rather the availability of skilled labour. This issue is being picked up by policy decisions being made at the State and national level for retraining. In addition, those indices of economic activity used by the chamber indicate a degree of optimism about economic activity in South Australia not reflected in statements we are getting from the other side.

What do we get from members opposite? We get doom and gloom, pessimism, lack of confidence, no hope for the future and a talking down of the economy at a time when it is difficult to try to bring the whole of the Australian economy over to a greater reliance on manufacturing and, particularly in South Australia, to get that shift into the technologically supported areas of computer aided manufacturing and computer aided design that will enable us to identify niches in the overseas export market where we will be able to make high value added products as a result of substantial value added management techniques to guarantee us a real place in the international market.

I might also refer the Leader of the Opposition to an article in *Australian Business* of 5 August 1987 under the heading 'Subs give South Australia a shot in the arm'. Edward Nash had this to say yesterday:

It is not simply that the building of the six submarines with the option of another two will inject hundreds of millions of dollars into the local economy and create thousands of jobs; more important will be the influx of sophisticated technology from companies in other States and overseas which will set up divisions near the assembly site to meet the demand for goods and services for the project and, if history is any guide, the skills and technology the project demands will enhance the State's reputation as an industrial base and stimulate innovation leading to export opportunities.

It is positive, encouraging and optimistic seeing that the State has something to offer and that its prospects for investment and growth are very good.

Earlier I spoke of four areas into which the Government infrastructure strategy for revitalising the manufacturing industry falls. Many of the strategies are designed to improve South Australia's export performance which, during the first nine months of this quarter, have gone through the roof.

I do not have time at this stage to go into the State's export performance. I simply seek leave to have included in *Hansard* a purely statistical table outlining South Australia's export performance by comparing the first nine months of 1985-86 with the first nine months of 1986-87.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical?

**Mr DUIGAN:** Yes, Sir, it is.

Leave granted.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EXPORT PERFORMANCE

	First 9 mths 1985-86	First 9 mths 1986-87	% change
Household Appliances	\$	\$	\$
Clothes washing machines	2.8m	4.4m	57
Household refrigerators	38 740	1.3m	3 255
Household dishwashing machines	1.6m	1.9m	18.75
Airconditioning machine	821 890	6 596 752	702
Electronics/Communications			
Electronic microcircuits	86 753	645 225	643
Telecommunications equipment	1.99m	3.8m	90
Parts for telecommunications equipment	173 594	442 655	54
Microphones, loud speakers and audio frequency electric amplifiers	94 969	449 117	372
Electrical apparatus for making and breaking, protecting and making connections in electrical circuits	5.7m	7.7m	35
Insulated electric wires and cables for distributing electricity	159 586	726 419	355
Engineering/Electric Motors/Generators			
Electric motors	18 141	864 625	4 666
Generators	205 676	5 199 418	2 427
Parts for civil engineering equipment, i.e. bulldozers, levellers, excavating equipment	4.67m	6.76m	44
Auto Industry			
Passenger motor vehicles	11.6m	19.1m	64
Brake assemblies and parts	14.3m	20m	40
Instruments/Analysis			
Optical instruments and apparatus	78 151	519 131	564
Instruments for meteorological, hydrological and geophysical analysis	174 574	386 710	121
Value Added Minerals/Gems			
Opal jewellery	33 837	544 299	1 500
Gold	693 590	2.2m	217

	First 9 mths 1985-86	First 9 mths 1986-87	% change 19 900
Miscellaneous			
Parts for bakery and confectionery machines	3 592	688 682	
Parts for paper mill, pulp mill machinery and paper cutting machines	23 778	281 245	1 082
Parts and accessories for bicycles	66 555	582 162	774
Aircraft parts (not including tyres, engines, and electrical parts)	62 135	724 725	1 066
Seats and chairs	33 276	218 272	555
Clocks	0	544 500	
Brooms and brushes	247 448	658 008	165

\*All figures from A.B.S., not adjusted for price or currency fluctuations.

**Mr DUGAN:** The figures represent both the consequence of the devaluation of the Australian dollar and the increasing awareness amongst manufacturers that they must look to exports for growth. The interesting thing about the growth in exports is the huge growth in technology related areas, and the indication is that the strategies which I have enumerated have been right in trying to produce high technology for high performance and high export earnings for South Australia.

Lest I be accused (albeit unfairly, I believe) of excessive reliance upon Government documentation in the presentation of the material today—and I must say that even the State Bank reports could hardly be described as Government documents—let me conclude by referring to two documents which are in no way beholden to the Government in a partisan sense whatsoever but which display—unlike the attitude of the Opposition—optimism about the future, and confidence in the South Australian economy.

The first of these is a report of the Engineering Employers Association of May 1987 to the South Australian Government about prospects for 1987 in the engineering area, and the second is a speech that was given by the Finance Director of the Adelaide Steamship Company at the South Australian investment seminars which were recently held in Melbourne and Sydney and which were, as I have said before, a sell-out.

Under the heading 'Industries Response Meeting The Challenge', the Engineering Employers Association report said that international competitiveness is the challenge set by the devaluation of the Australian dollar and the deterioration of the nation's balance of payments. The 1987 national survey found encouraging evidence that the engineering industries were responding to that challenge.

Despite prevailing predictions by some forecasters of manufacturing investment droughts (read 'Leader of the Opposition'), expenditure on plant and equipment rose by 23 per cent during 1986. The message is clear. Australian engineering firms increased their investment in new plant and equipment substantially during 1986 despite declines in the real value of their sales. While it acknowledged a decline in investment in some plant and equipment in South Australia, it said that recovery from this position was expected in 1987 when South Australia's respondents to the survey planned to expand their investment expenditure by 20 per cent. So it is not a drought at all but a boom.

Under the heading 'New Methods, Products and Technology' and in reference to South Australia, the report said that South Australia, in particular, witnessed an upsurge in this form of restructuring in 1986, being nearly 25 per cent above the 1985 level. During 1986, it said, 25 per cent of South Australian respondents increased the range of products they had manufactured locally. This figure was expected to increase to 38 per cent for South Australia in 1987. That is positive and optimistic, and the opportunities can be seen. Industry restructuring, it said, is taking place on two fronts. Engineering firms are adopting new operating methods and new technology to increase their productiveness,

productivity and competitiveness, and they are seeking out and taking viable new opportunities created by the effect of the current depreciation.

Under the heading 'Export Glimmer', it said that, while overall sales results in 1986 might have been disappointing, a pleasing aspect was the 13 per cent growth in export sales. South Australia led the expansion with a 42 per cent rise. Firms, it said, anticipated an expansion in their export activities by a further 20 per cent during 1987 and, once again, South Australia anticipated an increase of 27 per cent.

The report concludes by calling upon the South Australian Government in its 1987-88 budget to encourage economic adjustment and growth among South Australian engineering firms. Of course the Government recognises that decisions taken in the budgetary context will have a major impact on business confidence, and it has been aware of that in each of the five budgets it has brought down. That has resulted in some of the major investment decisions that I have spoken about today.

In respect of business confidence, I conclude by referring to the speech that was given by Mr Kent, Finance Director for Adelaide Steamship Limited, to the investment seminars in Melbourne last month, as follows:

On a comparative basis with other Australian States, the economic future of South Australia looks good and therefore all South Australian based operations should benefit.

Adsteam itself is continuing to commit significant capital to expand its South Australian retail wine and meat industry operations in the expectation of a sound economic future and, specifically picking up the point that was made by the Engineering Employers Association, Mr Kent said that one of the important criteria in considering investment in any State in any country is government. He said:

I am happy to say that from my viewpoint the present South Australian Labor Government business policies are positive and realistic.

He concluded by saying that he did not wish to make any bold predictions about South Australia in the next century, but strongly believed that the advantages that had been outlined at the development seminar and the investment seminar and what he called 'the positive Government policies towards business' would help South Australia develop in future years and make it look even better as we progress towards the year 2000.

I conclude by making an appeal to the Opposition—an appeal which was made by the Premier at the investment seminar as well as by Mr Kent—for the approach to business, to the State's economic and industrial development policy and financial future, and to the future investment potential of South Australia that we adopt in this place a bipartisan policy and that the Opposition abandon its negative, carping criticism of the efforts being taken to revitalise and regenerate the South Australian economy, both in the manufacturing sector and in other parts of our economy, and join the Government in encouraging investment to this State, join the Government in seeking new investment in South Australia, and abandon for ever this nonsense about

investment droughts and lack of business confidence and optimism.

My plea is for all of us to acknowledge that, like the rest of Australia, we are undergoing a period of major readjustment aimed at widening and revitalising our economic base and that we all focus our attention on the opportunities that exist in South Australia for manufacturing, micro-electronics, biotechnology and computer software, to name but a few. We need a bipartisan policy aimed at revitalising and diversifying our economic base and I concur in the view expressed in the Governor's speech:

... that the Government faces new and demanding challenges to strengthen the economic base which is so important in the development of this State as a balanced and caring community where all citizens are treated with respect and understanding.

Mr TYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome this opportunity at the start of a new session to speak on the contribution made by members of Parliament to this State and its economy. Members of Parliament are often accused of making little or no contribution to the South Australian economy. I refer members to my remarks on the need for advertising on Government vehicles which I made on 13 August last year (*Hansard* page 308). For obvious reasons, I shall not detail all that speech. It is sufficient to quote the following (and I quote selectively):

I have not seen much publicity on STA buses, and I suggest that many Government vehicles could carry messages such as I have described dealing not only with alcohol and drug related problems, but relating to water safety, cigarette smoking and other matters pursued by the State Government in relation to various aspects of legislation.

I believe strongly that here was an opportunity for this Government to promote its own legislative programs on Government owned vehicles, be they Highways Department, ETSA or housing construction vehicles. The opportunity was there for the Government to look at this question of advertising.

Secondly, I believe that it was opportune for the Government to investigate the feasibility of allowing sponsorship and advertising on other types of Government vehicles, be they sedans, utilities or whatever. I believe very strongly that Governments should also have the opportunity of having sponsorship or advertising on their own vehicles, irrespective of the type of vehicle that it may be. We all see taxis driving around with sponsorship and advertising on them. Why should not Government owned vehicles be given the same opportunity?

To that extent I have pursued this matter over a period of time with various Government departments, particularly in the area of education, which was one of the many Government departments that I believe could have been involved. After investigating this matter very carefully, I wrote to the Premier earlier this year stating that it was my considered opinion that a working party should be set up by the Government to determine the role that groups, companies, corporate bodies and the public could play in paying for advertising of their products, etc., on Government owned vehicles and properties; secondly, the role that groups, companies, corporate bodies and the public could play in sponsoring in part or in full Government initiated programs,

recreation and sporting programs, recreation and sporting buildings, health promotion building projects, road safety projects, awards, special sports functions; and, thirdly, the legislative requirements and amendments to implement any or all of the above if acceptable to the Government. I went on to point out that the STA carried a considerable amount of advertising, thereby offsetting some of the cost of running STA services.

I would like to go back a few months to the situation that obtained prior to my writing this correspondence to the Premier. I can recall having discussions with the teacher in charge of the West Lakes Aquatic Centre, well over 12 months ago now, in terms of the activities and the type of equipment utilised for the school aquatic program which is housed and run within my electorate at the South Australian Rowing Association headquarters. I spoke to Mr Rob Hood, who expressed a desire for additional equipment. I pointed out to him that money was not easily come by in terms of the requirements of many other areas. Suffice to say that I asked whether he had had a look at the question of sponsorship for some of the equipment that was utilised by the students—some 25 000 students per year through that particular centre. He asked me what the Government's policy was. I pleaded ignorance. Suffice to say that in very quick time I had that policy and provided it to the school and to Mr Hood. As a consequence of that, in a very short time in excess of \$40 000 was acquired by sponsorship. This included 5KA, the Commonwealth Bank, Farmers Union, etc. Many groups were involved in this area.

In speaking with Mr Hood last Friday, when I presented on behalf of the Government a \$20 000 cheque to the Woodville council and a \$20 000 cheque to the West Lakes Primary School for its involvement with the aquatic centre at the northern reserve of the West Lakes waterway, I pointed out the very important role that these aquatic centres and advertising played in the promotion of this complex.

Mr Hood further informed me that, as a consequence of his very active promotion of this program and his desire to get more sponsors involved, Qantas, our international airline, had also agreed to sponsor part of the cost of providing equipment at that centre. I am reliably informed by Mr Hood that to date more than \$100 000 has been provided to this centre because of the proposition I put to him in terms of sponsorship.

Mr Klunder: You helped him there.

Mr HAMILTON: As the member for Todd correctly points out, members of Parliament, by their own initiative and desire to promote the needs of the community, by their very actions and brain power, provide opportunities and incentives to various groups in the community to participate in Government owned programs, as in this case. I welcome that.

In the short time left to me I suggest that, in terms of my initial statements, this is the ideal opportunity for the private sector to become involved with government. I am delighted to say that the Premier, in response to my letter earlier this year about advertising and sponsorship, agreed with the proposition. He said:

Your propositions have a great deal of merit.

I believe that this is one of the many areas in which various groups, companies, corporate bodies and the public can play a part in sponsoring Government programs or advertising on Government owned vehicles and properties. Secondly, members will recall that earlier this year I suggested that a special events program, similar to that which applies in Western Australia, be held in this State. I am delighted to be able to remind the Parliament that this suggestion was also accepted by the Government, which agreed to consider

the question and follow on, I understand, in a similar vein to the system which applies in Western Australia and which was very successful in the promotion of the America's Cup. I believe, further, that in relation to other sporting complexes in this State corporate bodies could be involved in sponsorship with government programs, particularly in education and recreation and sport.

Before my time runs out I would like to put on record that I see no good reason why the company involved in the submarine project should not be approached to participate and put money up front to sponsor a sporting program or utility in this State.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** The *Advertiser* of Friday 24 July 1987, in the death notices, recorded the following:

Siostrom, Kenneth Mervyn—Peacefully at Hutchinson Hospital, Gawler, on 23 July 1987. Aged 70 years.

There was a list of those in the bereaved family. The funeral notices of the same day also recorded:

Siostrom—The Relatives and Friends of the late Mr Kenneth Mervyn Siostrom of Willaston are respectfully advised that his funeral will leave our chapel . . . for the Willaston cemetery.

I take this unusual approach to a situation (and it comes very favourably—if one can say 'favourably' under these circumstances) following the words earlier this afternoon of the member for Adelaide, who concluded his statement by saying that the Government must ensure that all citizens obtain care and understanding.

What are the circumstances? Mr Siostrom died of cancer, and had been a sufferer from that disease for some time. He was admitted on 26 June to the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler, where he received attention, having been there on a number of previous occasions. On 29 June he was transported by ambulance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for secondary assessment and, on sight, was immediately admitted because of his condition. He was kept in hospital from 29 June until Thursday 9 July. On that date, when he was discharged from hospital to return to Gawler, he was refused, as many other people have been, an opportunity of carriage by ambulance from the hospital to Gawler, whence he had come. At that stage he was less than 8 stone in weight.

He was taken back to Gawler after a quickly arranged passage in the back seat of a small car driven by his daughter. Between Adelaide and Gawler, a distance of 25 miles, he lapsed into unconsciousness. When his daughter arrived at his home at Willaston, near Gawler, it took three people to get him—an 8 stone man—out of the back of the car, because of the circumstances of his condition. He was treated at home by his local doctor and three days later he was taken once again to the Hutchinson Hospital. As I pointed out, 10 days later he passed on.

His is not the only case. I have correspondence that I sent to the Minister of Health a little earlier this year relating to the selfsame gentleman when he was transported by ambulance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital because of his condition. At the conclusion of treatment over several days, he was told that he could go home and that it would be necessary for a member of his family to get a small car and take him home. On that particular occasion he arrived home safely.

I do not deny that the black and white taxi, as the St John's Ambulance service came to be known in many areas, has been abused in many circumstances. However, I suggest that the care and understanding that this man should have received from the system was abused when he was refused the opportunity to travel back to his own home in an

ambulance. Whether it brought on his ultimate death at a quicker rate is not really in question. The fact is that a person who had been receiving care and attention from the hospital (his family were completely satisfied with that attention) was refused the opportunity to go home in dignity and in a way that was in his own best interest.

I am aware of a similar set of circumstances relating to a 70-year-old lady, from Tanunda, who was conveyed to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on doctor's advice for a complete knee reconstruction. When she was discharged from the Royal Adelaide Hospital (I have confirmatory comments from a number of people), she was refused the opportunity of a telephone call to a person at Tanunda who might have been able to arrange for her to be conveyed from hospital to Tanunda—not the other end of the earth—and was told that she would have to make her way home by bus. She was delivered from the hospital by taxi to the Country Bus Depot at 12.30 to catch a bus at 1.30. About 1½ hours later she was deposited in the main street of Tanunda and she was required to find her own way home from there. Fortunately, it was not a very great distance, but still it was necessary for her to find her way home with the few things that she had in her bag, and this was after she had been discharged from hospital following a complete knee restructure.

These sorts of situations are occurring too frequently. Those incidents that have been reported to me all relate to the failure of the system at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to assist those people who I suggest are genuinely in need of assistance. It is little wonder that people get concerned when they read in the newspaper that \$14 500 will be made available to teach prostitutes how to keep clean when people who are in desperate circumstances, such as these two 70 year old people to whom I have referred, are denied the opportunity of being conveyed back to their home.

Let me go one step further, again in relation to the health care (or the lack of health care) associated with people in this State. Within the past 10 days a gentleman from Gawler, invalidated out of the Police Force several years ago as a result of a massive injury he sustained whilst on duty, was in considerable difficulty. He had been in the Gawler Hospital and had been on a drip because of his condition, which was pneumonic, as well as suffering other complications, and he was having his temperature taken every four hours. He was conveyed by ambulance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where it was 6½ hours before he was placed in a ward. In the meantime, he had been in passageways on a barouche. For several hours he had not been approached, nor had he received any further drip treatment or had his temperature taken.

His daughter, who is resident in Adelaide, made inquiries of the hospital, but its administration could not tell her where her father could be found in the hospital system. It took a telephone call at high level from his medical adviser at Gawler before the family was advised where this person was in the system. In the area where he was held he was in direct contact with a person who was 70 years of age and who had collapsed at work with a suspected heart condition. That person took six hours to get into the ward and into a bed. Another person, who was 77 years of age and who had had a blackout, was left waiting in similar circumstances for six hours. Some people were on barouches, others were in wheelchairs and others were sitting on seats waiting to be seen.

I return to the commendable speech which the member for Adelaide made this afternoon by way of reply to the Governor's address. I do not agree with everything that he said, but he made some worthwhile points. In his conclusion

I thought that he made a very real point when he said that all citizens should receive care and understanding. I suggest to him that at present his Government is not doing that for a lot of people in relation to health care.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** Earlier this year I had the opportunity of visiting the United States, and it was brought home to me again how Australian air travellers are taken for granted because of the cosy arrangement that still exists between Australian Airlines and Ansett. I think it is an arrangement that stifles competition and inhibits domestic tourism inside Australia. Also, it is an arrangement that puts air travel out of the reach of people earning average incomes. It is not my practice to give commercials, but I believe it would be useful for this Parliament and the public to know what is offered to American air travellers that is not offered to Australians.

Of course, a great deal has already been written in Australia about the much cheaper air fares offered to United States air travellers, but many United States airlines also offer considerable incentives and rewards to those who travel often. The aim of these schemes is quite simple. It is what advertising agents call 'product loyalty'—encouraging loyalty to an airline by ensuring that frequent travellers on an airline earn sufficient rewards so that it just is not worthwhile to change carriers (or, to use Bob Hawke's expression, to 'jump ship'). There are also rich incentives for new travellers to enter these schemes.

So how do these schemes work? United Airlines in the United States offers what is called the 'mileage plus' scheme, through which frequent fliers can earn free and discounted travel. Once a passenger is enrolled in 'mileage plus', United Airlines opens an account, providing an ID card to be shown to the airline reservation desk or travel agent. This way the airline will automatically credit your account with the miles you fly. When you have accumulated sufficient air travel to entitle you to an award—in the form of free or discounted trips—the airline contacts you and tells you what you are entitled to. United Airlines has also roped in several other international carriers to enable 'mileage plus' travellers to add miles to their accounts when they travel with Air France, Alitalia, British Airways, Cathay Pacific, Lufthansa and Swissair.

So what does all this mean and what can it mean to Australians? If South Australians wanted to fly United Airlines from Sydney to Los Angeles next week, they would be entitled to an 8 000 mile joining bonus to credit to their account. They would also be eligible for an extra bonus of 2 000 miles per flight if they take at least two flights with United on their journey. So, before you leave the ground you have actually toted up 12 000 miles in credit. When you add in the actual flight miles from Los Angeles to Sydney return, you have then accumulated sufficient mileage for a free return economy class fare between Sydney and Auckland, New Zealand—or for an upgrade from economy to business on your next trip to L.A., or you can keep on accumulating until you have enough miles in the kitty to go to New York and back. I am told that you can also add miles to your account when you rent a car from Hertz, or stay in a Westin or Hilton Hotel.

United Airlines is, of course, not alone. Most of the American airlines offer such deals. An executive at American Airlines apparently invented the idea, and I am told that every other airline in the States would like to drop him out the back door of a 747 at 35 000 feet because they are all having to compete to offer real service to air travellers. In the United States I also travelled on Continental Airlines. It has a 'frequent flyer' program and is now introducing a

new form of travelbank called 'one pass' which offers similar sorts of incentives to the United Airlines program.

Australians can take advantage of Continental's 'frequent flyer' program and can qualify for joining bonuses, upgrades in the US and other benefits. I spoke with a number of passengers who had benefited from these schemes. One San Francisco man who sat next to me on a plane was returning from a trip to Paris. As a salesman, he was a frequent flier around the US. I spoke also with a businessman who took weekend trips with his wife to different parts of the US. He said that he would not have done so if he had not been enticed into such a scheme. So, passengers benefit and tourism benefits.

I know that proposing such a scheme for Australia's airlines will not make me popular with their managements. I will be worried about my luggage from this day forth. But I have written and am in the process of writing to the chief executives of Qantas, Australian Airlines and Ansett suggesting that they consider the introduction of similar 'frequent flyer' schemes here. Qantas will have difficulty arguing that it is opposed to the principle involved in such schemes because it is a partner in the 'frequent flyer' program offered by American Airlines. Americans can use Qantas to accumulate travel credit through this program: why not Australians?

I believe that South Australia will benefit from the introduction of 'frequent flyer' programs. After all, most domestic airline travellers live in the Eastern States and for business reasons the Sydney/Melbourne/Brisbane runs are the most heavily used. Accumulated mileage on these hops will result in free trips being offered for weekends to Adelaide, Perth, Alice Springs and Darwin. Our State and Australian air travellers generally can only benefit.

There has again been some publicity lately about the merit or otherwise of our sister State and sister city ties. In June, Adelaide City Councillor Norm Etherington said that sister city ties had done zero for tourism, and recommended that they be scrapped. I disagree with that, and I welcome the announcement that the Campania region of Italy is to be twinned with South Australia. About half of South Australia's Italian migrants came from Campania, and our ties with the region were reinforced by the strong response by South Australians to the appeal to help the victims of the earthquake which devastated the region in 1980.

Although I reject claims that sister city ties are a waste of time, I believe that we should all do more to make these ties work. We have to ensure that 'sister State' or 'sister city' means more than an excuse for councillors, local government officials, politicians and public servants to make ceremonial visits, the value of which escapes members of the public. We have to use these ties as a marketing edge, or lead in, to make South Australia and its benefits and attractions known in our sister State and sister cities. That is what the Premier and the Minister of Tourism have been doing—and we all know that it will work in the long haul.

In this Parliament I represent the eastern side of the city of Salisbury, which is twinned with the city of Fort Worth in Texas. In 1986, en route to Washington DC, I spent 24 hours in this most Texan of cities, which very kindly made me an honorary citizen. My visit, I have to admit, generated only a tiny amount of publicity—there was a little bit in the press and on one of their very many television stations. But I am now using some of my favourite direct mail techniques on travel agents in Fort Worth. There is no doubt—because of Paul Hogan and the America's Cup—that Americans now view Australia as a desirable destination, but much of the airline material available in travel agencies centres on Ayers Rock, Sydney, and the delights

of the Great Barrier Reef and other parts of Queensland. Slowly, but surely, I am working my way through a long list of Fort Worth travel agents, telling them about South Australia, our wine districts, the Grand Prix, the Casino, the Arts Festival, and the Flinders Ranges—the gateway to the outback. I have enclosed brochures about our State, I have mentioned the connection and my honorary citizen status, and I have invited these prospective travellers to look me up at Parliament House.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr RANN:** Well, we will have to look out for stetsons in the gallery. It may, I concede, have no effect, but it is worth a try and at least outward bound Fort Worth travellers may see pamphlets on South Australia on their travel agent's shelves. I certainly encourage members on both sides of the House to try to make these sister city ties work.

In closing, I point out that during my visit to North America I met with David Combe, the Consul-General to British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Yukon and the North West Territory. Mr Combe told me

that there was considerable potential to boost sales to Canada of South Australian wine. As Australian Consul-General in Vancouver he directly sponsors a wine appreciation society, with 400 members, which regularly holds wine tastings and generates publicity about the quality of Australian wines. Sales of Australian wine to Canada have doubled in the past year, from \$1.5 million in 1985 to \$3 million in 1986. So far most of this wine has been sold in British Columbia in Vancouver restaurants. However, Mr Combe believes that there is considerable scope for further sales in British Columbia, in the prairie provinces and in the more populous eastern cities and provinces—

**Mr Duigan:** And you are prepared to take it over there for him.

**Mr RANN:** —and I am certainly prepared to help and to do wine tastings here in Adelaide to assist this process.

Motion carried.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 August at 2 p.m.