

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 August 1987

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### PETITION: COUNTRY DOCTORS

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement incentives to attract general practitioners to country areas was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 732 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to form a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in Port Lincoln was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1986.

### NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion of no confidence without notice.

Motion carried.

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

That the time allotted for debate on the motion be until 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr OLSEN:** I move:

That, because of his failure to honour promises on public transport fares; his failure to stand up to union demands which have added to pressure for fare increases; his failure to answer questions in Parliament fully and truthfully; and his failure to effectively manage his portfolio, this House has no confidence in the Minister of Transport.

The focus of this debate is a public transport system which is on the skids, running out of financial control. But it must go much wider, because during the first two sitting days of this session we have seen a Minister exhibit all the arrogance and all the indifference to parliamentary and public accountability which has become a hallmark of this Government, from the Premier down.

This morning, Adelaide's long suffering public transport commuters awoke to yet another shock. Although the promise was made before the last election by the Premier that any future fare increases would be kept below the rate of inflation, commuters now find the STA advising increases of up to seven times the cpi. They heard the Government's official transport adviser, the Director General of Transport, saying on radio that even bigger rises were necessary if the financial problems of the STA were to be resolved. Did we hear anything of this from the Premier before the last election? Of course we did not. So far as transport was

concerned, all the Premier did was to parade on the O-Bahn track as though he was its initiator—when he and his Party had opposed this important Liberal project so strongly for so long.

The Labor Party has not learned from the Dunstan days of dial-a-bus and underground tunnels up King William Street. It still thinks it can go on conning the public about transport. However, I warn the Minister of Transport that he could become known as the Minister who presided over the final collapse of our public transport system. One should make no mistake about it: if these proposed fare increases go through—even rises of only half those proposed by the STA—the public will desert our buses, trains and trams in droves. More and more they will travel to work by car so that the STA will incur even more massive losses, while our major roads will become even more jammed with peak hour traffic.

In a city the size and shape of Adelaide, we should not be facing such horrendous transport problems. We should not be contemplating the breakdown of our whole public transport system. The fact that we are contemplating this can only be blamed on this Government—following all the promises that it made going back to the Dunstan decade: namely, the takeover of private bus services, the sell-off to the Commonwealth of the country rail network, and the creation of the State Transport Authority. They were all actions which Labor said would improve the economics and efficiency of transport in South Australia. However, all that Labor has achieved is the State Transport Authority having a serious, and still growing, financial crisis.

When the Premier and the Minister of Transport rise to contribute to this debate they will lecture the House about the difficulties that the Government faces and they will allege political expediency by those who criticise rising fares and cuts in services when funds are tight. The Premier and the Minister might be justified in doing that had they been honest before the last election—which clearly they were not. During the election campaign they sheltered behind a scurrilous union attack on the Liberal Party's public transport policies—on our willingness to admit the hard options that we faced. But since the election all public transport commuters have been forced to meet the cost of the weakness of the Government and its shameful neglect of basic responsibilities over the transport network in this State, and I cite the following examples:

The broken election promises on bus, train and tram fares.

Massive fare increases, yet reduced standards of service—commuters are even being told that more of them must stand on our buses as further pay-offs to the unions.

The failure to take any action to control the STA's losses which have cost taxpayers \$480 million since this Government came to office.

The blow-out in the authority's administration costs with fewer buses, trains and trams in service yet more administrators and maintenance staff.

The double-crossing over the future of the Bridgewater rail service.

The launching of an inquiry into this service at taxpayers' expense when the Minister says he already knows what the results will be.

His 'too smart by half' attitude to the members for Heyesen and Davenport in accusing them of political dishonesty yet failing to provide them with documents he had promised.

The mismanagement of the new ticket validating system, where there has been a blow-out of at least \$1.6 million a year in its cost when it will save only \$1 million a year.

His holiday at Jupiters while the public transport system descended into industrial chaos.

His failure to stand up to union demands, which have added to pressure for fare increases.

His failure to develop long-term planning for Adelaide's metropolitan public transport.

No-one would deny that the transport portfolio presents special problems, special challenges. The public, quite rightly, demands an efficient public transport system. The responsibility of the Government in meeting this demand must be to strike a balance between the standard of service and the cost to the community. To achieve this when funds are tight, when it is generally accepted that governments at all levels must limit spending, requires: efficient management of financial and human resources; strict accountability to Parliament and to the public for every dollar of taxpayers' money spent; a willingness to come clean with the public—to be honest about the hard options which must be faced.

But we have seen none of this from the Minister of Transport and the Premier. Before the last election they quite deliberately misled the people of South Australia about public transport fares. Again, quite deliberately, they misled the public about proposals to curtail services to cut costs. Let the House recall the quite specific promise by the Government that the Belair to Bridgewater line would not close.

Now, after the election, faced with the proof of their deceptions, faced with proof positive of their failure to manage, what is the response of the Minister and the Government? They come into this House determined to mislead and to misrepresent. Their measure of effective parliamentary performance has become how much of the truth they can avoid—even when that means telling outright and outrageous untruths in this House.

Last Thursday, the Minister told the House that the Government already had plans in hand to deal with Adelaide's transport requirements. But what are the legacies of almost five years of Labor mismanagement? What is the truth? According to the latest official figures available publicly from the STA, public transport patronage has declined since this Government came to office. Over the past three years we have had a reduction in passenger journeys on STA buses, trains, and trams of 400 000.

Under this Government, so far we have fewer people using transport, but more people managing it and at much greater cost. The number of STA staff has increased by 194—an annual additional labour cost of almost \$5 million. The authority's administrative expenses have almost doubled to nearly \$33 million. Since 1982-83 they have increased at a rate of almost \$5 million a year. All the latest proposed fare increases will achieve is to cover the cost of this blow-out in the STA bureaucracy.

The authority is running fewer buses, trains, and trams than four years ago, but the numbers of drivers employed is up by 124, and the engineering staff by more than 50. The STA employs 312 on bus maintenance alone for a fleet of 745 buses—two maintenance staff for every five buses. With trends like these—fewer passengers but much higher running costs—it is little wonder that the authority's operating losses have almost doubled under this Government. In addition to all the fares they pay, the operating losses of the authority now cost taxpayers \$13 000 for every hour our buses, trams, and trains are in service. This is a story of waste, of inefficiency, of failure to manage for which the Minister and the Government must take the full responsibility.

Conscientious STA employees are becoming increasingly frustrated. Let me quote in part from a letter from a senior STA employee received by me on 18 June this year:

The unions having eventually accepted new rosters in March after 12 months of disputation have done it again—but this time it has been hushed up by the Government. Plans to revise many services—improvements, but also rationalise poorly patronised services and make considerable savings for the STA have been thwarted by the unions. STA planning, scheduling, timetabling, costs and engineering staff have been working for nearly 12 months on these changes, which were due to come into force from Sunday 28 June 1987. In recent time staff has had to work overtime, including weekends, in preparing rosters, schedules, and timetables to have them ready for the changeover.

The letter continues:

In addition, there was to be a major route number revision of the majority of STA services as part of the new \$11 million ticketing system, due to start operating in September this year. When presented with new rosters and timetables the unions rejected them. Rather than cause a confrontation the Government decided not to pursue the issue and as a result all the changes have been shelved for 12 months at least. As you can see, an enormous waste of public money, with the Government not prepared to take on the unions over their stand. The results will now be cuts to many services (particularly in peak hours), and some cutbacks in night and weekend services, and also some poorly used services being cancelled (also many school bus runs being cut back).

I feel that someone has to make a stand—and the public must be made aware of what is going on. To substantiate what is happening, I enclose internal memos of planned changes as mentioned in the earlier part of this letter.

The STA documents provided leave no doubt about the credibility of that letter—this plea from an STA employee, frustrated by the manner in which this Minister and this Government have surrendered control of the authority to a few key union officials. I understand that the overtime bill for this exercise—this wasted exercise—was a quarter of a million dollars—another cost that will flow through into higher bus, tram, and train fares.

A further memorandum dated 22 June from the Chief Traffic Manager, Mr Heath, to the Chairman of the authority confirmed just how much the unions, rather than the Government, are in control. It is a memorandum that shows quite clearly that the attitude of union officials has forced the authority to propose cuts to peak bus services from later this year as the only way to reduce operating losses in the short term. This document is a further scandalous indictment of the failure of the Government to come to grips with the financial crisis in the STA. It is appropriate that STA workers should be consulted about changes like this. But union officials have no right to be as obstructive as they have been. This document makes it plain that STA management are having to go about the process of financial management with their hands tied behind their backs by union officials whom the Government will not attempt to bring into line.

Indeed, rather than confront union officials, the Minister, who enjoys winter time at Jupiters, has allowed some of his union mates to enjoy springtime in Paris at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia. The proposed introduction of a ticket validating system began as a sensible exercise to cut out abuse of fares and concessions. But it has become a smorgasbord of freeloading. We have had the trips to Paris and still the union officials were not satisfied until they were able to win a \$10 a week pay increase. When the Government announced the introduction of this new system in 1984, it said it was aimed at cutting out abuse which cost the authority \$1 million a year. But it is now obvious that the cost of its introduction will more than exceed this saving. There is the higher wage bill of at least \$900 000 and the higher interest repayments on the capital cost which has escalated from \$4.5 million to \$10.5 million: this will increase debt servicing costs by \$700 000 a year. These two factors alone—higher wage and interest bills totalling at least \$1.6 million—exceed the estimated savings by a conservative \$600 000 a year.

Yesterday the Opposition revealed, and the Minister had to confirm, that this system had been vandalised. While the Minister appears to have accepted the word of his union mates that none of their members were responsible, I quote as follows from the *Advertiser* of 4 August:

The Australian Railways Union last month said it would oppose the use of agencies and of vending machines, which it said would be vandalised.

It appears the Minister needs to do a bit more than just blindly accept what the unions say to him.

The introduction of this system has been a scandal of mismanagement and sell-outs to completely unreasonable union demands, but it is not over yet. When it is finally brought into operation, months late and millions over budget, fare increases will also apply. On this point, I remind the Premier of what he has said, going back to the 1982 election, when in his policy speech he promised:

We will not allow State charges like transport fares . . . to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Less than a year after winning office, the Premier put fares up by as much as 57 per cent.

Before the 1985 election, there were further promises. I quote from the *News* of 5 November 1985—just a month before the election—when the Premier said:

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

They are the words of the Premier. But within seven months of that promise, fares were on their way up yet again—by up to three times the inflation rate. Into the bargain, the Premier duped pensioners and the unemployed. In the *Advertiser* on 8 August 1984 he promised:

The State Government would not abolish free bus and train travel for pensioners and the unemployed.

In 1986, they were hit with a charge of 20 cents a journey. Now, like all other commuters, they found out this morning that they are in for even higher fares.

Let me analyse the latest proposals of the STA and compare them with the Premier's election promises. If implemented they will mean that for adult peak hour fares the cost of a one or two section fare will have risen by 42.8 per cent since the election; a one or two zone fare by 60 per cent; and a three zone fare by 64.3 per cent.

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

**Mr OLSEN:** I will get to the multi-trip in a moment, for the Minister—be patient. A couple at Elizabeth or Noarlunga wanting to bring a couple of kids into the city for some Saturday morning shopping will face bus or train fares of \$11.20. The equivalent cost in 1982, when the Premier won office on a promise to keep the lid on fares, was \$4.40.

The Government is also trying to con the travelling public into believing that commuters will be better off with the new multi-trip tickets, which will replace the weekly tickets. But let me again measure the reality against the Premier's election promises. Before the election, people buying weekly tickets were up for the following costs per journey, based on the official STA estimate that these tickets are used on average for 10½ trips per week: two sections, 53c; two zones, 76.2c; three zones, \$1.06.

If the proposed fare increases are approved, recognising that commuters will be limited to 10 trips per week compared with unlimited travel with the weekly tickets, the equivalent fares per journey for two sections will be 70c (a rise of 32 per cent); two zones, \$1.12 (a rise of 47 per cent); and three zones, \$1.61 (a rise of 52 per cent). In each case, these are rises at least twice the rate of inflation since the election when the Premier promised to keep all fare rises within the CPI.

However, even if the Government's final decision is to allow increases of only a quarter of those recommended by the STA, the Premier's pre-election promises are already blown to pieces, because any increase will come on top of the fare rises of up to 33 per cent implemented last year. The recommendations of the STA are one thing. The Government's final decision, of course, may be quite another. I believe that decision has already been made because the Government is now finalising its budget. The contribution the budget has to make to the STA is a very significant item of annual expenditure. Its magnitude depends very much on the fares the STA is allowed by the Government to charge. Therefore, with the budget only a fortnight away, it is inevitable that this decision has been taken by Cabinet.

We have seen this Government before leak out recommendations for increases in charges so that, when the final decision is less than the recommendation, the public is supposed to breath a sigh of relief that some constraint has been imposed by the Government, but this base political manipulation only underplays the nature of the serious crisis now faced by the STA. I am sure that its board would not have made these recommendations had it not believed that they were the minimum necessary to return the authority to some semblance of financial viability. Indeed, the Director-General of Transport (Dr Scrafton) said as much on radio this morning. He suggested that even higher fares were warranted. As I have already emphasised, the fact that the authority is in this position can be blamed only on this Government. It is a Government with a huge credibility gap in transport.

As well as the promise to keep the lid on fare increases, the Premier also said in his last election policy speech that his Government would complete the O-Bahn—and there are now suggestions it will be delayed a further 12 months; that it would commence construction of a by-pass to relieve traffic congestion at Darlington—this is under review; and that it would extend pensioner travel concessions, when they have been decreased. It is no good the Premier now claiming that circumstances have changed. The point is that, when he made these promises, he knew he was in for Commonwealth funding cuts.

Following its track record, with the Premier setting the standard in deception, in duplicity, in dissembling, the Minister's behaviour in this House over the past two sitting days has been as inevitable as the next public transport strike. He has failed to learn from his rounding-up exercise on motor vehicle registration and drivers licence fees—the increases which he said were 10 per cent but which in fact were closer to 17 per cent. Perhaps he had had too much sun at Jupiters at that stage.

No-one who was in this House last Thursday could have failed to gain the distinct impression from what the Minister said that the members for Heysen and Davenport had previously endorsed the closure of the Belair to Bridgewater line. The Minister was imputing to them political expediency, hypocrisy, and downright dishonesty. His motive was blunt and blatant. It was also the motive of an increasingly desperate Minister—made all the more outrageous by the quite firm promise of the Minister's predecessor in 1985 not to close this line. I quote from the statement of the present Minister of Marine dated 29 April 1985, a few months before the last State election:

The Minister of Transport, Mr Abbott, said today that the Government had no intention of ceasing the present Belair to Bridgewater rail service. Mr Abbott put an end to rumours that STA services on the line faced closure.

Ironically, in the light of subsequent events, the Minister also said:

There are a number of people who take particular pleasure in promoting scare stories of this nature.

That was a statement made only months before the last election. It was calculated to give the clear impression that there was no threat to the Belair-Bridgewater line or any other STA service—further promises we now know were to be broken.

The members for Heysen and Davenport already have more than adequately justified their positions on the Bridgewater service. I am sure they thought better of the Minister—one of the senior members of this House. That he would indulge in such a grubby exercise and that he would deliberately mislead you, Mr Speaker, as well as the whole House, was beneath contempt. For that alone, the Minister deserves the censure of this House. As I have shown this afternoon, this has been only the latest in a long series of failings by this Minister. Put together, they show that he no longer deserves the confidence of this House. If his Cabinet colleagues are consistent, they will support this motion.

At Cabinet last Monday the Minister was roundly criticised for his handling of the Transport portfolio. The Government's marginal seat members are nervous, with their constituents facing further massive fare increases. However, I am concerned that the Minister was not listening. After his drubbing in Cabinet, he got his staff together on Monday evening and criticised them. He said he was not being kept in touch. That was his excuse. He said, 'It's your fault—you haven't been keeping me in touch.' They had to share the blame. Who else does the Minister blame? The State Transport Authority Board? Is he to get rid of some of the board members in the hope that this will shift the focus onto them and that the public will believe that the board should carry the can for public transport mismanagement (gross mismanagement) rather than the Minister and the Government?

The responsibility for allowing the STA deficit to get totally out of control rests fairly and squarely with the Minister and the Government. They make the major policy decisions; they set the cost parameters; they give in to the unions. They are responsible to this Parliament for the public transport system. If the Minister has any pride in his own performance, and if he has any respect for this Parliament, he will reflect on his performance of the last two sitting days and accept that this House and the public are owed some answers for a change.

He will tell us how much STA fares are to rise: he will reveal the decision the Government has already made. He will tell us the STA's operating loss for 1986-87 and its projected deficit this financial year. He will tell us which train and bus services the authority wants to cut or rationalise from next May and when the Government will make the major decisions. He will tell us what other action is under contemplation to resolve the financial crisis of the State Transport Authority.

Let the Minister make no mistake about it: the authority has a financial crisis. It has been unable to take any significant action because of the weakness of the Minister and the Government and the dominance of a few key union officials. Union officials are in the driving seat: they call on the Minister only when they want him to rubber stamp deals. The Government has acted, since it came to office, as though the STA is on a never ending journey. Yet, taking into account the likely loss last financial year, the Government has had to pour in \$480 million (almost half a billion dollars) to meet the losses on our public transport since 1982. That is a cost to every South Australian man, woman and child of \$320. It is a cost on top of the fares which the public pays and which have gone up at twice the rate of inflation under this Government. It is a financial crisis for

which the Minister deserves censure. It is a crisis which demands answers—full answers, precise answers, honest answers for a change—about what the Government intends to do. I challenge the Government to provide these answers this afternoon.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** Let me say at the outset that this Government is committed to a public transport system which is efficient, relevant, and delivers services where they are needed to the greatest extent possible. This Government accepts that there must be a subsidy for such public transport, but we cannot take on the user-pays system that was trumpeted loudly by the Opposition when it was convenient but hastily put under wraps when we come to a debate such as this. The Government rejects such a system, but we will not accept a system at any cost.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the Premier resume his seat for a moment. The Leader of the Opposition was heard with a not unreasonable degree of interjection and the Premier should be entitled to the same courtesy.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** While being committed to such a public transport system—

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, I presume that you Mr Speaker, have given your warning to the House under Standing Order 159, which provides:

No member shall interrupt another member whilst speaking, unless (1) to request that his words be taken down; (2) to call attention to a point of order; (3) to call attention to the want of a quorum; or (4) to move a motion in pursuance of Standing Order 61 or 156—

particularly subclause (b). How is it that subclause (b) is only now being invoked, when while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking the member for Briggs interjected no fewer than four times, the member for Mawson interjected at least twice, the member for Fisher interjected at least twice, the Minister of Transport interjected at least once, the Minister of Mines and Energy interjected at least twice, and the member for Gilles interjected at least once—and yet not a word was heard from the Chair?

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. In addition to the members mentioned by the member for Light, interjections were also received by the Leader of the Opposition from members on his own side. The Chair has pointed out on previous occasions that interjections that are highly disruptive will be dealt with far more strictly. When a member is actually drowning out another member, as was the case when the Premier began his contribution to the debate, such interjections are particularly disorderly. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think that this—

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** You want two sets of rules too often; we all know that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Does the Deputy Leader have a point of order?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, Mr Speaker. In terms of your ruling, are we now to have instituted two types of interjections—those which you believe are acceptable and those which you believe are not? Is that the import of what you are saying, Sir?

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader is fully aware that the way in which we operate the business of the House is based not only on the Standing Orders and the practices of Erskine May but also on the established practices of the

House. Although, strictly speaking, all interjections are out of order, in the past it has been accepted that there is a certain level of contribution to the debate that can in some circumstances be tolerated. I have made clear with many previous rulings that I will not tolerate interjections that are clearly calculated to drown out the member who is making a proper contribution to the House. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. A vote of no confidence in a Government or a Minister is meant to be one of the most important procedures of the House, I understood, but look at the farcical way in which it is treated by those members opposite, with points of order being taken, interjections, and nonsense. I am going to discuss the substance of this matter, and I reaffirm—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** 'About time' the honourable member interjects—out of order. Some half a dozen interjections and points of order and attempted interruptions to my remarks have occurred from the moment I began making them. I know that members opposite find it hard to cope, and I know that they try to make up for lack of numbers by noise and disruption. However, I want to deal with this motion, and deal with it directly. I reiterate that this Government remains committed to a public transport system, but not at any cost, and we will insist that there be efficiencies, cost savings and a rationalisation of services to ensure that services are put into the areas where they are most needed, having regard to the resources available. We will not be stood over by any group in the community, whether it be the unions, the Opposition or pressure groups in particular areas. That is the principle upon which we are operating. Those are the principles that the Minister of Transport has evinced, and that is why I express, as does our Government, the utmost confidence in the Minister's handling of these matters.

On the other hand, the Opposition wants to have a bob each way. They observe our public transport system and acknowledge its problems. The shadow Minister of Transport, on one of the very few occasions that he has deigned to speak on this matter, said that he accepts that the Government has significant problems which will continue in the future unless dramatic changes are made. A little later he said, 'The time is quickly approaching when we will have to stand up and be counted. We cannot continue to allow the projected deficit of \$1 billion to occur over the next 10 years.'

That is quite correct. One will hear every generalisation being mouthed by the shadow Minister and the Leader of the Opposition when it suits their opportunism, and by anybody else: great generalisations such as 'Stand up to the unions'; 'Sack them'; 'Get rid of this deficit'; and 'Take control of the system'. Yet on each and every occasion when there is a concrete example, when a job needs to be done or when a confrontation has occurred, where is the Opposition? It is trumpeting 'Sack them' when it is all in the abstract, but put up a picket line on the Belair-Bridgewater line and have a few of the troops out around the camp fire and they are saying, 'We demand that you talk with them. Why is the Premier refusing to negotiate? Where is the Minister? Why is he attending a Transport Ministers conference instead of sitting waiting near the telephone to see whether he will be asked up to the camp fire at Bridgewater?'

That is the attitude that they take when faced with a practicality. 'Rationalise the services'; 'Save money'; they say, but when we get to a specific, concrete example off they go again with 'You can't touch that one'; 'No, no, we

didn't really mean that' because they might offend the honourable members in the Hills areas, and 'We will let them take the brunt of it because we have to be careful that we do not get on the record as saying the Bridgewater-Belair line must stay open.' I challenge any member of this Parliament to find a statement from either the Leader of the Opposition or the shadow Transport Minister saying the line has to be open. No, they imply and hang back leaving the hapless lobby fodder on the back bench to go into battle for them, and to make the promises that will be disowned at the appropriate time if ever they have the opportunity. They even made fools of themselves yesterday by getting tossed out of the House to get a headline: that is what it is about—a bob each way: generalise about it, but when the time comes, back off.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I believe that it is against Standing Orders to impute improper motives to members. If any member wishes to question the press, they will find that I made no direct approach to the press, nor did the press approach me except for one local paper to which I made a statement later in the day. What the Premier is imputing I did yesterday is quite improper, and I ask him to withdraw that imputation.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order raised by the honourable member for Davenport is quite correct, and I hope that all members, during the course of this debate, will be cautious about imputing motives to one another. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I make no imputation against the honourable member, and if he takes what I said as such then I am happy to withdraw it. Incidentally, perhaps there are degrees of lobby fodder and I exempt the honourable member from that because his relations with his Party are not as close as those of the honourable member for Heysen.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Heysen.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If the Premier is prepared to provide an apology to the member for Davenport, then I ask him to provide the same apology to me.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I am happy to withdraw any imputation that the honourable member perceives. I am sorry to draw attention to his actions in that way. He possibly holds himself up to contempt. However, let me get back to this issue of an Opposition that does not have the guts to face up to the implications of what it urges on us: that you sack them if it is general, but you do not if it is particular; that you close something down if it is general, but do nothing if it is particular.

We are prepared to take those decisions in the interests of public transport in this State. We run the best public transport system, the most efficient, the least costly, the one with the lowest deficit and the cheapest fares in Australia, and we intend to keep it that way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Leader invites us to go and tell commuters that. I invite the commuters of Adelaide, South Australia, to go to any other city in this country, or to most cities in the world, because they will find that what I say is true. One of the impressions that this Opposition is seeking to forment is that of a system in total disarray. Certainly it is a system under pressure. Certainly it is a system where massive changes are made to contain the cost of the deficit—we have not backed off from that:

we have admitted it, and laid out the facts. Let us have some perspective on this. The current costs of running the STA have, in fact, been reduced over the recent period. The reason the deficit is escalating is not to do with recurrent operating costs but with the large capital costs of such systems with new buses, resignalling, and most importantly, with a \$100 million O-Bahn project.

They are the facts, so let us have that perspective. In saying that, I am in no way backing off from the problems of containing the STA deficit, and we are tackling them. What about the industrial disputes issue, where it is virtually suggested, again, by the Opposition that the system is in such disarray that the trains, buses and trams never run and commuters and passengers do not know at what time or how the services will be assured? That is not true. I agree that, at times, statements by those who wish to disrupt the system or make a point, or media reports, may give that impression, and they are certainly fuelled and fermented by the Opposition for its own purposes.

The facts are that in the 12 months prior to this Belair-Bridgewater dispute, as I am advised, there were in fact only two disputes which involved stoppages with the AFULE, both of which were to do with their employment by Australian National Railways—a national award issue and not to do with the STA and its management. There were no stoppages by the Australian Railways Union and, in fact, three authorised off-peak stop-work meetings by the bus employees to consider various issues, and one unauthorised stoppage by one depot, the St Agnes depot, over a foolish dispute on which, again, we did not hear the Opposition say too much when the Government intervened, laid down the law, and made a particular result occur. They were very silent on that occasion.

That is the record of disputes and stoppages. This past month, of course, we had the mess of the Belair-Bridgewater line, which mess has been made infinitely worse by the way in which the Opposition and its members have sought to keep the pot boiling, keep it fermenting, hope that things will spread, hope that there will be no settlement and demand that the Government, which last year was meant to sack them all, deals with the unions, talks to them, compromises, and makes its peace. Let us not have that hypocrisy persisting.

The Minister of Transport, when he makes his contribution to this debate, will deal in some detail with aspects that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not intend to go into the question of fares and fare structure a great deal, but to say that it is very interesting to note the way the Leader uses figures. As I say, he has parcelled up and buried his little user-pays scheme, which would have resulted in monumental increases in public transport costs. He is talking about back door taxation. It is a funny back door taxation that actually recovers less than 25 per cent of the cost of the service. That is a pretty strange definition of a tax: a tax which loses money, where 75 per cent more has to be paid out after collection.

What a ridiculous concept! But that is the user-pays concept the Leader of the Opposition is on about. As to massive fare increases, he has a very short memory there, too. Admittedly, the time is receding when he had his brief taste of government—and his only taste, I would hope—but I suggest that members examine the record at that time and see what happened to fares and fare increases of the order of 100 per cent or more. It is necessary to recover it, but to talk about back door taxation in this way is ludicrous. The Liberal Party's very own policy recognises the problems that are faced. 'A modern and efficient public transport system' says the Liberal's policy before the last election,

'will be encouraged with the objective of increased patronage with more effective cost control. The escalation of the deficit has been alarming. A Liberal Government will make every effort to reduce the imbalance between the cost and revenue of the STA.' There are a few ways of doing that, one of which is to raise the fares—no, they do not want that to be in it. 'This will not be done by disproportionate fare increases.'

Just what does that mean? It was not spelled out. Set against the user-pays policy of the Opposition, 'disproportionate' takes on a whole new meaning, and exposes their hypocrisy. Just as an aside, I heard the shadow Minister, I think, or someone bleating about a scheme to publicise the new ticketing system, its flexibility, advantages and use, and by so doing promote public transport, and he is complaining that it is an outrageous waste of public money. I would refer him to the Liberal transport policy contained at page 14 of that Party's document, which states:

A major publicity campaign will be undertaken to promote the use of public transport.

With what? I suggest money and promotion. This Crouzet system, which has been condemned so much, provides such benefits in terms of customer convenience, flexibility of tickets, and so on, that not to publicise it will be to the detriment of public transport. So, how about the Opposition cleaning up its act and reading its own policy before berating our Minister and saying it has a lack of confidence in what he is doing?

While I am on that question, although it was about 15 minutes into his address that the Leader of the Opposition got around to the Crouzet system, we heard a mishmash of nonsense talked about that system and its costs. Certainly the cost is greater than contemplated at the time the contracts were signed. A figure of some \$6 million which was referred to has become a figure of around \$10 million and many factors are involved in that, including massive foreign exchange changes that took place from March 1985 until now. Although that was the contract itself (and everyone was not hedging at the time), I am advised that the STA in the course of that contract has made something like \$1 million on foreign exchange dealing in order to minimise that loss. We are not just sitting back and saying that we accept that situation and that it is money down the drain. Nearly \$1 million has been recovered under that system.

As to the statements of the Leader of the Opposition, let me refer to two. Yesterday he referred to \$100 000 damage to the Crouzet machines through vandalism. He cheerfully and gaily adds a '0'. That is very good! Secondly, he said that the Crouzet system cannot be economically justified. The Crouzet system has a number of aims, one being flexibility in terms of scheduling and ticketing. Another is its major impact on security, the cost of which would go into many millions of dollars if we had to go through an orthodox security approach. Yet another advantage is the detection and elimination of fraud with a figure of \$1 million being talked about in that regard. Who knows the figure? We will only know when the system is in operation. Finally, the system gives a sophisticated access to data which again would cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars to collect.

If we package that together, set it off against the cost of the Crouzet ticketing system, we will find that indeed the predictions that within 10 years or so the system will have paid for itself are correct. It is a cost effective way of running public transport ticketing. We say that for a number of reasons: first, the system has been adopted in major centres around the world and, secondly, since we have acquired it and based Crouzet here the Tasmanian transport authority

has decided to take it on. I suggest that members opposite talk to Robin Gray and company and ask why they are taking on a dastardly, socialist, wasteful scheme. Members had better warn him. Thirdly, and interestingly in the light of what is being said about our getting in a French system when there was an appropriate and effective Australian one, the Western Australian transport authority has been inquiring how it can transform its system to do some of the things our Crouzet system will do as its people have discovered inadequacies in the system they have adopted. Members opposite should not attack us over the Crouzet system until they have the facts and have done the research.

I conclude on this point. We have been given a litany of statements about the Minister and his failings. The motion was cobbled together hurriedly after the event, as we could not get a copy of the motion until the Leader got to his feet. It contains generalisations. My Minister is under attack. The Leader of the Opposition should look at his own house and the beam in his own eye before he states the deficiencies here. What has his own shadow Minister been doing to contribute towards public transport in this State?

I have quoted him on a couple of occasions. He acknowledged the problem last year when he said, 'Sack the unionists' and this year he said, 'Keep them on the payroll', and so on. I have acknowledged that occasionally he intervenes, but I refer to *Hansard* and the Address in Reply in August 1986, which was the first major opportunity the new shadow transport spokesman had to make some definitive statement about where he or his Party stood. How much is there in that speech about transport and his responsibilities? Search as I could, I came up with one reference. I was going to say 'Nothing', but that is not true: there is a reference to transport and it refers to fringe benefit taxes on new cars—one throwaway line and the rest is about recreation and sport. That is \$6 million worth of recreation and sport against more than \$500 million worth of transport.

The answer to the honourable member's apparent failure to deal with this is contained in an interview that he gave with a suburban newspaper where he said that he was taking on this portfolio, but that he had a far greater knowledge of recreation than of transport, because he had written the Liberal Party's policies in relation to sport and recreation. He said that he thought he was being pitted against Labor Minister Gavin Keneally, who had been around for a long time—the Mr Fixit of the Party would make his task very difficult indeed. Indeed, it has—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** Who wrote this rubbish?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am quoting the member for Bragg. We should have done the member for Heysen a favour and kept him out another day and that would have saved him this embarrassment. I am quoting his colleague's words and I am referring to the member for Bragg's general silence on transport matters and I am not surprised that it is reported in the paper. The *Advertiser* of June 1987 states:

The reality is that if Mr Ingerson does not make any headway during the next session he will be dumped, allowing Mr Olsen to bring—

goodness gracious me!—

the former Environment and Planning Minister, Mr Wotton, back to the front bench.

Perhaps the pattern of events of the past two days now is revealed. We now see why the member for Bragg gets question No. 5 and the member for Heysen gets question No. 3 and is thrown out. The point I make is this: the Leader of the Opposition has just discovered transport in a great flush of opportunism. He has asked a lot of questions and now he has made a big speech. We have dealt with it. His own Party shamefully has neglected it and I suggest that, rather than talking about my Minister and his great per-

formance, the Leader of the Opposition should pick up his own shadow Minister by the scruff of the neck and sack him, replace him or do whatever, but he should fix up his own act before he dares to come in and criticise us.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Todd has a point order.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I wonder if you, Mr Speaker, could repeat your admonition about interjections because, during that contribution by my Leader, I managed to count 20 interjections from the Leader of the Opposition out of a total of 46 interjections from the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot accept the point of order as such by the honourable member for Todd. However, I draw the attention of members to my remarks of 23 September 1986, when I stated:

There are three matters on which the Chair will be fairly unbending: first, members shall be clearly heard when they have the call to speak and shall not be shouted down—

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr LEWIS:** May I seek your direction, Sir, on the Standing Order that refers to the way in which members must respect the Chair and they must acknowledge the Chair on entering and leaving the Chamber. Would you, Sir, remind the member for Todd of that Standing Order, because not five minutes ago he approached a member of the public in the gallery without acknowledging you as he left the Chamber and as he re-entered it?

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order raised by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee should have been taken at the time that the Standing Order was infringed. It is the same point of order to which he drew my attention last night with regard to another member. I accept that the point of order raised by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee is a completely valid one and I remind members of that particular Standing Order. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Premier has a rather peculiar view of the way in which a State Government works. He now expects the Opposition to solve his problems. The Government, not the Opposition, is charged with running the transport system in South Australia. At the end of his tirade, which was pretty thin on substance and fact, the Premier introduced some material from a gossip column in the newspaper suggesting that the shadow Transport Minister should be running the public transport system for him, but that is an absurd proposition.

The Premier has suggested that we are dealing in generalisations, but he cannot get around the facts. At least the Opposition had the wit at the last election to put out a transport policy, whereas the Labor Party did not manage to cobble one together (to use the Premier's word). However, he made a passing reference with fairly firm promises in his policy speech to the people of South Australia, who by now must be getting almost hardened to the hypocrisy of the Premier, the very hypocrisy of which he is accusing members on this side and which allows him to blatantly break election promises without turning a hair.

He used to look embarrassed when he first broke a whole raft of promises in 1982. Then, he said that he would not increase taxes and looked uncomfortable when he did, but now he does not turn a hair. He has been schooled by the Prime Minister to break promises with impunity. In fact, these Labor Leaders break more election promises than they

keep. That is certainly true in transport. In what was in effect a non-existent transport policy, the Premier said:

Priority is being given to ensuring better transport services to Adelaide's outer suburbs.

That is marvellous! They are now going to pull seats out and herd people like cattle. The Premier continued:

We will complete the \$95 million O-Bahn busway system from Adelaide to Tea Tree Gully.

What is the result? They are certainly not giving priority to better transport: they have delayed that project. The Premier continued:

We will commence construction of a bypass to relieve congestion at the Darlington intersection, which will form the start of a third arterial road and provide a new corridor to the southern suburbs.

Nothing has happened. Listen to this bleeding heart bit:

Pensioners are those who qualify for benefits from the Department of Community Welfare. They will receive generous travel concessions on STA services within Adelaide. We will extend these concessions to municipal transport services in major regional cities.

What has he done? He is now charging a fee. That is the total of the Labor Party's transport commitment to the public of South Australia, and the Labor Government has broken all its promises in that regard. However, I return to the matters of substance that have been dealt with so adequately in this debate by my Leader. The Premier has been unable to answer even one of those charges so, for all his fulminating and seeking to ask the Opposition to solve his problems, he has not even one answer. He certainly has no answer to the fact that he said unequivocally that the Government would not increase charges during its first period in office and that thereafter it would increase them only in accordance with the consumer price index.

What is the public to believe? The Premier has already broken that promise, and now we have this proposal to exacerbate the problem being experienced by the long-suffering public of South Australia. I am sorry that the Premier was not here yesterday to hear the figures that I quoted when I spoke about talking up the economy on every possible occasion. We have Grand Prix and submarine projects running out of our ears.

However, in his attempts to talk up the South Australian economy, the Premier omits to tell the South Australian public that in terms of take home pay this State has fared worse than any other State during the life of this Government. When we consider how South Australia is doing compared to other States, we see that the increase for the average worker over the past 12 months has been 3.2 per cent (compared to 6 per cent nationally), but that increase has been more than wiped out by increases in transport charges let alone other costs such as water and council rates.

This Government has struck hammer blows at the average South Australian citizen and the proposed increases in public transport fares will press even harder on South Australians, especially those who commute to their work in the city from the outer suburbs that he promised to look after.

The Premier talks about the O-Bahn and says that that must be causing massive problems. What nonsense! He berates the Opposition by saying that we want to privatise the bus system. However, it was a sorry day when Transport Minister Virgo, following the socialist policies of the Labor Party, bought out Bowmans bus services to the outer suburbs. As soon as they became profitable, the STA gobbled them up. That company had a fleet of new buses and provided an efficient system, so the Government spent millions on buying it, turning the owners into millionaires; it gave them a job and handed over the services to the STA, which has done nothing but lose money ever since.

Let the Premier look overseas at public transport systems and see how they work. He talks about the user-pays principle, but who pays in South Australia? Every taxpayer in this State pays through the nose for the transport services the Premier seeks to provide. He now says that the O-Bahn service has caused the trouble, but what was Labor policy? Labor wanted to put in an LRT which would have cost about three times as much. Any economic analysis of a light rail transport system indicated that, had we gone down that track, the deficit would not have been \$105 million but \$200 million. The Government hails the O-Bahn as a success story when it wishes but, once committed to that by previous Labor Governments, it is a Liberal Party initiative to try to provide a public transport system that we could afford.

What has the Premier to say about this ticketing system? They had to get the union movement on side, so they paid for a trip overseas to see how it works in France. What is the result? They may as well have saved their money. The union bosses came back and said that the Government would rue the day it tried to introduce this system. So much for their consultation and getting the unions on side so that they will have an easy ride! What is the Premier's answer to that?

The system will cost money, not save it, and the taxpayer will be out of pocket when the system is instituted. The Premier says, 'We can't be worried about a loss of over \$6 million because the financial arrangements were not satisfactory.' Whose fault is that? Is it the fault of the shadow Minister or of the Opposition? We are not pulling the purse strings. It is the Government that is introducing the system, and it was the Government that sent its mates overseas, only to return and tell the Government that it would rue the day. The Minister does not even know the cost of the damage.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** It's \$10 000.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Minister had better check that figure. When questioned a day or two ago, he did not even know what the damage was or its extent, although he said he knew that there had been some damage. He now says that the cost of the damage is \$10 000, but he has not the faintest idea of what is going on in his department, and that again is a case in point.

In the past day or two the Minister has even resorted to the dirty tactic of accusing members on this side who attended the meeting, called in good faith in the Hills, of supporting the closure of the Belair-Bridgewater line. There was no point whatever in what the Minister said on Thursday in this House unless he intended to give the clear implication (and he did) that those members whom he named had supported the resolution to close that railway line. Such a charge, however, is absolutely untrue, and the Minister knows that.

The Minister also said that he would make available the document that gave rise to this fantastic and untrue slur on these members concerned. However, for some reason or other the document was shot back to his department like a rocket, and it was out of sight. He was asked to table the document because, had it been a docket, he would have had to table it, but the honourable member, who had asked for it, said that it had gone back to the department, post haste, and that he could not have it. When he inquired on the next day of sitting, he was told that 'No, it is not available', and by the next afternoon he was told that he could not have it. How on earth can members in this place deal with a Minister when he seeks to deal with them in that fashion.



It is plain that the Premier cannot get around the fact that he was given solemn undertakings to the public. The Minister and the Premier are charged with delivering those undertakings, and they have failed miserably on all counts. This litany of broken promises following the last election is of the same magnitude as the broken promises that occurred after the Labor Government was first elected. As I have said, the Premier used to look a bit shamefaced then, when he said, 'No, we have the Auditor-General's Report, we have all the facts and figures, and we know we will not have to increase taxes', following which a month or two later he had to admit that he would have to—but at least he looked a bit shamefaced about it. Now we have the same situation in relation to transport, where history is repeating itself, and the Premier gets up here with a flow of bluster and humbug about the role of the Opposition, and completely evades the matter of responsibility of his Minister and of the Government. The facts in this matter are plain.

The Minister of Transport is wont to sugar coat the pill when he is delivering to the public information about these broken promises. We know what he said. In the same sort of fashion I guess he is trying to explain what happened on Thursday by saying 'I didn't say that.' He is trying to suggest that he really did not say it, but what he was saying was perfectly clear, and the Minister knows that. He announced to the public that there would be a 10 per cent increase in driver's licence fees. In fact, the fees were all in excess of 10 per cent—the whole lot of them. The Minister said that the figures were rounded up. When the Minister was challenged about these increases in fares, he said that he had just rounded them up. It was not a bad bit of rounding—10 per cent up to 16.7 per cent—although he forgot to round up the .7 per cent, and had he done so it would have been 17 per cent. So, misrepresentation and downright deceit on the part of the Minister is not unknown to us.

The problems that the Government and the Minister are encountering are entirely of their own making. We have this sudden necessity to tighten the purse strings: we have this sudden need for austerity. I suggest to members opposite that they look hard at their policies on which they promised their way into Government. They promised their way into Government, and they attempted to keep their promises. They did that initially, but now they just do not worry about them, particularly in relation to education. They just do not worry about it now: they are all expendable. We have heard this sorry tale from Canberra that we must curtail expenditure. They have all gone down the same track, promising their way into office, keeping some of the promises, and then finding out that they cannot afford the other promises, thus making the medicine that eventually has to be taken all that much nastier and unpalatable.

As I said yesterday, Mr Hawke increased Government spending by over 7 per cent in real terms for the first two years of his Government. Talk about boom or bust policies! Now the screws are on. The present Government increased Government expenditure by 6.9 per cent in 1983-84 in real terms, and by over 11 per cent in real terms during the second year of its tenure of office. Now the Government expects the long-suffering users of public transport to pay for it. The problem is of the Government's own making entirely. It is on the Government's head: the Minister is squirming around seeking to blame the Opposition for pointing out the Government's hypocrisy and downright deceit, and that was absolutely pitiful behaviour.

The fact is that the Minister, as a responsible Minister, has failed to honour the promises of the Government in relation to public transport fares. He has failed to stand up to union demands, which have added to the pressure of

fare increases. He sent his mates overseas to look at the ticketing system: they came back and he gave them \$10 a week extra for their trouble. They said that he would rue the day that he wanted to bring it in. The system has been vandalised and the Minister does not even know what it cost. He has failed to answer questions in Parliament fully and truthfully, and he has maligned members on this side of the House in a bit of the dirtiest politics that we have seen in this place for some time. The man's gall is nothing short of astonishing in the light of his failure to effectively manage his portfolio.

Perhaps I could sum up by referring to a letter that a lady wrote to me. She would not get top marks for English literature or spelling, but she is a member of the public, and wrote to me in the following terms. I think that she shared the sentiments of a person speaking on Vincent Smith's talkback show on 5DN—she just happened to be listening, and this caller said, 'Keneally is a disaster; everything he has touched has been a disaster.' We know that he presided over the incineration of the prisons when he was Minister responsible for prisons, and now he is presiding over the disintegration of the public transport system. However, this is what the lady who wrote to me said, and I would think that this is fairly typical of the long suffering public who rely on the public transport system. She stated:

This increase of fares must stop. Those new ticket machines were made surplus in France, and then this idiot—

that is the Minister, of course—

uses taxpayers' money to buy them. They prove useless and he has paid \$11.5 million, and I think he should be sacked because of it and made to pay for them.

I thought that was pretty good, and I would think that that sums up the sentiments of many people in the public arena. Suffice to say that the Minister has been a disaster. He was sunning himself up in Queensland—that State which is the blight of the lives of all Labor politicians, we are told; that place which is the closest to hell on earth that we can imagine. The Minister was up in Queensland sunning himself while we have the unions running the transport system in South Australia. He says that he was running the department by phone—well good luck to him. He must have spent a lot of time on the phone and not much time on the beach, if that was a statement of fact.

It reminded me of a former Premier; when the moratorium dispute got too tough for him and the Commissioner of Police stepped in to do something about it, it was a matter of up, up, and away. It reminded me of that occasion: when it gets too hot you get out of the kitchen and go somewhere else. This Minister has been a disaster. As I say, he presided over the incineration of the prisons, which cost the taxpayers literally millions of dollars, and then his mate in planning bulldozed down a heritage item, which cost them millions, and here he is presiding over the disintegration of the public transport system, and is perfectly happy to facilitate the breaking of yet again a further solemn election promise given by the Premier. It is a disgraceful exhibition, and the Minister ought to be sacked.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** Well, I listened very intently to what the Deputy Leader had to say: it is the same speech that he has been making during the 17 years that he and I have been in this place, except that it had a different title. So, we have heard it all before: there is a lot of fury and a lot of gutter tactics, but very little in substance. I need to respond to some of the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition, but before doing that I want to reinforce the opening remarks made by the Premier in this debate. The South Australian Government is very strongly committed to a transport system

that is viable, relevant, and efficient. As I have said many times—and it has been repeated here today by the Premier—there is a cost barrier that the community in South Australia is not prepared, I believe, to go beyond, and we have reached that cost barrier. This is the first Government in living memory that has been prepared to take the hard decisions in the area of transport.

It is true that, in this past two years because of changes in the economic situation, those challenges have been faced by this Government and those decisions have been forced upon it. I reject totally at the outset the allegation made by the Leader that I am presiding over the disintegration of public transport and that the STA is running out of financial control. Anybody here who took the trouble to have a look at last year's accounts would know that the increase in recurrent costs was .6 of one per cent: that was the increase in the operating cost of the STA. The accounts which will be available to the House this year, and which honourable members opposite will have an opportunity during Estimates Committees to ask questions about, show that we have done even better: recurrent costs of the STA have been reigned back for the first time ever.

**Mr Olsen:** \$480 million.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** In a moment we will get to some of the allegations that the Leader made earlier: I gave him an opportunity to make his speech, but he will now not give me an opportunity to make mine. This is like the situation yesterday, when I asked the House for an opportunity to make a personal explanation to explain what the real cost of the damage to the Crouzet system was, and the Leader of the Opposition denied me the opportunity to make that explanation.

I know why the Leader denied me that opportunity, because he thought that I was going to put to the test the statements made by the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport. The truth is that I was not going to refer to those statements at all—I was going to draw to the attention of the House the fact that the Leader (as he always does when he wants to) stuck a nought on the \$10 000 cost of damage to the Crouzet system to make it \$100 000. He thought that that would be a story over which the media would take a great deal of pleasure, and they did.

I suggest to honourable members opposite and to members of the press (or to anybody who has a real interest in what is happening in the STA) that they look at the Collins Report, as we call it, of PA Management Consultants, which was commissioned by this Government to study the financial performance and management structure of the STA. This study had never been done before. I invite honourable members, if they have not already read it, to do so. I sent a copy of that report to the Leader of the Opposition and to the shadow Minister. What does Collins say in that report? In the second paragraph of the executive summary he states:

Our overall conclusion is that the STA is being competently managed, provides a generally good standard of service, and has begun to face up to the critical issue of maintaining public transport services while winding back the real level of Government funding of the STA deficit.

The report states that South Australia has the best public transport system in Australia (and, in my experience, one of the best in the world). In addition, we have one of the best road systems in the world, so we do have advantages in Adelaide in that we have adequate car space on the road, which is unheard of elsewhere, and a public transport system that provides a level of comfort and reliability unequalled elsewhere in Australia.

The only threat to public confidence in the STA is the performance of a few people, encouraged by members oppo-

site for their own political ends. I say to the Opposition, as I said to one radio commentator in South Australia, that if this campaign of denigration of the STA continues, then people will lose confidence in what is a very good system, one that is competently managed and is reducing its recurrent costs.

Let me tell the House, if I am able to over the interjections of the Leader, who is going now, anyway, that the real budget problem the STA faces is servicing the capital costs—it is the ownership cost that the STA has. I invite honourable members to look at the PA Management Consultants' report at page 14, which shows a graph giving certain facts quite clearly. I would have thought that the shadow Minister would have been the second speaker on this matter so that I had something to reply to instead of the old mishmash that we have heard for 17 years and which I could write, coming from the Deputy Leader. I could do that without any trouble at all, but people would take as much notice of me making his speech as they take of him making it.

Anyone who refers to that graph will see that the cost of payment of weekly paid employees has come down; interest plus depreciation amortisation costs have gone up; for other expenses, costs have come down; interest on loans and leasing costs have gone up; payments and other costs of salaried staff are at the same level—and we are doing something about that (I will address that matter in a moment); and fuel and energy costs are down slightly. There is no doubt that the STA has performed remarkably well in relation to recurrent costs. Mr Collins states in his report, when referring to capital investment:

In addition, more than \$90 million is being spent on completion of the north-east busway—

that is from start to completion—it will be slightly more than that—

and the authority is responsible for debt service charges associated with this project.

I know that honourable members opposite want to take credit for the busway idea. We give them that credit. It performs superbly, is doing everything required of it and the decision about it was made by members opposite when in government. However, it has caused a huge capital debt that has to be serviced by this Government and the STA. It is that sort of debt that is dragging down the commercial viability of the STA in funding terms. While the STA has done remarkably well in managing its operations, it has little capacity to manage a debt that is forced on it by Government decision. I point out that the two major decisions made about public transport in recent years are the Noarlunga line extension and duplication, and the O-Bahn busway. They were both made by Government, both need to be serviced by Government and they are not STA decisions. However, the STA has to find the funds to service those debts.

The Leader said that I have not been prepared to stand up to the unions. They will find that rather interesting, because at the last meeting I had with the unions one of the senior officials said to me, 'You are the worst transport Minister we have ever dealt with. You do not say "Yes" to anything, you say "No" to everything. With every other Minister we have dealt with we could make some gains, but with you we do not get anywhere.' They got fed up with me at one stage and asked to speak to the Minister of Labour, but after speaking to him they wanted to deal with me again because they thought that I was the lesser of the two evils.

I reinforce the point made by the Premier that one of the reasons we are having some of this industrial disputation at the moment is that the unions are not getting those sorts

of gains that they believe they should have. They are not getting them because the State does not have the capacity to meet those sorts of industrial claims and, in any event, any industrial claim needs to be evaluated as to the justice of that claim. Of course there is trouble between the STA and me as Minister, and the union; of course there is conflict, but when the Government does take a decision that members opposite knew three years ago was the position recommended to Government, when I took that decision (not an easy one), what sort of assistance did I get from the Opposition? Nothing at all from the Leader, he did not say, 'Good on the Government, they are cutting out a service that is uneconomic and poorly patronised.'

There was not a word from the shadow Minister of Transport except to say that he thought it was a good idea for the trial to be given an opportunity: that was the only comment he made. With both of those gentlemen taking that position (and that was the responsible thing for them to do), they left the member for Heysen to run the race and the member for Davenport, an independent member, to make the running, so when there is a stand taken where are the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport?

They are up at Bridgewater with the picketers, supporting them, and saying to the unions, 'Good on you! Get into the Government: don't you let the Government make tough decisions. We're supporting you: you can rely on us. We are the Opposition: we will support the union in its battle against the Government.'

There is no support at all from the Opposition in difficult decisions. It did everything it could to undermine the Government. That is the position of the Opposition. It is like the recently quoted editorial from the *News*, which stated that the Government should take the axe without fear or favour and slice into Government costs. But the two things the Government has already done—with Goodwood and Bridgewater—were the wrong decisions! The Government should do something, but do not do something—that is the attitude of the Opposition. It always has been. They were cowardly in Government, and now they are brave in Opposition.

It is the same with the legislation they keep asking the Government to implement on essential services. The Opposition, federally and in South Australia, has never implemented such legislation, because its members know how futile it is when they are in Government, but in Opposition they are very strong supporters of it. When they have the responsibility, they run out of nerve: when they do not have any responsibility they are the bravest people around.

A few things need to be put right. The idea that the Dunstan Government forcibly took over the private bus services was put to rest at that time—and it is still rubbish. The private bus services came to the Government to ask for more and more increased subsidies because they were unable to run their services, to the extent that the Government had to take over the private operators to have a viable transport system in Adelaide. That is the truth of that.

I am glad the honourable member raised the issue of taking out seats in the buses, because it gives me the opportunity to formally put on the record what we have been trying to get through the media and have been unable to do. There is no intention by the STA to take out seats. The STA is negotiating with the unions which have an agreement, ratified by the Arbitration Commission, about the number of people able to stand in buses—to increase that number of people so that we can get more people on buses in peak periods, thus having to buy fewer buses, pay less capital cost, less servicing cost and have a more viable STA.

So, let us put that to rest. I do not want to hear any more of that rubbish about taking seats out of buses.

I want to get on to what seems to be the burden of the complaint of members opposite, that is, the problems that the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport had yesterday because they used unparliamentary language and were not prepared to withdraw. I have been in this House for 17 years, and only the member for Davenport has been here longer. I have been suspended, and, in fact, I can recall only one member, the previous member for Heysen (Mr McAnaney) being suspended from this House and not really knowing what was going on. Every other member who has been suspended by this House has known the results of his or her action. In fact, the member for Davenport stated that he wanted to be suspended yesterday, so he was suspended. However, I notice that he voted for the acceptance of his explanation although he did not want it to be given. I will tell the House what happened. I will get blasted for saying this, but when the member for Heysen was suspended I said to the member for Davenport, 'You're in a bit of trouble. David Wotton, the member for Heysen, is out there on TV telling everyone in the Hills how he's standing up for people in the Hills. What are you doing just sitting here in the House?' Five minutes later he was out with the member for Heysen. What I said last Thursday—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Order!

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is highly disorderly for the member for Murray-Mallee to be interjecting when the Chair is trying to accept a point of order from the member for Davenport.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I draw to your notice the last comment made by the Minister—although there were several comments—when he said that I left this place (and that was the impact of his words) because he called out something to me across the House which I did not hear at the time—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is supposed to be raising a point of order. If he wishes to make a personal explanation claiming that he has been misrepresented, he can do so later, after this debate concludes.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** It is imputing an improper motive to the action I took yesterday. The Minister stated today that he called out across the House that I would have to do the same thing, or words to that effect. I did not hear that.

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

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I withdraw and apologise. The member for Davenport obviously did not hear my comment yesterday, and I accept that. It was a coincidence.

I have one or two other very quick responses in the time left to me. The Leader of the Opposition talks about increases in fares. In the time his Government was in office between 1979 and 1981 it had two budgets and increased some fares by 100 per cent and some by 75 per cent—but there were 100 per cent increases in the fares. In terms of disputes, the Premier has already indicated the level of disputes.

In South Australia every time something happens or anyone sneezes the unions are on the radio or in the press saying they are going to do this or that. Because they continue to threaten the Government and the STA, everyone in South Australia believes that the system is always in turmoil and always stopping. What the unions are doing, in effect, by threatening all the time is helping to destroy their own industry, developing a loss of confidence in the

industry. I have pointed out to them that I think this is counterproductive. Somehow, I think that message is probably getting through to them.

The question was asked about who will pay for the Bureau of Transport Economics survey. We do not even know yet whether it will be done. I have written to the Federal Minister asking whether the bureau would do it, as requested of me by the union. The terms of the agreement were that I should ask the Bureau of Transport Economics whether it would do a study, and I have done that. I have written and am now awaiting a reply. People in this House must understand that this was a condition imposed by the union. It was not a condition that we sought, and not one that we believed would be effective, but it was a condition to have the transport system operating again and, as I said earlier, I know the economic reality of that decision.

Another point I want to put straight—I have heard members opposite accusing the Government in relation to this agreement—relates to one service down and one service back to Bridgewater. The timing of those services was requested by the union. It is nothing to do with the STA. The STA and the Government did not want the train to run at all, but the unions wanted one to run and dictated the time they said was most suitable with benefit to the children and to commuters. They selected the time. They, in fact, made a mistake when they said 7.29—and we imposed 7.29. They actually meant 7.39. They made a mistake: it was not the Government. The Government has taken every step available to it, having regard to our difficult economic climate, to make sure we have a viable and relevant public transport system of which everyone in South Australia can be proud. We have such a system now. I am very concerned about the damage that has been done to it by its critics who, mostly, are doing it for either political or industrial reasons.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I suppose it is better to be a feather duster than a cream puff. I came into this House—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bragg will resume his seat for one moment. I caution Government backbenchers against drowning out the member for Bragg. The honourable member for Bragg.

**Mr INGERSON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. I came into this House respecting the Minister of Transport, and I believe he was respected on both sides of politics for his straight dealing, but since he has taken over the transport portfolio we have seen a new side to his character. That was highlighted particularly yesterday by his behaviour in relation to the members for Heysen and Davenport. I thought that it was the most disgraceful example I have seen in the short time I have been in this place.

I would like to take up a couple of comments the Premier made. The Premier made a comment about the recurrent operating cost decreasing during the time of his Government. I did a quick calculation on figures from the Auditor-General's Report and note that, in 1981-82, \$20 million of the \$100 million was the capital cost as it related to the total operating cost of the STA and in 1985-86 that has only increased to \$26 million of the total. So, we still have \$132 million of the \$158 million going into operating costs. Like all figures, if we want to play games it is easy to show that operating costs and capital costs can vary quite considerably. It is interesting that the Minister of Transport took

up the O-Bahn, as I understand that the costing for the alternate light rail was double the cost of the O-Bahn.

It is easy now for the Minister to say that the cost of the O-Bahn is a problem when there is no doubt at all that he was quite happy, along with the Premier, to open it, welcome it and encourage everything positive that has been done on the O-Bahn. Let us look at the Crouzet system and the comments the Minister and Premier have made about fraud. It is interesting to read a union document handed over to me after the trip, 'Springtime in Paris', which refers to fraud and states:

Elderly passengers were confused on whether they required to validate their ticket which they carried in a 'plastic wallet' similar to pensioners in Adelaide. Most failed to validate their tickets.

On schoolchildren, it states:

Young passengers although obviously conversant with the system blatantly abused or ignored the system.

In regard to adults, it states:

Adult passengers mostly validated tickets . . . with the . . . exception of obvious fare evasion until noticing the two local bus officials . . .

Finally, it states that the method to combat fraud is to increase the number of inspectors. That is a document from the 'Springtime in Paris' jaunt, written by Mr B. Walton on 16 August 1986. The Minister talks about fraud in the system and the fact that it is set up to counteract it. Yet, a union official who went on the trip said that one of the problems with the system is the possibility of fraud. We heard the Premier saying how important the fraud aspect is to the system.

I wish to take up the Minister's comment that in the last two years he has faced hard decisions in terms of cost savings in the STA. In 1984-85 the actual cash paid by the State Government to the STA to bring up its running cost was \$77.4 million. Two years later, under a very well managed system, we are paying out \$95 million. The worst part of the \$95 million is that the budget figure is \$84 million—thus it is \$10 million over budget. The Minister said that he understood clearly what this was all about. He is running a very tight ship.

It is interesting to note that the consolidated account, put out by the Premier each month, showed that in December 1986, on a budget figure of \$84 million, the STA payment by the Government was already \$5 million or 17 per cent over budget, and by May of this year it has turned out to be a lineball figure, which means we have one month's trading or \$10 million over budget. The Minister said that he was running the budget under control. How could he be running the budget under control when he has before him every month these figures produced by his Premier? How could he possibly have the budget under control?

When we talk about servicing capital costs, it is interesting to see what has happened to capital costs and from where the capital is coming as it relates to the STA. It is coming from SAFA. The interest on capital investments is down to the STA because all of the finance and extra capital in the STA has been bled into SAFA. Today in terms of interest payments STA is paying at least 2 per cent more on every dollar it has borrowed than it was paying prior to the introduction of SAFA. We talk about better management and increased capital costs under this Minister. Let us look at the interest paid on the loans. The interest of \$7.5 million paid in 1981-82 is now \$13.9 million—partly due to an extra 2 per cent created by SAFA. While we all support the need to have an organised financing system within SAFA, let us get back to the real effect it is having on the STA. Let us not kid ourselves about what is happening.

The final point relates to Bridgewater. The Minister said that he was in total control of the system. Half way through

the Bridgewater complaint we had the Minister shooting off to Queensland, with nobody in charge. It is one of the few times in the history of Government that the documents required to go before Executive Council to appoint an Acting Minister were not completed. The excuse was that the Minister's staff did not have time to fill them out. That is the sort of attitude that the Minister took in relation to the Bridgewater line. His comments in the last two days about the members for Heysen and Davenport have been despicable. I support the motion.

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** I thank the member for Bragg for keeping his comments short and enabling me to speak in this debate but, frankly, I am staggered that he is No. 3 on the Opposition speaking list. It is obviously a vote of no confidence in him by the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The decision obviously was taken in the Party room that the Opposition could not afford to have the shadow transport Minister take the important No. 1 or 2 position.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is trying to receive a point of order from the member for Murray-Mallee but is being distracted by the interjections of the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr LEWIS:** Are the remarks made by the member for Fisher relevant to the subject of this motion?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is unable to rule on that matter because of the interjections by the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Fisher.

**Mr TYLER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The more time the honourable member uses up in irrelevant points of order the longer I will take and the less opportunity members opposite will have in this debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair asks the member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw a phrase he used which was clearly unparliamentary.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would be happy to do that if the honourable member would withdraw the imputation he made against me.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are to be no conditions attached to the withdrawal. The Chair directs the member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw the unparliamentary term he used.

**Mr LEWIS:** I withdraw, Mr Speaker. On a point of order may I ask that the member for Fisher withdraw the improper imputation directed at me?

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair did not hear the words. What is the imputation? Will the member for Murray-Mallee inform me? The honourable member does not wish to proceed. The member for Fisher.

**Mr TYLER:** What we have seen in the last couple of days of this parliamentary sitting is an Opposition that has been itching to attack the Government on something. It has been thrashing around trying to find an issue. It has unfortunately found it in the area of transport and has made a deliberate attack. It has been itching to get to this point when it can move a no confidence motion in somebody. Once again the Leader of the Opposition and members of his Party have missed the whole point. They have failed to understand what is happening in the economy, particularly in the transport area. The Government has not run away from any issues. It realises that tough decisions need to be made. The shadow Minister has highlighted the fact that the STA is running at a \$100 million deficit in this State.

When the Government decides that it will do something about it, members opposite scream and squeal. It appears that it is okay to make cuts as long as those cuts do not affect them. It is all right to cut out services in working class and middle class areas but, when their constituents are affected, that is when they scream the most.

The Leader of the Opposition missed his target. Actually, he did not hit the Minister of Transport, because his motion and the related comments are a slur against the STA board, which comprises senior business sector people who have tried to run the STA in an effective and efficient manner. They have made several recommendations to the Minister and, when the Government endorses those actions, the Leader of the Opposition screams about it. Really, what he is saying is that he has no confidence not only in his shadow Minister but also in the STA board. The Government set up an inquiry to review the performance of the State Transport Authority, and the Minister of Transport quoted from that report early on, but he did not mention a paragraph that I think sums up the whole situation as far as the State Transport Authority is concerned. The Collins report states:

The State Transport Authority has been largely successful in fulfilling the expectations which existed at the time of its creation. Adelaide has been provided with a modern, integrated public transport system. The service, vehicles and infrastructure are generally of good standard and passenger amenity has been considerably improved. The system provides the great majority of Adelaide residents with a public transport service which is accessible and reliable.

Unfortunately, I am nearly out of time, but I congratulate the Minister of Transport for making some tough decisions. He should continue in the same manner, and he should implement further recommendations contained in the Collins report. It appears from the answer that he gave me in Parliament last week that a further review of the State Transport Authority will be undertaken and that the STA will continue to be maintained by this Government.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Let me highlight to the House the fact that the Premier ignored specifics, his own broken promises, the alarming STA deficit and the way in which the unions run our transport system. He even excused the unions of industrial sabotage, which he dismissed, even though public property has been taken to with sledgehammers. We have seen no defence on this matter and I suppose that today, to the Premier's credit, he did not even attempt to defend the broken promises relating to fare increases. He did not attempt to defend the indefensible. That is the only point of credit that one could give to the Premier's response to the House today.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** And he didn't defend his Minister, either.

**Mr OLSEN:** He did not defend the Minister at all. The Premier referred to broadbrush specifics on policies of the Liberal and Labor Parties of several years ago, but he did not tackle the core issues that have been laid on the table today. The Minister of Transport and the member for Fisher both referred to the Collins report. The Minister quoted selectively from the Collins report. I will quote several paragraphs from that report. On page 32 it states:

Head office costs have grown disproportionately to the expansion of the system.

That is exactly the point that I made in my speech today. The report further states:

New systems and initiatives have not been matched by sufficiently rigorous pruning of pre-existing activities, and the authority does not have specific targets in relation to overhead costs reduction.

Once again, that is the specific point that I made in my speech today. The Minister is accountable to this House for the performance of the State Transport Authority. The

member for Fisher attempted to indicate that the Minister should be excused and that we are talking about the board and the management. We are not talking about the board and the management. The person who is accountable in this Parliament is the Minister. He is responsible to this Parliament and to the people of South Australia for the performance of the STA.

The member for Fisher reflected on the performance of this Government and of the Premier. When there is good news, they are always up front to announce it but, whenever there is bad news or a problem, they are nowhere to be seen. They duck and run for cover. For example, take last night: it was not the Minister or the Premier who was prepared to front on the program *State Affair* but, rather, the unfortunate public relations officer from the State Transport Authority was told to front up and attempt to defend the indefensible. The Minister has not tabled in this House the record—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Transport is highly out of order in interjecting out of his place.

**Mr OLSEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am delighted to observe your impartial chairing of this debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that the Leader is not reflecting on the Chair.

**Mr OLSEN:** Not at all. I said that I was delighted to observe the way in which you are impartially chairing this debate.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** Partially?

**Mr OLSEN:** Impartially. Have no fear about it: it was not a reflection on the Chair but, rather, quite the opposite. The fact is that if the Minister had any statistics or a record from the State Transport Authority relating to the number of machines that have been vandalised or the running total cost of those, I am sure that he would have trotted those out to the media, but he has not done so. He has not done so because there is no record on running costs. There are individual costs, but they have not been collated, and that is the point. The fact is that this \$10 000 misses the point. It is not the past that we are talking about as the only cost in vandalism and damage. What is important is all the other costs of returning those machines to good working order, and the Minister knows that that figure is well above \$10 000. The fact that he did not table any of that documentation indicates that he does not have a leg to stand on. Referring to capital expenditure, page 15 of the Collins report states:

... it is our view that inadequate attention has been paid to the ... capital expenditure and to the flow-on effects of such expenditure on the STA's recurrent costs and deficit.

I draw attention to the words 'inadequate attention'. It is the Minister's responsibility to attend to such matters, but he avoided his responsibility and he has been negligent in his duty to this House and to the budget papers that are presented in this House. Page 15 further states:

... it is not clear that the authority's capital investments have always been as cost effective as might have been expected or given rise to anticipated savings in recurrent costs.

The Minister conveniently forgets those parts of the report that clearly support the point of view being put forward by the Liberal Party in relation to mismanagement of the State Transport Authority on the part of the Minister.

The Premier does not know what is going on in the transport portfolio. He said that the Government had no idea about the amount of abuse in relation to fares and concessions, but in a letter to the editor of the *News* of 1 May, the Minister stated:

What we are talking about, hysteria aside, [ticketing issues] is a \$6 million public investment designed to save \$1 million a year.

In relation to fraud, the Minister nominated the figure of \$1 million. There has been a blow-out of \$1 million in the cost of those ticketing machines and an increase from \$4 500 000 to \$10 500 000—a \$6 million increase in the capital cost. That will involve a debt servicing cost of about \$700 000. Already the Minister has given away to the union about \$900 000, so after stamping out fraud as it relates to concessions and patronage, with the new ticketing system the net loss on an annual basis still will be about \$700 000. Neither the Premier nor the Minister refuted the argument attached to those statistics that I placed on the table at the beginning of this debate. They walked away from those statistics, and they did so because they are indefensible: the argument cannot be destroyed. That is why they talked in generalities rather than going to the specifics.

What a weak presentation by the member for Fisher. I really feel sorry for him. The Whip put the wood on him. He did not want to get up, but he was told that he had to do so. It was obvious from the banter that was going on that he drew the short straw. However, he got up because he was told to do so. Let the member for Fisher ask his constituents how they are getting on with their public transport.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Dui-gan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Slater.

Pairs—Ayes—Mr Allison, Ms Cashmore, and Mr Chapman. Noes—Messrs Mayes, McRae, and Tyler.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. TED CHAPMAN

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I move:

That six weeks leave of absence be granted to the member for Alexandra (Hon. Ted Chapman) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills to be introduced before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended so that on Thursday the adjourned debate on the question 'That the Address in Reply, as read, be adopted' take precedence over all other business, including questions, between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I have a doubt about supporting the motion because the Standing Orders appear to conflict. One Standing Order provides that the Address in Reply debate shall take precedence of all other business, whereas another Standing Order provides that on every

Thursday private members' business shall be dealt with from 11 a.m. onwards. Those two Standing Orders are in conflict. If I can have an assurance that the Standing Orders Committee will correct this conflict, I shall be happy, but I believe that the only reason for the Minister's moving the motion is that there is a conflict in the wording of those two Standing Orders and that such wording is ambiguous.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** This is perhaps a matter for you, Mr Speaker, and I would not want to disagree with urging on you that the Standing Orders Committee be invited to look at this. I am merely asking the House to approve what I recall I asked it to approve at the appropriate time in the last session. My information is that the object of the motion as it stands is not to prevent private members moving their motions, because that is already prevented by Standing Order 44. If the motion is not agreed to, in the present state of the Standing Orders the only business before the House on Thursday morning will be Question Time. I do not believe that that is the wish of members. I believe that it is the wish of members that we proceed with the Address in Reply debate and that we have Question Time at the traditional hour of 2 p.m. That is the reason for the motion. It does nothing further and, if what the honourable member says is the judgment of members generally, certainly the Standing Orders Committee should examine this matter.

Motion carried.

#### TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Technical and Further Education Act 1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

In essence the Bill is intended to achieve two things. First, the main amendment extends to officers of the teaching service certain long service leave entitlements available to public servants under the Government Management and Employment Act. This move reflects long standing practice to align, wherever possible, leave conditions for public servants and officers of the teaching service.

Second, other amendments are intended to assist understanding and calculation of long service leave entitlements by repealing certain provisions that are either too detailed or no longer necessary and replacing them, where appropriate, with terms and expressions similar to those in the Government Management and Employment Act.

Specifically, the main thrust of the Bill is to allow officers of the teaching service to take pro rata long service leave after seven years effective service at the discretion of the Director-General. Should leave be approved normal conditions will apply, namely, the timing and extent of the leave will be subject to departmental convenience.

A further amendment which also flows from the Government Management and Employment Act provides for long service leave payments to be calculated at non-substantive salary rates if the Director-General so decides. Such a pro-

vision would cater for, say, an officer who has acted at a higher classification level for an extended period prior to taking long service leave and who expects to return to that classification level following the leave.

The remaining amendments are either consequential on the principal amendments or reflect a general tidying up of the existing Act.

A transitional clause will ensure that officers of the teaching service are neither advantaged nor disadvantaged by the repeal or rewording of existing provisions.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 (2) of the Act which defines 'effective service' of an officer for the purposes of the Act to mean the continuous full-time service of the officer (subject to Ministerial discretion). The amendment removes the reference to full-time so that continuous part time service automatically counts as effective service.

Clause 4 substitutes sections 19, 20 and 21 of the Act which are the main long service leave provisions. The new section 19 provides that an officer accrues an entitlement to long service leave as follows:

- (a) 63 days for the first seven years of effective service;
- (b) 0.75 of a day for each complete month of effective service from the eighth to the 15th year;

and

- (c) 1.25 days for each subsequent complete month of effective service.

It also ensures that any long service leave entitlement that accrued before the commencement of the Bill will not be affected and that any entitlement to five year pro rata long service leave that would have arisen apart from the Bill will be preserved.

The new section 20 provides for the taking of long service leave after the seventh year of effective service but before the tenth such year. After 10 years there is an entitlement to take long service leave. In all cases, long service leave may only be taken in respect of completed years of effective service and only at times and for periods that are, in the opinion of the Director-General, convenient to the department. The salary payable to an officer on leave is that applicable to the officer's substantive classification level. The Director-General may authorise payment to the officer of additional salary or allowances. An officer may elect to take twice the length of long service leave on half salary. A part-time officer may elect to take a reduced amount of leave on the pay applicable to full-time service.

The new section 21 entitles an officer who has completed at least seven years effective service to payment in lieu of long service leave on ceasing to be an officer. If such an officer dies the equivalent payment is to be made to the officer's personal representative or such of the officer's dependants as the Minister considers appropriate. If there are any outstanding claims under the Act against the officer, the section empowers the Minister to deduct an appropriate amount from the payment in lieu of long service leave.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act 1972. Read a first time.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

In essence the Bill is intended to achieve two things. First, the main amendment extends to teachers certain long service leave entitlements available to public servants under the Government Management and Employment Act. This move reflects long standing practice to align, wherever possible, public servants and teachers' leave conditions.

Second, other amendments are intended to assist understanding and calculation of long service leave entitlements by repealing certain provisions that are either too detailed or no longer necessary and replacing them, where appropriate, with terms and expressions similar to those in the Government Management and Employment Act.

Specifically, the main thrust of the Bill is to allow teacher to take pro rata long service leave after seven years effective service at the discretion of the Director-General. Should leave be approved, normal conditions will apply, namely, the timing and extent of the leave will be subject to departmental convenience.

A further amendment which also flows from the Government Management and Employment Act, provides for long service leave payments to be calculated at non-substantive salary rates if the Director-General so decides. Such a provision would cater for, say, a teacher who has acted at a higher classification level for an extended period prior to taking long service leave and who expects to return to that position following the leave.

The remaining amendments are either consequential on the principal amendments or reflect a general tidying up of the existing Act.

A transitional clause will ensure that teachers are neither advantaged nor disadvantaged by the repeal of or rewarding of existing provisions.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 (2) of the Act which defines 'effective service' of an officer for the purposes of the Act to mean the continuous full-time service of the officer (subject to Ministerial discretion). The amendment removes the reference to full-time so that continuous part-time service automatically counts as effective service.

Clause 4 substitutes sections 19, 20 and 21 of the Act which are the main long service leave provisions. The new section 19 provides that an officer accrues an entitlement to long service leave as follows:

- (a) 63 days for the first seven years of effective service;
- (b) 0.75 of a day for each complete month of effective service from the eighth to the 15th year; and
- (c) 1.25 days for each subsequent complete month of effective service.

It also ensures that any long service leave entitlement that accrued before the commencement of the Bill will not be affected and that any entitlement to five year pro rata long service leave that would have arisen apart from the Bill will be preserved.

The new section 20 provides for the taking of long service leave. It introduces the possibility of taking long service leave after the seventh year of effective service but before the tenth such year. After 10 years there is an entitlement to take long service leave. In all cases, long service leave may only be taken in respect of completed years of effective service and only at times and for periods that are, in the opinion of the Director-General, convenient to the department. The salary payable to an officer on leave is that applicable to the officer's substantive classification level. The Director-General may authorise payment to the officer of additional salary or allowances. An officer may elect to take twice the length of long service leave on half salary. A

part-time officer may elect to take a reduced amount of leave on the pay applicable to full-time service.

The new section 21 entitles an officer who has completed at least seven years effective service to payment in lieu of long service leave on ceasing to be an officer. If such an officer dies the equivalent payment is to be made to the officer's personal representative or such of the officer's dependants as the Minister considers appropriate. If there are any outstanding claims under the Act against the officer, the section empowers the Minister to deduct an appropriate amount from the payment in lieu of long service leave.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 11 August. Page 101.)

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I am very pleased to support the motion. I, too, want to express my deep regret at the passing of two former members of this House. The Hon. Don Simmons, AM, DFC, was one of nature's gentlemen, and was greatly respected by all those who were fortunate enough to know him. His contribution to the people of South Australia was most outstanding, and I extend to his wife Betty and his family my sincere condolences. I did not know the Hon. Ron Loveday personally, but his contribution to the people of South Australia was also most outstanding. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

In opening the third session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament, His Excellency the Governor outlined the excellent progress that has been made in relation to some of the ongoing objectives of the Bannon Labor Government. The Governor spoke of the very tight economic situation confronting the State. This Government is well equipped to steer South Australia through these troubled times, and we all look forward to better things ahead in the not too distant future. In my Address in Reply speech last August, I spoke of what a tremendously busy year 1986 had been up to that point, and all members of this place now know that things remained just as busy for the rest of that year. I think we all heaved a sigh of relief when the Christmas break came, and we were all able to unwind. However, looking back over 1986, the year was well worth it. It was a wonderful jubilee year and one that I will personally never forget.

I felt particularly close to the Jubilee 150 celebrations last year, because, as is the case with some other members of this House, I was a centenary jubilee baby, born in 1936, and so it was a particularly significant year for me. After the flurry of activity generated during 1986, I expected 1987 to be a very quiet year. I am pleased to say that this has not been the case and that, so far, 1987 has been a very good year for South Australia. It shows that there is plenty of confidence in South Australia, and it is an indication that people are very happy with the way that the Bannon Labor Government is running this State—and they have a very good reason to think that way.

His Excellency also mentioned our successful bid for the lucrative submarine replacement program. The South Australian economy will not have to wait for 10 or 15 years to start seeing the boost to the economy from this magnificent project: it will provide an almost immediate benefit. Some \$80 million will be spent on this program on site between now and mid next year. Therefore, as I say, the effects will be virtually immediate and we will not have to wait for



them. I wish to place on public record the absolutely outstanding job done by the Director of the submarine project task force, Mr Jim Duncan, in working closely with the Premier to procure this great prize for South Australia.

I now want to spend some time on industrial matters, because of their importance to the State. Technology Park, which is situated in the district of my colleague the member for Briggs, will play a major role in the submarine project in providing much of the sophisticated equipment for the submarines. I know that that establishment will do an excellent job. Together with other members of this House I visited this excellent establishment in May this year. There is a lot happening at that place, and I was most impressed and proud of the establishment.

The second container crane was commissioned earlier this year by the Premier and the Minister of Marine. The crane will offer the port of Adelaide an increased capacity of 100 per cent, and will attract more shipping, especially from Japan. The Government's initiative in building this valuable asset is sure to be of immense value over the years to come.

Industry in the Regency Park industrial complex area, on the eastern side of my district continues to grow and prosper. Many of the companies in this area are using up to date methods, processes, and technology, and they are using it very successfully. The potential for increasing the valuable export market is great indeed in this complex. As one who is concerned with environment and planning issues, two things particularly impressed me in relation to this industrial area. First, the fact that it is separated from houses overcomes a lot of problems which occur when houses and factories are together. Secondly, the visual effect of this industrial area is very pleasing. Offices and factories are well designed and planned. Landscaping, involving the planting of lawns and trees, etc., around the factories, creates a very pleasant environment. It is certainly much better than the old-fashioned approach of corrugated galvanised iron and concrete and no planning, with factory-type buildings clustered together with no green planting, appropriate planning, or whatever. It is very pleasant to drive around the Regency Park complex. In fact, some of the factories and offices in this area have won KESAB and local government awards for landscaping and for the beautification of their premises.

I am pleased to say that some factories in the Wingfield and Gillman areas have copied the ideas used at the Regency Park complex and thus show about a 500 per cent improvement in their general appearance and in the way that they operate. One particular street in Wingfield comes to mind where factories are situated on one side of the street with houses on the other. The factories have landscaped their premises and created an attractive appearance by replacing some of the galvanised iron with colourbond, etc., and this has provided a very visually satisfying impact, especially from the point of view of the residents in the area. I am pleased to say also that following this activity undertaken by the factories, homeowners on the opposite side of the street did likewise and upgraded their own premises. It is now a pleasure to drive down some of these streets where there is no noise or air pollution involved with factories. I believe that this is the way to go. What has been done in this street in Wingfield has achieved complete compatibility between factories, offices, and dwellings.

I am confident of a very bright future for the manufacturing industry in South Australia. I know that we are on the brink of a very exciting resurgence of this type of activity. In relation to the industrial and manufacturing scene, I was pleased to attend the opening of the Centre for Manufacturing at Port Road, Woodville, which premises

were formerly owned by GMH. The Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce (Hon. John Button) and the Premier opened this establishment. The main administration and consultative area was formerly the main administration, engineering and service department of GMH. I was previously employed by that company for 34 years, and I actually worked in this area for some 10 of those years. The furniture is now different in this area of the plant, the colours are different and there are carpets on the floors, but otherwise it is the same. It was a strange feeling for me to attend that function, to walk around the office block, and remember the good times when the motor vehicle industry was all go in South Australia. I remembered the old workmates with whom I worked, some of whom having since passed on. I have a lot of fond memories of that plant; indeed, the whole Woodville plant holds a lot of memories for me.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They made decent cars in those days, too!

**Mr De LAINE:** That is right—the member for Gilles points out that they made decent cars, and that is very true. In mid June I attended a function in my district at ROH Industries at Finsbury. That function was to commemorate the export of the 500 000th alloy wheel to Japan. The Hon. John Dawkins, Federal Minister of Trade, officiated at the function, which was very enjoyable. Early last year members of this House, including me, attended a similar function to commemorate the 250 000th alloy wheel, which was an exceptionally good performance from this relatively small company.

Several years ago the company undertook a complete restructure of its plant and operations to take up the challenge of creating an export market. It has done that job very successfully, and also supplies Australian vehicle manufacturers with top grade alloy and steel wheels. The company's products are absolutely first class. I was very pleased to be able to inspect the plant on a couple of occasions. Although it is fairly old, it has been refurbished and is well laid out, clean, tidy, and a well run assembly and manufacturing plant.

It was interesting to hear members of company management at the presentation, along with other positive things, acknowledge the part played in the success of the company in recent times by the great cooperation between management, employees, and unions. It is a great living example of what can be achieved when these three components get together, great in any walk of life but particularly in manufacturing industry. The future looks bright indeed for this progressive company and its workers because of this outstanding cooperation.

The establishment of a new Occupational Health and Safety Commission will be, contrary to what is thought by many members on the other side of the House, of immense benefit to South Australia. Employers will find that, because of the new legislation and the setting up of this very worthwhile commission, not only will workers be protected but also in the long term employers will be protected by it. This legislation and the setting up of this commission is most timely, as it will grow in tandem with new methods, processes and technology which are coming upon us at an ever increasing rate.

In my opinion the commission will become a vehicle to create much more communication and understanding between workers and bosses. I am sure that this will be the case, and I look forward to seeing that happen. I was pleased to see that an old time friend and former State secretary of our union, ADSTE, Association of Draughting Supervisory and Technical Employees, has been appointed as inaugural

Chairman of this Occupational Health and Safety Commission. Colin Meikle is an excellent choice for this most challenging and vital position, and I know that he has the respect of both employer groups and the trade union movement. I wish him well in his new position, and am sure that he will do an exceptional job. He is well respected, and is a very sincere, sensible and well balanced type of person who will bring great stability to this new commission.

I will now reflect on some of the ongoing things occurring in my district, particularly in Port Adelaide, that have been brought about by the extreme confidence of employers and other agencies in the economy and the way in which the State is being run by the Labor Government. Development of Port Adelaide continues at a good rate, and one by one old buildings, shops, and houses are being upgraded and restored as the overall mood of upgrading the area spreads. The tourism feeling and potential is increasing over this whole area. One by one the buildings are being upgraded, refurbished, and in some cases rebuilt. The area is gradually taking on a wonderful look, in my opinion very much how the place would have looked when the buildings were new.

**Mr Hamilton:** South Australia's Fremantle.

**Mr De LAINE:** As my colleague says, South Australia's Fremantle. In fact, I know people who have seen Fremantle or who have come from Western Australia and who have said that there is much more potential in Port Adelaide than there is in Fremantle. In fact, people from overseas have been amazed at the progress of the area for so little outlay—just sheer good management by the Premier's special unit branch.

Small tourist targeted businesses are beginning to be established in the area, and I am amazed at the increasing number of tourists who visit the area. Some of these ventures are being established in some of the more unusual parts of Port Adelaide. My office is in Port Adelaide and I work there every day, and every now and again I move to a different part of the area and find that a new business has been established that I have not noticed before. This is happening right across the Port area, particularly in the historic precincts. I applaud the proprietors of these ventures, and hope that their initiative and faith will be justly rewarded: I am confident that they will be.

The old Port canal development comprising the Super K Mart, speciality shops, and service offices, and now the new Customs Department and Government offices, is onstream although separated from the old commercial part of Port Adelaide by Thomas's Mill. It blends very well with the Port in general. The architectural design and the material used, have been well thought out, and the workmanship is excellent. The new buildings blend extremely well with the buildings in the old part of Port Adelaide.

Just west of the Super K Mart is the latest housing development in the Port area. This comprises a joint venture between Devon Homes and the South Australian Housing Trust, and there are 84 houses in the development that are now occupied. These houses are delightful places, well planned, well designed, well built and attractive in appearance. Now that the people are in them and doing their own thing in relation to gardens, they are very nice. Further development is progressing in the area with landscaping, extensive gardens, and recreation areas where people can sit in the sun, and with areas lit up at night so that residents can sit out under the stars and trees to talk, think, or whatever. It will be an excellent and pleasing area in which to live.

This public housing area is built on top of the old Port canal which, as we all know, has been almost completely filled in. It is an area that holds a lot of memories for me,

as I swam there as a youngster, like many thousands of Port Adelaide kids. It is a bit sad to see the canal go, but I think that what has taken its place is much more pleasing and useful. It has become a very desirable place to live because, as I have said previously, of the beautifully designed and planned houses. The area is attractive, pleasing, and visually appealing, and the open spaces make it very desirable. The tremendous advantage in this housing area is not only the fact that it brings much needed people back to the Port area generally, but it is the absolute convenience of having so many services and facilities within two or three minutes walking distance of the development.

Things like shops, the business area, transport—both bus and train—are right on the doorstep; a police station; the fire brigade; churches; restaurants; and hotels—every sort of service and facility that would be needed for a residential area is there. Taken together with the pleasant living conditions, I cannot imagine a more convenient or better place to live. Just west again from this new housing estate is the Old Port Reach of the Port River. It has been jointly announced by the Premier and the new Mayor of Port Adelaide, Mr Ron Hoskin, that there will be a major development here on both the east and west banks.

It is to be developed into an exclusive harborside development, and we eagerly look forward to that. Strangely enough, some of this land—especially on the western bank of the river—has never been built on. It is virtually the same as it was when European settlers arrived at Port Misery, with the few mangroves, so when the new development is completed it will add a new dimension which has never been seen before in the Port. This then leaves the area on the northern side of St Vincent Street, adjacent to the old milling company's flour mill, which is now a National Trust museum, and the present *Troubridge* berth, also to be redeveloped. Property acquisition is being undertaken, and some work has started on the development, which will complement the other restored areas. A large area of factories has been demolished and, within the next two years, we will see a massive development of new buildings in this area, which is very exciting.

I feel very proud and fortunate to be the member for this area in these exciting, history making times. Obviously, there would have been a lot of excitement back in the 1830s and 1840s when the Port was established, but I do not think there will ever again be a time as exciting as the present, with so much restoration and upgrading of the whole area, along with new buildings, taking place. One of the bonuses for Government and me is the amount of employment generated by this development of the Port area. As buildings were constructed and refurbished and restored, many jobs were obviously created in the building and associated industries. Since those buildings, houses and shops have been completed, permanent jobs have been created, which is wonderful for the people of Port Adelaide.

Another pleasing thing to me is that a large percentage of these jobs are for young people. As the redevelopment continues, a few restaurants and food outlets are emerging which will service not only the permanent residents of the area but also the increasing number of tourists coming into the area. The tourism and hospitality industry is Australia's fastest growing industry, and South Australia is no exception. This is the case according to figures I saw recently, and Port Adelaide is taking a front line in this trend.

One type of industry, however, which is and always has been lacking in the Port area is that of accommodation. A developer approached me recently with a proposal to build a top class accommodation and convention complex in the

area which, I hope, will go ahead. When tourism really takes off, I expect a rush of this type of development application.

The South Australian Maritime Museum, which has been one of the biggest success stories in the rejuvenated Port Adelaide area, continues to attract many people. By the end of June over 100 000 visitors had been to this excellent museum. People are coming from all over South Australia, from interstate and from overseas. I was speaking recently to the Director of the museum, Dr Kevin Fewster, who intends to do a survey to pinpoint where the visitors are coming from in order that more may be done to service the needs of these people.

I approached the Premier on behalf of people, originally, because I felt that the \$4 entrance fee was a little too dear for this museum, but, after being there several times myself and speaking to visitors who came from far and wide, I was convinced that it was a very cheap fee to pay. In fact, most people are suggesting that it should be more. Nevertheless, now that everyone has seen what the museum has to offer, the \$4 fee is very reasonable.

I was pleased to see that the dispute involving the safety of the lighthouse platform has been resolved. A canvas awning was put up to guard against small children falling between the rails, and the heritage branch people were invited down there by the Director of the museum. After seeing the situation first hand, they agreed to compromise and allow the canvas awning to be kept in place but to be lowered one rung of the guard rail. I and many other people in the Port area feel that the lighthouse looks better because of this awning; it improves the appearance of the lighthouse.

Another major development which has received planning approval is the railway museum. This will be relocated from where it is at present, at Mile End, to the Old Port Dock site. There were some problems in gaining planning approval, the main problem being the visual impact and the sheer size of the building, which will be made of Colorbond and well designed. When one looks at the fact that the building will be housing 230 tonne locomotives, one sees that to house those sorts of machines requires large buildings. With some sort of compromise—the Colorbond, landscaping, judicious planting of trees, a very attractive fence, and so on—the approval has been given for this basically Commonwealth funded museum to be started.

It seems ironic that for about 140 years the Port Dock railway station was in existence and in the service of the railways, then several years ago the ANR chose to close this station. It was particularly annoying to me, because some months prior I had started travelling by train to my employment at GMH Elizabeth, and I took advantage of catching the train at the local station and going through the Port Dock station, but within a few months of my doing so the station was closed. I think that it was very short sighted on the part of the ANR, but now that the railway museum is to be sited there there is a very good case for the line and the station being re-established as part of the museum complex, even if it is only for the use of steam trains between Adelaide and Port Adelaide for tourism purposes. I intend to speak to the museum, the planning people and the Minister in this regard, to see whether something could be done.

After all, the railway line is still intact and could be reopened at a very small cost. All in all, the area is very exciting, and the whole of the industrial outlook in South Australia is very good which, I think, shows the confidence of the people of this State in the way the Bannon Labor Government is running South Australia.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I am pleased to take part in this Address in Reply debate and take the oppor-

tunity to pay my respects to the families of Don Simmons and Ron Loveday. I did not know Ron Loveday, but I certainly worked with Don Simmons and came to know him while he was a Minister in this House. Soon after he left that portfolio I had the opportunity to take up the position of Minister for Environment and Planning, and I understand some of the respect that members of the community had for the position he held.

I also take this opportunity to commend and congratulate His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan on the magnificent job they are doing in South Australia and on the way they carry out their responsibilities. I always find, in travelling through different parts of the State where people have had the opportunity to meet His Excellency, that both His Excellency and Lady Dunstan have been very well received and are doing a considerable amount to make the people of South Australia at home in their presence.

Although I wish to speak about a number of issues, the main concern I have is how South Australia seems to be slipping back, particularly in recent years under a Labor Government. I want to go into some detail on that later, but first I would like to say a few things about the transport portfolio and the abysmal way in which the Minister of Transport is carrying out his responsibilities. I always thought that the first responsibility of any government was to serve the people. I can only presume that the present Government has totally lost control of its administration and in the process has also lost sight of the fact that its first priority is to serve the people of the State. A glaring example of that has been in the transport portfolio and its handling by the present Minister. We have continued to see examples of cuts taking place at a level where people of this State are affected. Services have been affected.

Nobody would underestimate the need to tighten our belts, but when that process takes place we always find that it is at a level where most people are affected. We find that administration levels are exceptionally high in South Australia, and the Bannon Government is doing very little to cut down on administration costs. If the Government is serious about its cost cutting structures, surely administration must be high in priority rather than inconvenience, loss of opportunity and loss of service to the people of this State. If one were to look at the policies that came down prior to the last election (and, as was said earlier, one could hardly call the paper that came out on transport prior to the last election a policy paper), the small amount of detail given on what the Government would do upon winning that election (as, regrettably for the people of South Australia, happened), contained plenty of very rosy promises, most of which I suggest have been broken since that election. The Government has continued to spend a considerable amount of money.

I refer particularly to transport and the STA, which has spent a lot of money at the administration level, particularly on its new head office. We can look at the amount of money being spent down at the railway station, although I am not sure why, because fewer people are using trains now than ever before in this State and fewer people are using public transport generally—either bus or train services. There are fewer opportunities for people to arrive at various destinations by train, yet we find that an incredible amount of money has been spent. I presently have a question on notice to ascertain exactly how much money has been spent in the upgrading of the Adelaide Railway Station. We realise that the whole ASER development has been very extravagant, with a considerable blow-out in costs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I stood up in this place to support the ASER development initially. However, not one person in South Australia could support the incredible blow-out in costs we have seen with that development. Much of the cost has come about because of industrial disputes and extra costs along those lines. I look forward to obtaining the information so that I will have more detail in that regard.

Getting back to the cost of administration and the cost of the railway station, which have been excessive, as far as the provision of services is concerned we have seen a severe lack for the majority of people in this State. The statistics show clearly that there are now fewer people using public transport. That is a pity, as I would have thought the obvious thing to do in regard to the city of Adelaide would be to create incentive for people to use public transport so that we would not have added costs and problems associated with more vehicles coming into the city centre. One could be excused for believing that the Government wants fewer people to use public transport.

I have found that even Government supporters are expressing grave concerns about the irresponsible attitude that the Government, in particular the Minister of Transport, is taking in regard to the provision of public transport in this State. That does not relate simply to people in my electorate where public transport is totally inadequate, nor does it simply relate to the Hills area. I am getting that feedback from many people in various parts of the State. We have heard many allegations over the last few days. I suggest that the credibility of the Minister of Transport is at rock bottom. In the 12 or 13 years that I have been here I have never seen gutter tactics used in the way the current Minister has used them over the last couple of days. On Thursday last and since then in this place accusations have been made that are malicious and grossly untrue.

I do not want to spend a lot of time on the subject, because I will have the opportunity to do so later on, but reference has been made on numerous occasions to the report to which the Minister referred. I suggest that probably he quoted very selectively from that report and I suppose that is the only reason why he does not want me, the member for Davenport or any other member of the Opposition to see it. One need only to have looked at some of the media statements or to have heard the Minister last Thursday evening on the 11 o'clock news of 5DN, when he was quoted as saying that anybody who wants the report can look at it. I wonder how many members of the public have seen that report. I have not had the opportunity to peruse it. The Minister said that he would make provision for me to peruse the report, but of course we know that yesterday in this Chamber he withdrew that offer.

In relation to the meeting to which the Minister referred in this report, I think this is one of the saddest parts about this whole gory situation raised by him. I was invited by the State Transport Authority to attend a couple of meetings (I cannot remember whether it was two or three), and I went along virtually as an observer. Anybody who has looked into this matter in any detail would realise that I was there as an observer. The Stirling district was not part of my electorate at that time, but I was invited to attend to find out what was happening and to make a contribution to that committee. Obviously, the Chairman of that committee has prepared a report and, if the Minister is correct in the accusations that he has made in this place, then either the Minister is telling untruths, or he is suggesting that that senior officer of the STA misrepresented the facts in regard to that meeting.

That is a very serious situation, because the person who chaired that meeting is the person who was left holding the bag at the public meeting held at Aldgate some months ago in regard to the Bridgewater line. About 600 people attended that meeting. I have done a considerable amount of checking on that, and as far as I know that was the largest public meeting ever held in the Hills area. Invitations were extended to the Minister and to the Chairman of the STA, but they both refused to come along and they did not recognise the importance of it. They sent the same poor public servant who chaired the meeting to which the Minister has referred. That officer was unable to answer three-quarters of the questions that were asked, because most of them were political questions. They could be answered only by the Minister or perhaps by the Chairman of the State Transport Authority, because he had that responsibility. That is the story.

The sad fact is that we have a senior public servant who the Minister suggests has misrepresented the facts in relation to that meeting. I suggest that it makes it extremely difficult for any member of Parliament, either in the Government benches or in the Opposition benches, to attend such meetings when one realises that at a later stage a report of that meeting might be totally misrepresented by a Minister in this House, because only the Minister has an opportunity to look at those reports and files. Certainly, Opposition members, members of Parliament and members of the community do not have that opportunity. I think it is a great shame that the Minister has placed Mr Heath in such an extremely difficult situation. Also in relation to the public transport dispute about which we have heard so much over the past three days, on so many occasions the Minister has not been around. He has been either in Queensland or somewhere else, but it has not been the Minister who has made the statements.

Mr Sweet is the person who has made the statements and who has appeared in the newspapers or on the electronic media. People could be excused for suggesting that Mr Sweet is the Minister. The other day I attended a function and I heard people talking about Minister Sweet because of the amount of material with which he has been provided and the number of statements that he has made. I know Mr Sweet personally and I commend him on an excellent job in public relations, because that is what he is there for. I suggest that he has been given an immense amount of responsibility that should have been handled by the Minister of Transport and by nobody else. I think that that just proves that the Minister of Transport has been quite gutless in this whole exercise and that he has not been prepared to accept the responsibilities as he should have done.

I turn now to some general matters regarding the economy of the State and the situation in which South Australians find themselves. There is no doubt that the Labor Party's high taxing and record interest rate policies remain the biggest threat to the living standards of average South Australian families. As a family man with four children I understand the situation as much as anyone. The Premier cannot escape the fact that at the time he was elected in 1982 the average South Australian family was far better off than it is now. Let us consider the facts. In 1982 the average home loan carried a weekly interest bill of \$62.67; the average residential electricity bill cost \$4 per week; it cost the family breadwinner travelling two zones by bus each day to and from work \$7 per week; and per capita State taxation for a married couple was then about \$14.28 per week. These commitments represented 28.8 per cent of the average weekly male wage in 1982. Today those amounts are as follows: the weekly cost of an average home loan, \$132.35 compared to \$62.67; the average electricity tariff, \$8.15 compared to

\$4; the equivalent bus fares, \$12 compared to \$7; and the per capita State taxation, \$25.71 compared to \$14.28 per week in 1982.

The total in the current situation amounts to \$178.21, which is 42.9 per cent of the average wage. I suggest that those figures show how much Labor's high taxing and high interest rate policies have eroded the weekly pay packet, and nobody can deny that. If anybody in this House can deny those figures, I would be pleased to hear about it. It is beyond dispute that average families now are far worse off than they were four years ago and no amount of fudging or manipulating the figures on the part of the Premier will convince South Australians otherwise.

The Premier often huffs and puffs about the advantages enjoyed by the average family in South Australia at present, but that is just not correct. It is beyond dispute that the average family is far worse off now than it was four years ago. Indeed, the only way in which families can again have more choice over how they spend the money that they earn and can experience the incentives to get ahead is to support the tax cuts that were proposed by Mr Howard during the recent federal election campaign. Mr Bannon is demonstrating, as he has been over a period, that his Government has neither the capacity nor the concern for the average family to be willing to take the decisions necessary in order to lower the community tax burden, and that is a sad state of affairs.

Recently, I received a deputation from a group of small business people in my district who were concerned and were forcible in their disgust at the administration of the Bannon Government. As small business operators, they had just received their 1987-88 land tax bills from the Government. As if those bills were not high enough, they had to add their higher electricity tariffs, increased water rates with a lower allocation before being charged for excess water, the complexities of the fringe benefits tax about which we all know, and the many forms to be filled out to comply with the ever expanding web of Government regulations; and so it goes on.

The small business people to whom I spoke were absolutely dumbfounded at the increased costs that they were facing while trying to keep their small businesses going in this State. They were receiving little assistance and felt strongly that this Government had been able to get away with far too much for far too long by way of increases in taxation and charges. I suggest that, with all the taxes and regulations that small businesses are forced to meet, it is little wonder that the number of South Australian bankruptcies is at an all time high. That is another fact that the Bannon Government cannot dispute. Last financial year, there were 1 354 bankruptcies—almost four a day. That is a higher figure than we ever saw in the Great Depression.

Now we hear from Mr Blevins, the Minister in charge of industrial affairs and a senior Minister in the Bannon Government, that he wants his Government to control even more and to produce more red tape by involving itself in such things as resource development, which is an area already more than adequately undertaken by the private sector. In this State there is a desperate need to show support to those people whom we expect to employ other South Australians, and it is essential that we give those people a lead and some incentive instead of knocking them down all the time in the way that we have over recent years.

They are the people who will invest money and create jobs to give their employees and South Australia a better future. I am sure that I am not the only member to receive representations from people with interests in small business. Further, I am sure that all members are hearing the same

concerns and the same plea for help that I have received from small business people in my district. I hope that Government backbenchers especially will do what they can to have the Government change its policies and provide some incentive, because little incentive is provided now for people to remain in small business, to expand their business, and in the process to employ more South Australians.

In recent times, the Leader of the Opposition has made clear his concern about the alarming investment drought that we have come to recognise in this State. I am alarmed by figures which show that new private capital investment in South Australia was expected by business to decline by an estimated 14.2 per cent in real terms during the financial year just ended. When the Bannon Government came to office, private capital expenditure in South Australia was increasing at a healthy annual rate of almost 10 per cent. This increase continued late into 1982-83 with a rise of 9.2 per cent, but since then we have experienced an investment slump that has now accelerated. The following figures show the decline since the election of the Bannon Government: 1981-82, 9.8 per cent; 1982-83, 9.2 per cent; 1983-84, -7.5 per cent; 1984-85, 0.0 per cent; 1985-86, -4.5 per cent; and for 1986-87 the forecast is for a figure of -14.2 per cent.

Those figures indicate that we are not getting the investment for building new factories and for expanding existing industrial plants that is necessary to guarantee sustained employment growth for the future of this State, and surely that is what we in this Parliament should be working towards. New private capital expenditure per head of population in South Australia is the lowest of all the mainland States and one-third below the national average. We all should know that the Bannon Government's tax and business regulation policies have been a major disincentive in this State. Indeed, the Bannon Government has increased State tax collections by 86 per cent since coming to office—almost twice the rate of inflation.

When Mr Bannon was elected Premier, the total public sector outlays of the State made up 19.5 per cent of the gross State product, whereas this year that figure stands at 21.9 per cent. In other words, over 20c in every \$1 produced by South Australians is taken by the State Government for its big spending policies. Again, that fact cannot be denied.

We are about to see the next State budget introduced within a matter of weeks, and I only hope that that budget will begin to reverse the trend to which I have referred. However, I have not much confidence that that will happen. I only hope that the Government, and especially the Premier as Treasurer, will recognise the absolute need for the budget to be brought down in such a way as to reverse the investment drought.

If this investment drought continues it will only put us further behind the other States of Australia. I have enough confidence in the people of South Australia to want this State to be the greatest and not to lag behind in that way. The Premier and the Government have the opportunity to change the trend and to start to put South Australia in front again. I hope that in the next budget they will attempt to do just that.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I wish to congratulate the Governor on his speech on the opening of Parliament on 6 August 1987. In that speech he outlined to the people of South Australia, and to members of both Houses in particular, plans that the Bannon Government has in tackling the tough economic conditions that we are experiencing at this stage in South Australia. I contrast that with the approach of the Tonkin Government, five or six years ago, when it was confronted with tough economic decisions: it chose the

soft, easy road and nearly bankrupted this State. When listening to the speeches that have been made in this place since the resumption of Parliament on 6 August, one can understand how that could happen. For example, the member for Heysen referred to the 'big spending policies' of the Government and yet he, along with the member for Davenport, has been most vocal when the Government has attempted to do something about reducing any such policies. They do not want a cut in, say, under-utilised services in their electorates. They make out that they do not want the Government to cut such services, but here today the member for Heysen, for example, complained about big spending.

Members opposite ought to appreciate that if there is big spending and we are in difficult times some curtailment of that expenditure is needed—and we are seeing that right now. This was explained in the Governor's speech. From their period in Government, during which time the member for Heysen was a Minister, I would think that members opposite would have learnt something and that they could perhaps understand this approach. In the short time that I was in this House during the dying stages of the Tonkin Government, I was appalled at the lack of economic responsibility shown by members opposite. They gave no indication of responsibility whatsoever, and this was indicated by responses given by Ministers during the Estimates Committee hearings.

Apart from the opening of Parliament, 6 August was notable for two other reasons, to which I want to refer in this House today. One was of great importance to our world, while the other, perhaps of not such significance to our community, was of particular significance to me. The first was the forty-second anniversary of the dropping of a nuclear weapon with hostile intent. History has recorded that horrible destruction that caused the instant death of many citizens of Hiroshima and the lingering death of those who survived the initial blast. It is pleasing to note that since that time only one other nuclear bomb has been dropped with hostile intent—and that was several days later. Since then no other has been used with hostile intent.

This, I think, is because the major powers realised the enormously destructive power that nuclear weapons have, and we have seen how the civil facilities of any country, no matter how well organised, are unable to cope with a minor nuclear fallout, such as that which was experienced at Chernobyl. Russian authorities had to fly in medical experts from America and Europe. The reports written by the medical experts when they returned to their countries indicate that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had well rehearsed procedures for dealing with nuclear catastrophes, but even with the limited number of people who were affected by the Chernobyl disaster, in comparison with the damage that could be wrought with one nuclear weapon, one can realise just how the emergency services would be taxed to the full, with perhaps many people not receiving any treatment at all.

The other factor is that many people throughout the world have protested vigorously against the use of nuclear weapons. I think that that protest has been effective, to such an extent that certain people within the Liberal Party last year determined that they ought to participate in the peace march. Unfortunately, some were troglodytes, and the backward members, the reactionary people within their organisation, have been very hostile about that. At least they are realists: they know that the use of atomic weapons in war will result in not just one being used; there will be many hundreds. They also know that the slogan that there are no winners in a nuclear war is quite true.

Even if a war happened in the Northern Hemisphere we are not safe here in Australia, because we would eventually get the fallout. It is the pressure from millions of people throughout the world that has seen to it that there has not been the use of nuclear weapons with hostile intent and that when an American President thought to use them in the Vietnam war saner people stopped their use.

The other anniversary that I wish to talk about is of personal significance to me: 64 years ago, with high hopes, my father arrived at Port Adelaide. As a 15 year old youth he had been apprenticed as a farmer, although he did not know who he would be working for. This scheme, actively promoted by the Premier of the times Sir Henry Barwell, encouraged youths aged between 15 and 18 years to come to South Australia from England to be apprenticed for three years to local farmers. The scheme operated under the Migration Act of 1913. Some people may want to know why I raise such an obscure event in this House. I do so because it has some bearing on what I will say later about what we are hearing today about the New Right.

I do not think that we have a new right, but just some very reactionary people dressed up in new clothes. The people brought out as apprentice farmers were told that, after they had been here for three years, they would be given £300 and some land where they could set themselves up as farmers. What they did not know was that they had to be 25 years old before they could get that loan of £300. The scheme was given publicity in English periodicals such as the Boys Own paper. Only when the boys arrived in South Australia were they told about the 25 year age limit. Only then they found out that the apprenticeship involved working as a farm labourer, and once a month in the evening the apprentice and his master would go to a meeting of the local agricultural bureau, where the main topic was either horses *versus* tractors or tractors *versus* horses. There was no instruction in farm management, livestock care, fertilisation or weed eradication.

Judging by the number of sections pegged out as farms in the Mid-North which ceased to be farms, a lot of those farmers knew very little about those things, either. Many of the boys were unhappy and had their apprenticeships cancelled. A policeman interviewed boys who complained. That was a good way of conducting industrial relations—when somebody complained about the treatment they got the police officer had to go round and talk to them to pull them into line. Nobody ever heard of those boys getting a copy of their indenture or apprenticeship papers, nor did their parents in the United Kingdom receive a copy of those papers.

The boys were not given passports: instead, they were issued with an identification certificate, which was taken away from them on arrival at the old Mounted Police Barracks, in Kintore Avenue. That scheme was abolished in 1924; when the Gunn Labor Government achieved office, it wiped it out. I think that it is fair to refer to some of the things said then. It may be said that it is just a figment of people's imagination, but the Liberal Women's Educational Association wanted to bring out girls who were aged from 16 years to be apprenticed as domestic workers. That move failed. The person associated with that movement was a Mrs Good, who stood against Bert Edwards for a seat in the area of Adelaide at that time and was soundly thrashed.

When those youths went to work on the farms they did not work on just one farm, but from what I remember my father telling me they seemed to work for a number of people. Among the people they worked for were those who treated them like their own children, while others treated them in the most heartless and cruel way imaginable. They

did not work under any award—there were no awards for them. In fact, in a speech at the time Lionel Gunn referred to a person who escaped from an apprenticeship coming to Adelaide to work with a milkman for 10s a week instead of the award rate of the time, which was £2 15s. This sort of thing happens when there is no award coverage.

I will refer to two instances that stand out in my mind from my father's references to his early experiences. On one occasion when he was working for a farmer a horse died outside where he was sleeping. They had finished the day's work and he wanted to use a team of horses to drag the dead animal away, because it was starting to putrefy (this was during the harvest period in the summer). The farmer's response was, 'No, you can't do that, because if you do you will tire the horses and they won't be able to pull the harvester (or reaper, whatever was used at that time to remove the heads of wheat). When we have finished, you will be able to pull it away.' Of course, when they had finished they had to get a scoop to dig a hole and push the putrefying remains of the animal into it and cover them up. They could no longer pull it away, as it would have collapsed.

The other incident occurred when he went to work for a farmer. When the evening meal was due he washed up and walked towards the house with the farmer who said, 'What are you doing?' My father said, 'I am coming in for tea.' The farmer said, 'You don't eat with us.' 'You'll find a rifle in your room. Go out and shoot a rabbit and cook it.' That was the response at that time. I have referred to these matters because they are relevant to the debate going on in this country today. Theories about the deregulation of the labour market have been espoused by right wing think tanks throughout our country.

People will find that those right wing think tanks are staffed by failed Liberal members of Parliament, academics who are attracted to their theories, and other people. They are supported by some big businesses in Australia. They all talk about deregulation of the labour market. This has been picked up by the Liberal Party at the State and Federal level. John Olsen, the Leader of the Liberal Party in the South Australian Parliament, has said that he agrees with the New Right's policies: he said this in a speech at the Stirling Hotel, so one can only assume that he agrees with the policies enunciated by Howard prior to the last Federal election. That was a policy to take away from workers and their representatives in small industry the right of representation in the Arbitration Commission and the right of award coverage.

What happened to my father in the early 1920s, 60 years ago, would happen again today if there was no award coverage. I have had the privilege of looking after and representing the interests of workers for nearly 25 years, and I can tell the House that out in the business world of the State there are tens of thousands of business people who try to do the right thing by their workers, who will pay award rates and who will provide safe working conditions, but there is another group of employers who will not, who will do anything to exploit workers and who will do anything to ensure that workers do not work in safe working conditions because they cost money. They go to any lengths to avoid that. They demand that people work for any number of hours for as little as possible, and they do not want to pay penalty rates.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** I agree with the member for Gilles: they do not want to pay at all. A survey of youth workers in South Australia that was conducted five or six years ago estimates that between 50 000 and 70 000 youths in our

community working today are not paid for that work. One has the experience of youths, both male and female, coming into one's electorate office from time to time stating they have been conned into working for a trial period for nothing, to see how they go; to see whether they are suitable. It is only afterwards they find out that there have been about 10 people through that hairdressing salon in 12 months trying to see whether they are suitable—and none has been paid.

We have had the problem with the industrial laws of this State where, if one is not being paid, one is not deemed to be a worker, therefore the award coverage does not apply. There are a number of examples of non-award coverage in Australia, one being out-working. Anyone familiar with the textile or clothing manufacturing industry knows the stories of women working from rooms in their houses or sheds in their backyards sewing up garments for as little as 50c or \$1 per garment. They could be working for up to 20 hours a day and having to pay for their own power, repairs to their machines, the materials they use—and they are paid less than the award rate. That is what happens when there is no award coverage—straight-out exploitation.

That is what would happen if this Parliament and the national Parliament were crazy enough to agree to deliberately exempt small employers from the coverage of awards. Inquiries conducted in this State at the turn of the century refer to working conditions for those out-workers as horrible as those which have been described in a recent survey conducted in Melbourne. Nothing has changed in the 90 years between those two surveys—not a thing. The reason nothing has changed is that there is no award coverage for those people.

If we were unfortunate enough for the Liberal Party to be elected to Government it would set about implementing industrial policies which would put working conditions back to the days when children worked in the mines. Every member opposite would say, 'We would not want to do that', but if they were to implement their policy of small business not being respondent to an award and let those people have free and easy negotiation with their employers, where they can strike an employee-employer relationship and agreed sum of money for an agreed number of working hours, that is precisely what we will be going back to.

In those days, that was precisely how industrial relations were regulated. There were laws prohibiting people from combining to form unions to be able to negotiate collectively with the employer, and this is precisely what the New Right wants to do—turn the clock back 100 years. They do not want to look to the future—they want to go back. That is why I said they are not the New Right, but just the old, greedy, exploitative employers or their representatives in new clothing.

They claim that if we were to have this relaxation we would put more people back into work. I suppose that is a simple solution for simple people. I suppose it sounds good, but the reality of it is that, if we want to be a nation which can compete in world markets, we will not do it by putting the clock back. We will do it by adopting policies which will make sure we go forward. I am of the view that we have to be quite tough in how we go about adopting those policies.

There has been some discussion in the press lately about Sweden. The ACTU has put out a document which very few of us have seen, although we have read the reports, indicating that they think there ought to be a fundamental change in the attitude of employers and employees in the organisation of their industry. They refer to Sweden and a

number of countries visited during a trip to Europe. I will make a few references to what has happened in Sweden.

Sweden has a gross domestic product which is 3 per cent of America's and 16 per cent of West Germany's, yet its businessmen say that it is a big reason why 25 to 30 of the 500 biggest companies in the world outside the US are headquartered there. Those big companies are the companies which small business feeds off; small business, the providers of specialist knowledge, specialist equipment, provide to those big organisations. Of those big organisations, Alfa Laval makes about 85 per cent of its sales outside Sweden; ASEA, 70 per cent; Electrolux, 80 per cent; Ericsson, 80 per cent; Saab Scania, 66 per cent; SKF, 95 per cent; and Volvo, 80 per cent. This is precisely what we ought to be doing in this country: having industries which process the raw material into a commodity which can be sold on the international market—in other words, have added value, and the created wealth stays here in Australia. Those companies are doing that.

Instead, we have had conservative Governments in Australia since the war making very conscious decisions to turn their backs on a reform of our manufacturing industry so that we as a small country could carve out a niche in the world market for manufacturing products. Instead, they said we would hitch our star to the commodity markets; we would sell our wool, wheat, iron ore, coal and alumina on world markets and we would be all right. Manufacturing industry could make some farm equipment and replacement equipment for the Australian public. What has happened is that we have seen the bottom fall out of the commodity market.

That commodity market to which our star was hitched only makes up 19 per cent of world trade, and it is a declining amount in world trade. It has been declining at the rate of about 1 per cent per annum, so we have had a Government of conservative people—the Liberal Party—hitch our star to that and decry every effort of the Labor Party to reverse that trend. If we were able to have in this country manufacturing industries which are able to carve out specialist niches in the world market, we would have our agricultural industry, on the one hand, and our primary industry in the mining area expanding at the same time, and we would be able to export these manufactured products.

I am not suggesting, and neither is anybody else in my Party suggesting, that that area of exports ought to be broad based, but we can achieve this aim if we carefully structure our manufacturing industry. It is no good saying that there should be less taxes for small businesses and that that would solve our problems, as all it would do is turn Australia into a carbon copy of a third world country. We are not a large country but we have well educated young people, and we ought to use them and their skills rather than allowing them to be wasted.

As I indicated earlier, it would not matter if we were to charge or not pay young people, as it would involve very few more than would be employed in industry, but it might replace mature workers who need to be paid. It would not put any more people in that work; the positions are not available, because industry has been restructured. A vast change has occurred in work processes. It is no use saying that people ought to work harder as it would not make any difference. The real problem has involved a lack of investment in manufacturing industry in Australia in the past 20 years. It is not something that only I have been saying but some of the employers in manufacturing industry who have seen this change in direction have been campaigning for a

change. Most of the criticism in that area can be levelled at the managers as they make the decisions.

If we were to do what the Swedes have done—they have worker directors in companies where the unions have the right to appoint up to two regular members who can vote, as well as two deputy members who cannot vote, to boards of directors of nearly all companies with 25 or more employees—the situation might improve. Mr Bo Berggren, a boss of Stora, a Swedish mining and forests products company, describes these people as 'super' and 'very good indeed'. He says that they learn on the board how difficult it can be to make big corporate decisions and goes on to describe how they restructured the company by replacing three old machines in a paper mill with new equipment. It meant that the company survived but that 130 jobs were lost. These people who have been experiencing the scene in Sweden know that, whilst 130 people may not still be working at the paper mill, they do not just go out on the dole but rather work in training establishments to enable them to work elsewhere in Swedish industry.

We can do no better than to look at the Swedish experience and learn from it. If that country, which has low inflation and 2 per cent unemployment, can have a small population of 8 million people and still have 25 or 30 of the biggest 500 companies in the world, with 80 per cent of industry owned privately, 8 per cent Government owned and 5 per cent held by cooperatives, perhaps we in Australia can learn something from that. If we were to emulate the statistics that I have referred to we could do no better. That is the direction in which we ought to be going rather than taking away from workers the right to work in a decent and safe place.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I express again my condolences to the families of two former members who have passed away—the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. I knew and served in this place with them both. Despite our ideological differences, I had respect for both of them. I had close contact with Mr Loveday, as he lived in my electorate for a considerable time. I am sure that those whom those two members represented in this House appreciate the service they rendered and would like me to express their thanks for the contributions they made.

The present Government must be called a fair weather Government: when the weather is a bit rough Ministers do not front up, and that is a pity. Recently we have seen an attempt to close the Goodwood school. It is a special school in that it is very beneficial to a certain section of students in our society. The Government has made a decision to stop the school enrolling year eight students which, in effect, closes the school. That is a pity, and when the fight was on the Minister did not appear, nor did any other Minister or backbencher appear in place of the Minister. In other words, nobody had the political intestinal fortitude to front up and say, 'I am a member of the Government—ask me the political questions and I will answer them.' A public servant was sent along who could not in all fairness answer the political questions. It is a sad day for democracy when a public servant is placed in an impossible situation and no member of the Government fronts up. If it were the opening of a new classroom, the public servant would have been told, 'No way—the cameras will be there saying nice things about us; we want to be there.'

The same thing happened in relation to the public transport dispute and the Hills railway line. When the public meeting was called the Minister was invited but did not come. Over the years I have had respect for the Minister.



He would remember that when he first came into this place I made a speech about the Housing Trust. The Minister made a private comment to me, and I congratulated him on what he was doing at that time. He would remember what it was. From that point on I always got frank answers and comments from the Minister, although our letters that have floated backwards and forwards from time to time may have been wordy. The Government has a lot of political minders and they are highly intelligent people when it comes to the English language and play the political game to the 'nth' degree.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Yes, as the member for Chaffey says, they have not lived in the real world, although I am not on that tack at the moment. They have changed the good image of some members of Parliament and created an attitude that Ministers have to be political animals to be successful in the political world. That is a pity. It was either the Hon. Cyril Hutchens or the Hon. Ron Loveday who once made the point that politicians should really come from all sections of society. Whether we are rogues, liars, thieves, sinners or otherwise, all should be represented in Parliament: we should truly reflect society.

I remember a young matriculation student asking me whether I agree that all politicians are liars, cheats, rogues and only out to serve themselves rather than worry about their fellow man. I told her that I could not answer that question but that, as she saw us as typical politicians, I would give her a typical politician's answer. I said that I believed we were truly representative of the society that elects us. I believe that the concept of minders, together with press secretaries and research people, has created a different attitude in Parliament.

In relation to the meeting that was held in the Hills, I want to quote a statement made in this Chamber by the Minister, because I want members to know what the result was and why I was very disappointed in and angry with the Minister. After my personal explanation last Thursday, I believe that yesterday morning the Minister had an opportunity to explain his position, but he did not, and that left me no alternative but to believe that the way the community had interpreted his statement was the way that he intended it to be interpreted. He said:

I am interested that the member for Heysen interjects, along with the member for Davenport—

That is one point that I did not pick up before, and that is that I did not interject on that day. At the time I was writing on a sheet of paper, but I was listening. When somebody has a shot, it is my practice to listen. I did not interject. The Minister continued:

... who was also active earlier today.

I was not active early in the day. He further stated:

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.

These are the words that have caused a lot of my constituents, as well as other people who are not my constituents, to phone me. The Minister stated:

Five points were agreed at that meeting...

No points were agreed at that meeting. It was agreed that five points would be forwarded to the Minister for consideration: there is a difference.

Since last Thursday (and I have a record), apart from the two letters that I received today, I have received 17 communications, five of which were abusive, from people who believed strongly that I am a supporter of the Bridgewater rail service (as I am), but they were cross to think that at some time I may have supported its removal. Those complaints amount to the biggest number I have received in

relation to any of my actions, statements or comments since 1979 or 1980 when we were in Government. That sort of thing stirs a politician. In addition, people have stopped me in such places as the local newsagent's on Saturday morning and asked me, 'Stan, why did you agree to take away the Bridgewater rail service?' I have replied, 'I did not,' and they have then said to me, 'The Minister said you did.' I know that the English language is a difficult language—I have enough difficulty with it—but it was disappointing that the Minister did not take the opportunity to say, if anything else was intended, what was really intended. I had to assume that nothing else was intended other than the view that was accepted by the community. I believe that the Minister had minders who helped him prepare things and the intention was to deflect the flak away from the Government and to try to pin it on two individuals from other sides of politics who at some time could have supported the closure of the line, which I did not.

It is interesting to note that in the following year—1985—there was another meeting in the Hills in regard to the suggested closure of the railway line. That meeting of the Hills Transport Action Committee received an apology from the member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, stating that Mr P. Duncan had sent a telegram which advised of his apology and indicating that he also strongly supported the fight to retain effective urban rail services in the Stirling hills area, and that the pressure to dismantle public transport systems must be resisted at all levels. The meeting drafted the following objectives:

1. To prepare a submission to convince the Minister of Transport that an upgraded Belair-Bridgewater rail service and an integrated bus service under the jurisdiction of the STA is the most viable and necessary transport system for the Stirling district.

2. To provide evidence to convince the Minister of Transport that an investigation into extending the rail service to Mount Barker should be instigated.

The committee worked at its objectives, but with the opposite result. Now the Government says that it would like to discontinue the Bridgewater service. If it does, the Government says that it does not intend to give the Bridgewater community, in particular, any public transport service by the STA. Bridgewater has had a public transport service, and I want ALP members to think about that, because they have many supporters in that town. In fact, I believe that over the past 30 years I am the only Liberal to win the Bridgewater polling booth in the State arena, and I have won it every time I have contested it.

During the recent election I believe the federal member for this area received the biggest vote that a Liberal has ever polled in that town—a town which has had a public transport service for over 100 years. Not only does the Government want to take away this train service but it does not want to replace it with a bus service. Therefore, the residents of Bridgewater will have no public transport provided by the STA. That is unacceptable. If such a situation occurred in a Government member's electorate, they would be just as angry as the member for Heysen and me (and I point out that it is not my area, but many of my friends live there).

Let me now look at the logistics of the exercise. Again, I ask ALP members to think about just what is involved, in case they have not thought the argument through. I will explain it slowly in the hope that members might take note. At present railcars, when services are operating, are stabled or yarded at Bridgewater. If they do not go to Bridgewater when they finish their service, they stop at Belair. As there is no stabling provision at Belair railcars must return to Mile End, which is seven kilometres further away from Belair than Bridgewater.

Therefore, if the railcars finish at Belair, they have to travel a further seven kilometres back to Mile End to be stabled. It is the last service at night; it could pick up passengers but it does not because it is the end of the roster—that is the way it works out. If the service was extended to Bridgewater and stabled there, the distance travelled would be reduced by seven kilometres. The staff who live in or near Bridgewater man the existing service and, under the railways agreement signed with the union, there is a guarantee that any of the personnel rostering on at Bridgewater could continue to do so.

Now, because the STA wants to close the Bridgewater-Belair line, it is asking those staff members to sign on at Mile End. Staff members are refusing to do that because it is not part of the agreement. If the STA signs on staff at Bridgewater—and I do not mind if services are reduced (but I will come to that in a moment)—the men and women start work immediately at Bridgewater. Therefore, they start picking up passengers in the morning from Bridgewater en route to Belair. Of course, it would not involve a packed carriage, but it would be a service to the people at Upper Sturt estate or Crafers West and other areas which do not have a reasonable bus service.

As I have said, that service would pick up passengers en route to Belair. However, if the railcars are stabled at Mile End, the morning service must start so early that there are no passengers to pick up. Therefore, the train travels an extra seven kilometres from Mile End to Belair with no-one on board. I hope that people can understand why one has great difficulty accepting the sort of logic that has been applied to this matter. I shall now refer to some proposed travel times. I would be quite happy if all off-peak services were cut out, except perhaps for one service up and back each Sunday and Saturday. If that were the case, there would be no complaint from me, as I think there must be some economies of scale in the operation; I have admitted that all along.

I am asking for four services on weekdays, but if that was cut back to three I would not object. I am suggesting that the B101 (the 'B' denoting that the service is Adelaide to Bridgewater, leaving Adelaide at the time given) could leave at 7.42 a.m., the B104 at 2.21 p.m., the B108 at 5.51 p.m. and the B310 at 6.17 p.m. The train leaving at 7.42 a.m. would service the school children travelling to Blackwood, St Johns, Heathfield or Marbury in the Stirling area. The train leaving Adelaide at 2.21 p.m. would service some of the school children returning home to the Hills area by train. The 5.51 p.m. train would service those people who finish work at about 5 p.m., and the 6.17 p.m. train would pick up all the others. They are the only services that we would need from Adelaide to Bridgewater.

In relation to services from Bridgewater to Adelaide (denoted by the 'B' coming after the number), the scheduled services could be the 204B, leaving at 7.01 a.m., the 105B, leaving at 7.39 a.m., the 106B, leaving at 9.18 a.m., and the 109B leaving at 3.33 p.m. The 7.01 a.m. train would cater for those people who must be at work in the city by about 8 a.m. The 105B train at 7.39 a.m. would service school children and others wanting to be in the city by 9 a.m. or at schools along the way. The 106B train leaving at 9.18 a.m. could service shoppers, although that service may not be necessary—but it is possible. The 109B train leaving at 3.33 p.m. would service school children who are leaving school at that time and want to be delivered home. That is all we are asking.

What is the cost difference between stabling the four cars at Belair (although it may not be necessary to stable the four of them there) and having them travel an extra seven

kilometres back to Mile End? When the Government indicated that it was getting the new cars—which were supposed to be on the track by, I think, March of this year at the latest (or originally it might have been November last year)—it gave a guarantee that the service would remain. The cars provided were more powerful, fitted with special brakes for Hills service.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** The 3 000 series.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Yes. Special brakes were fitted and they were to give a faster service through that area. An expressway through the inner suburban area means that trains can travel from Bridgewater to Adelaide in about 45 minutes—and some of them do that at the moment. I ask the Minister whether the request for those four services is unreasonable, because, taking away the off-peak services, the cost could be reduced substantially to the cost originally argued. The operating cost is about only \$500 000 a year. By comparison, rail services to Elizabeth or other places are also very poorly patronised during off peak periods.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Just before the dinner adjournment I was about to make the point that there is no complaint from the Hills people that we maintain those few rail services a day, but they do see the injustice of buses travelling to Elizabeth or Salisbury or trains and buses travelling south in the offpeak periods, including late at night, when there are virtually no passengers on them at all. If we are to be fair, we must say that those buses that are not well patronised, together with the trains on those other routes, must also come off.

While talking about the different routes, we need to remember that the Government approved the STA spending millions of dollars on a new signalling system on the railway lines. The speed system, with one or two route systems installed, was changed to a route system, when the only two problem areas were small. There was one at Goodwood and one behind the Adelaide Gaol. The total cost of that signalling system was, I believe, somewhere in the vicinity of \$5 million. I hope eventually to get that figure from the Minister.

At the same time we paid the South Australian Film Corporation \$20 000 to produce a film to show people how to use the route system when there were already in the industry people who knew how to use it. I am advised by those who are involved in the system that it is not very complicated anyway. People in the railway industry are concerned that members like the member for Albert Park have not backed them. They thought that the Minister, who was a railway man, would have backed them, but the two people upon whom they relied to give them backing have not done so. That is a disappointment to them, and I can understand that disappointment.

I now refer to another matter in the Minister's portfolio area. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has sent out notices to people who have already paid for their drivers licences. It costs a dollar a letter to send out the notices, with postage costing 37c since 1 July. This has happened since the Government said that it would tighten up on waste. However, we have heard no comment from the Minister to show that he is concerned or that he is taking some action to reprimand those who were responsible for sending out these notices. How can it come about? It is said that there are thousands of letters involved. When a constituent telephoned and said, 'How could I get this second notice when I have already paid for the driver's licence'. He was told, 'You are not the only one; there were thousands of them.' How does that come about in this modern day and age with

our technology, experts and our tightening up of financial resources? That is another failure—where the Minister has a great mob of minders around him and is really losing touch with his department and the type of person that took an interest in what was happening around him. He has become dependent upon others.

I now turn to the matter of Government cars. I know that you, Sir, use one. I am not anti individuals when I say, 'What do you expect from people out there, when we have had a public transport system for over 100 years and when they are told that there will be no STA public transport system—either bus or rail—to Bridgewater?' The Government takes it away totally, and the same applies to the Upper Sturt estate. Government cars involved expenditure of \$1.1 million in 1985-86, \$815 000 of which was for drivers' wages and \$340 000 for overtime. Commonsense surely prevails that if a driver is called out on a Sunday for a three hour minimum period at double and a half time, the minimum cost for that call-out is \$75. If they are called out to a function on a Sunday, go home and come back four hours later for the pick-up, double the rate of \$75 would be paid.

I know that it is important to have ministerial, chauffeur driven or hire cars to go to functions because the Minister is the last one who is expected to arrive just before the Governor or other official visitors, and there is no space nearby to park a car; I understand that. However, I believe we could tighten up and save more on ministerial cars alone than what the Bridgewater line would cost us if we cut out the off-peak services and kept the peak-hour services. That is not a bitch against cars. I know why some of the cars were originally issued. One member had a serious accident in a private car many years ago so the Liberal Premier of the day said, 'Here is a car to keep you out of bother.' Another member got a car because he demanded it.

We now have a fleet of cars that cannot be justified in times of economic constraint. It is not unreasonable to ask why we do not make cuts in this area also, but we do not. I am not jealous, as I have never had any ambition to have other people drive me around: I prefer to drive my own bit of tin, and always have done so. That is no reflection on the drivers, who I believe are generally good drivers. I am not anti them because they earn, on average \$31 000 a year, which means that some of them must get \$40 000 a year; therefore, they must get as much as the base salary of the MP whom they drive around.

The whole area of the transport system is of concern to the Government and to the community. We have the Taj Mahal that was built over the way: what an expense that is to maintain. Do not tell us that we cannot cut the cost of the STA headquarters. Of course we can. It is like *Yes, Minister*: the public servants look not in their own area but where they can cut the ones below. They do not say to the Minister that they can get rid of the guy or woman alongside them, although that opportunity exists in times of constraint. If we look at how STA headquarters staff has grown in the past 10 years compared to outside staff we would be dumbfounded at how much that overhead has knocked us around, but we do not have the intestinal fortitude to do that. The public servants say to themselves, 'How can we go to the Minister and knock our mate off alongside us?' It is better to try to cut someone out further down the line.

Another matter is split shifts. I know that workers object to split shifts but, if we were able to have them, a lot of the Minister's problems in relation to trains would be solved. Those who have fought to save the Bridgewater line would not like me saying that, but I know that in the back of their minds they know that that is one way of helping to solve

the problem. That is something that should be discussed throughout the community.

I refer now to other matters such as the Upper Sturt Road, about which the Minister refuses to release a report. On that road we have school buses travelling with up to 30 children hanging on to straps. That road is the most dangerous and has the highest death and accident record in the State. An accident will happen on that road and, when it does, I will not say, 'I told you so,' because I will be too disgusted. However, it will happen when that narrow road is wet, the side collapses and a bus rolls. All I ask is that people remember that this was said. There are problems about the way in which decisions have been made about public transport. If commonsense prevailed, a lot more people, including Government members, would be happy.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** I will take this opportunity to address one of the most serious and enduring threats to our community in Australia, namely, our unacceptably high road toll. This is obviously a subject of concern to members on both sides of the House. Last year 288 South Australians died in 9 350 accidents.

It will come as no surprise to this Chamber to learn that 40 per cent of road deaths in South Australia are alcohol related. That is why the doubling of the random breath testing effort is so important. Horrible as they are, road deaths alone do not give a full picture of the daily tragedy on our roads. Each year in Adelaide, 2 000 people are admitted to hospital because of road accidents. Apart from those dead on arrival or who later die because of shocking injuries, each year about 50 people are severely and permanently disabled, causing immense personal tragedy, and necessitating a massive financial and resource commitment from the community. This year we can be fairly certain that, following road crashes, 80 people living in the Adelaide metropolitan area will suffer head injuries that will leave them with some noticeable effects. Approximately 1 000 others will suffer a blow to the head severe enough to leave them unconscious.

At a public seminar on road trauma at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in May this year, neurosurgeon Peter Oatey estimated that road accidents will cost South Australians more than \$2 500 million over the next decade. That estimate includes the cost of treatment, compensation pay outs and lost production. There are, of course, a myriad of other costs, personal—to individuals and families—and financial. Mr Oatey brought home the epidemic nature of road accidents by claiming that, in the next 10 years, one person from every fifth home in every street in Adelaide is likely to be brought into the casualty department of a hospital following a road accident.

There are those who believe that not much can be done about road accidents. Some believe that there is little point in stepping up efforts to combat these problems because road accidents simply reflect human behaviour, frailty, error or dependence on the car. I reject that view. I also reject the view that is frequently espoused at conferences on road safety, including the three held this year in Adelaide, that politicians—members of this House—do not have the guts to take the action necessary to reduce the road toll. I believe that the road toll can be lowered, and Japan has shown that it can be. In 1970, Japan's road toll was in the same proportion as Australia's, but, during the 1970s, through legislative action, the use of education resources, law enforcement and so on, the Japanese succeeded in dropping its road toll dramatically to the point at which it is about half the Australian level.

There will be a community backlash against any strong measures aimed at sincerely reducing the road toll, but that

will not be from the vast majority of South Australians, particularly parents, who are worried about the safety of their children. Speed as well as alcohol is obviously a critical factor in our road toll. Excessive speed on our roads can and must be reduced. Recently I was interested to read a report by Jack Maclean, who is regarded as an Australian expert on road safety, who said that, in Switzerland, a major review of speed limits was undertaken. Following that review, the speed limit was lowered by ten kilometres per hour, which resulted in 25 per cent fewer fatalities and 20 per cent fewer injured people.

In May of this year I was in the United States and Canada where I spoke to some of the top experts on road safety. Their message was quite simple: if we in Australia are really serious about cutting the road toll, we must cut the speed limit. During the Carter presidency, speed limits on open roads and highways were reduced to 90 km/h. Frankly, that was not a road safety initiative but was as a result of the energy crisis in the late 1970s. That move alone has been estimated to have saved tens of thousands of lives, injuries and enormous cost.

Earlier this year a working party from the Local Government Association in this State recommended that the speed limit on residential roads be reduced from 60 km/h to 40 km/h. I am aware that a number of councils are also concerned about the danger to young people in residential areas, particularly where there are a large number of young families.

I believe that this recommendation of the LGA working party deserves serious attention by Government and councils. Certainly, we should look at some reduction in the speed limit in residential areas. I look forward to the decision of the LGA annual general meeting in October. A reduction in speed limits in residential areas is now under serious scrutiny in New South Wales. A pilot scheme is currently under way in Bankstown, in Sydney's western suburbs, where the limit has been reduced from 60 to 40 km/h, and we are awaiting the results of that study.

However, US experts stress that the effectiveness of such measures in reducing speed limits will be increased substantially if parallel action is taken to slow traffic down through speed humps, slow points and other speed reduction measures. I believe that we also need to look seriously at the wisdom of maintaining 100 km/h zones on some stretches of road in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Areas adjoining these roads have in some cases changed substantially in terms of their character and become more built up commercially and residentially.

Certainly, US experts have expressed alarm that such speeds were allowed in metropolitan areas and that high speed limits were allowed on roads which still have uncontrolled intersections. I believe that a review of these limits could prove useful. That is not saying that we necessarily have to reduce them, but that we should consider whether we should or should not do so because of the changing nature of the areas surrounding those zones. Interestingly, the LGA working party also recommended the introduction of colour coded strips on the road surface to indicate to motorists approaching changes to speed zones.

The working party wanted each zone—that is, the 110 km/h zone, the 80 km/h zone and the 60 km/h zone—to be identified by a particular colour which would be painted on traffic lines and stobie poles in order to reinforce to drivers speed limit changes. We must also bite the bullet on radar detectors, those devices manufactured, sold, fitted and purchased with the specific intent of helping speedsters to evade and break the law. Last year at a ceremony at Technology Park in Adelaide I launched a device which indicates to

motorists when they are accelerating beyond the speed limit. It is a warning system designed to encourage motorists to keep their speeds down, and to advise them when they are creeping above the speed limit. That is not the intent of radar detection devices, that are designed only to warn speedsters when they are in danger of police detection. Early this year the Victorian Government announced its intention to ban the use of radar detectors and radar jammers, and I believe that such a move should be considered nationally.

A comprehensive driver education strategy could be a major key to cutting our road toll, and I was very pleased to see that an improved road safety driver education strategy was mentioned in the Governor's speech. Surely, we need training to engage in an activity in which nearly all of us spend so much of our lives, and which is so potentially dangerous to ourselves, our families and to others.

I have not seen the figures for Australia, but each American drives nearly 11 000 miles each year. In a lifetime of 50 years of driving, that comes to well over half a million miles. Driving, as we all know, is a demanding activity. It requires preparation. All of us must know how to blend into and survive in our crowded, complex, ever changing transport system, but we need to learn how to start, stop, brake, steer and drive at night under all sorts of conditions.

We also need to learn about the effects of alcohol and other drugs on driving performance, how to drive economically and how to buy, insure, maintain and do minor repairs to our cars. We must learn, too, an appreciation for and a need to obey often complex road traffic laws as well as routine signs and signals, but this is really just the easy part. Still to be mastered are such crucial considerations as perceptual skills, space management, split second decision-making and the effects of emotion and fatigue on driving performance.

In the US, public schools offer driver education classes. It is not a new idea: the national thrust for driver education in schools was begun in the 1950s because research showed—and still shows—that between 80 per cent and 92 per cent of road crashes are due to human error. US research shows that driver education graduates have fewer and less costly accidents as well as better violation records than those who have never taken a course. They are also more likely to wear seat belts and have fewer arrests for drunken driving.

I am not suggesting at all that driver education in schools is a cure-all. There is obviously considerable debate in the US about the effectiveness of different approaches to driver education, but in the United States it is an integral part of a comprehensive national strategy on road safety, including speed reductions, road improvements and hazard elimination, vehicle inspections, seat belts and alcohol countermeasures that has led to a dramatic reduction in road traffic deaths. The US approach is working. Between 1967 and 1982, the number of road deaths per 100 million motor vehicle miles dropped from 5.67 to 2.93, a 48.3 per cent reduction in the number of road deaths during that time.

That is obviously a phenomenal accomplishment, because it occurred during the period when the number of licensed drivers increased by 32 per cent, when the number of registered motor vehicles increased by 42 per cent and when the number of miles driven rose by 40 per cent. Percentages alone hide the human impact, but during the same time-frame the reduction in road accidents meant savings—if I can use that clinical word—of more than 229 000 lives, nearly nine million injuries and about \$113.5 billion.

At present, more than 8 000 schools in the United States offer driver education in their curricula and about one million students are enrolled. They offer traditional classroom learning experiences and on-street practice driving, as

well as simulated driving experiences. Students are required to demonstrate specific areas of competence related to roadway use. They receive carefully structured perceptual training. They are taught to be better judges of road conditions. The emphasis is on responsible decision-making and better performance.

Road safety education of course should not be just confined to high schools. In New Zealand, there is a superbly produced and highly acclaimed program called the 'Safe Playing Club', which is aimed to teach young children aged from 3 to 5 how to be safe near traffic. It is a program developed after nine years of research, assisted by New Zealand's Accident Compensation Corporation, the National Advisory Research Council and the Traffic Accident Research Foundation, as well as a host of other agencies. Research has shown that about half of all pre-schoolers go on to the road about two to 10 times per hour whilst playing outside, most of the time without their parents being aware of it. For years, emphasis has been given to road rules, like 'stop, look and listen' and 'look to the right, look to the left and look to the right again' before crossing the road. Studies all over the world show that children do not become very safe road crossers until about age 8. At age 5 and younger, even after very intensive training, virtually all children make very bad mistakes trying to cross the road about 60 per cent of the time.

The central thesis of the New Zealand Safe Playing Club is that a major reason why small children are hit by cars is because playing dangerously is fun, even when children do not know that they are playing dangerously. Children have fun riding bikes and trikes on the road and older children often act as bad models. Playing dangerously is also a great way to win attention and parents warning children to stay off the road only makes the danger seem more fun, more tantalising. So, the Safe Playing Club aims to encourage young children to play safely by making playing safe loads of fun.

Safe players earn stickers and treats. Young children send letters promising to be safe to a Humphrey Bear-like television character called Big Ted. Essentially, the program is a delightful, positive way to encourage young children to play on the grass, stay on the footpath and other safe places near home, as well as teaching children to keep away from the dangers of the road.

New Zealand parents are provided with an action story book in which their child and his or her family and friends are the central characters in stories that teach the boundaries of safe play. The family book is reinforced by a video which can be rented free—courtesy of the Lions Club—from video outlets around New Zealand and by a package of safety story books for use in preschool centres. I would like road safety authorities, the Education Department and the Children's Services Office to evaluate the New Zealand program, which has certainly been winning international acclaim.

There are other education strategies aimed at adults. While I was in the United States, I was briefed about a new program called 'TEAM' (Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management). TEAM is a coalition of public and private sector organisations working together to assist public assembly owners and managers to control the sale and consumption of alcohol in sports and entertainment facilities. It has been found that many road accidents occur after people have drunk excessively at sporting and entertainment events. TEAM is involving major US sports stars in its campaign to educate sports fans about the dangers of driving home under the influence of alcohol. TEAM was launched by President Reagan in December 1985. Its aims are four-fold; to create a more enjoyable entertainment atmosphere; to

promote effective crowd control; to address highway safety issues that affect people when they travel to, attend and leave events in public assembly facilities; and to organise community coalitions that will promote activities to reduce the incidence of drinking and driving and encourage the use of safety belts.

TEAM involves the training of arena managers and employees on how to control alcohol use as well as using sporting and entertainment events as a means of communicating the 'don't drink and drive' message.

There is a range of issues to consider. I was most interested recently to read research which shows that even experienced motorcyclists have a five times greater risk of being injured in an accident than do car drivers. On a same-kilometres travelled basis, novice motorcyclists have an accident risk 20 times greater than people driving cars. Obviously a number of factors contribute to the higher risk for motorcyclists including, obviously, the lack of protection for motorcyclists and the fact that motorcycles are smaller and less visible than other vehicles.

I have long been a supporter of the compulsory use of daytime running lamps on motorcycles. I know that that is unpopular with some motorcycle lobby groups, but they are simply ignoring the facts. Daytime running lamps will protect motorcyclists, pedestrians and other motorists. I am sure all of us have had the experience of suddenly being caught unawares by a motorcyclist passing at speed, having approached from some blind spot. Any move designed to improve the detectability of motorcycles can only improve the perilous situation in which motorcycles travel. In North America, the United States and Canada daytime driving lamps for motorcycles are mandatory. I would strongly support steps to change Australian Design Regulations to ensure that all new motorcycles sold in Australia are required to have daytime running lamps. Interestingly, the debate about daytime running lamps in North America has gone much further. In Canada, provincial governments are planning a major awareness campaign to encourage the voluntary use of headlights during daylight hours in all new vehicles, including passenger cars, trucks and buses.

Accident research specialists estimate that 200 lives per year, or 2 500 injuries, or \$200 million could be saved through the use of daytime driving lights in Canada. That is not just a political or theoretical pipedream. Legislation requiring the use of daytime driving lights in Scandinavia has reduced multi-vehicle collisions by up to 20 per cent. In Canada all the evidence from collision surveys indicates that the use of daytime driving lights reduces motor vehicle accidents. Quite simply, the lights improve the detectability of a vehicle and a driver's ability to more accurately estimate the location of an oncoming vehicle, thus contributing to the safety gap whereby a vehicle is safe to pass or pull out while in motion. Use of daytime driving lights has been reported to be particularly applicable in situations such as two lane passing, merging, and intersection manoeuvres. Obviously, the use of lights is particularly important in adding to vehicle conspicuity in poor weather and at dusk.

A number of British Columbian corporations using fleets of motor vehicles already require employees to drive with their headlights on. Their reasons are threefold—to reduce accidents, to reduce insurance premiums and repair costs, and to reduce time off the road. I am told that the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, British Columbia Telecom, school bus fleets, Greyhound Bus Lines and Government departments already insist on compulsory headlight use. However, we are not talking about motorists simply switching on their headlights in broad daylight. Current low beam headlights, while useable and providing a safety aspect,

are considered to be too intense and too sharp for use as a full-time driving light.

The Federal Government in Canada has recently indicated that a standard will be developed requiring manufacturers to install a low intensity front lamp system in new vehicles beyond 1991. This Federal proposal will require manufacturers to install a low intensity light element in the high beam circuit, a third element in existing lamps or a separate light system which would be automatically turned on when the ignition was activated. So the term 'daytime driving lights' refers to the use of low beam headlights during daylight hours. The Canadian Department of Transport, therefore, has a mandate to develop standards for a low intensity element within the headlight.

There is certainly no suggestion in Canada that daytime driving lights be made compulsory at this stage. Satisfactory standards still need to be developed for add-on equipment such as the switches needed to automatically turn a vehicle's headlights on. However, the Canadian Department of Transport's requirement for new vehicles to be equipped with daytime driving lights beyond 1991 will support the development of low intensity light bulbs and will require them to be more readily available to the consumer.

All of Canada's Provincial Governments—of quite different political persuasions (Labor, Social Credit, Conservative and Liberal)—have now indicated support for the use of daytime driving lights. British Columbia will mount educational and information programs urging the use of daytime driving lights as a road safety initiative. This awareness program will be developed with industry associations such as the British Columbia Automobile Association, the British Columbia Motor Transport Association and the Canadian Fleet Supervisor's Association. Information will also be provided to consumers about how they can have these lights fitted. Pamphlets will be made available through motor licence offices and through safety organisations.

When I first heard about the move towards daytime driving lights in North America and in Europe I naturally assumed that this was because of dark winters, long sunsets and poor weather. I am told that this is not the case and that daytime driving lights would provide a road safety advantage in winter and summer conditions in any part of the world. It certainly deserves examination by Federal and State authorities and, if daytime lights are found to be desirable in our conditions, similar awareness campaigns should be considered in the lead-up to any future changes in design standards for new cars.

Obviously, in such a short time I can only canvass a few of the road safety options open to us. I certainly gained considerably by talking to some of the best people in this field in the United States and Canada. We are fortunate in this State to have a Government and a Minister committed to road safety improvements, and I am pleased that a review of road safety initiatives is now under way.

In the United States I was impressed with the Highways Safety Improvement Programs, a massive initiative involving a Hazard Elimination Program, which includes the elimination of roadside obstacles, improvements to intersections, improvements to signage, the installation of guardrails and median barriers, and various changes to road design and construction.

A major rail crossing program led to an 88 per cent reduction in the number of fatal injuries occurring at railway crossings. I understand that significant results were obtained simply by moving rail crossing signs further back from the railway lines. I hope to speak about these and other initiatives in a later speech in this House. I believe that there will be widespread community support for a

crusade around Australia to reduce our road toll. Many of the initiatives that I have talked about need not be costly. All of them need serious examination before their introduction is contemplated. Indeed, I believe that any successful upgrading of our road safety program will be cost efficient as well as saving Australian lives.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** In supporting this motion, I congratulate the Governor on his excellent presentation of his Government's programs for the next 12 months. I, like other members, pass on my condolences to the families of Mr Loveday and Mr Don Simmons. I had the privilege of knowing Mr Simmons when I was practising as a pharmacist in Salisbury. On a couple of occasions he visited our Savings Bank agency, when I met him and had a few very pleasant moments with him. I did not have the same privilege of knowing Mr Loveday. I pass on my condolences to the families concerned.

I was very impressed with the comments made by the member for Briggs, because recently I, too, spent some time in America looking at road safety programs and the two major areas on which he spent some time in his speech are areas that I think need continued monitoring in this State. I refer to controlling alcohol as it relates to driving and the extension and improvement of random breath testing. I congratulate the Government for at last deciding to implement standards that were set down by the Random Breath Test Select Committee some two or three years ago. It is interesting to note in the report tabled yesterday that the current breath testing program is having a very significant effect in this State.

The other topic on which the honourable member spent some time relates to speed. I myself have been conducting a rather interesting experiment. Although this experiment does not have statistical validity, recently I have been attempting to drive around the metropolitan streets at 60 km/h. It has been a rather interesting exercise, because I discovered very quickly that there was never anybody behind me. It highlights the fact that very few people believe that 60 km/h is a speed which they should maintain on our metropolitan roads. I think that there is a need to increase the blitzes to ensure that there is a more significant police presence on the roads in order that the public will be convinced that 60 km/h is a reasonable speed at which to travel. If such a program were implemented, it would have a very significant effect in reducing the road toll, particularly in the metropolitan area. On a future occasion it is my intention to expand my ideas on road safety.

I will continue with some comments I made today in the censure motion against the Minister of Transport, and refer to the STA and areas in which I believe the Minister could and should have acted. I point out, first, that at the end of June 1987 the Government paid an extra \$10 million in cash over the budget estimate to keep the funds flowing for the STA. Secondly, I will talk about the ticketing system, which initially was to cost \$4.5 million but will now cost \$10.5 million. I will talk also a little about the extra cost of wages involved in that program.

I would like to talk about the study on the Bridgewater line; the fact that patronage is significantly down over the period of this Government; the prospect of fare increases of up to 40 per cent; and the fact that the public is totally cheesed off with a system that is wracked with strikes, fare increases and no explanation at all from the Government about its future plans for the STA.

The Minister said today, very coyly, that he believes that he has been doing a good job in this area, but I will discuss a couple of the problems in which he has been involved

just to show the House the sort of mess that the transport system and the STA in particular is in under the Minister's direct control. First, I refer to the reduction in services to Bridgewater, Northfield and on many bus routes. During the Bridgewater strike there was an interesting editorial in the *News* which really sums up the Minister's interest in the Bridgewater line. The editorial, headed 'Gone Missing', states:

Train strike in Adelaide. Transport Minister in Brisbane. Of course the meeting of Transport Ministers was planned in advance and the South Australian Minister, Mr Keneally, scheduled his attendance. But the dispute which has thrown services into turmoil has been long brewing. The least that can be said of Mr Keneally is that he displays very bad judgment. The thousands of people inconvenienced today might think of it more as cavalier indifference.

That reflects the attitude of the Minister in the middle of one of the longest rail strikes that we have had in this city. The strike was called to protest the closure of the Bridge-water-Belair line. An interesting aspect of the whole exercise is that the Minister is reported to have said to the STA board and to the public that under no circumstances would the line remain open. The Minister said that he would adopt a strong stance to ensure compliance with Government policy to close what was termed an inefficient line. What happened? There was negotiation between the union and STA officers, and one would have to believe that the STA officers had been instructed to adopt a particular stance.

Suddenly, the Government's policy was turned over and there is now going to be a special study into the line. When the Minister was questioned about the study last Thursday he said, 'I do not agree with that sort of study. I really do not know who is going to do it. I think the Bureau of Transport Economics in Canberra will do it. I do not know how much it will cost. I do not know who will pay for it but we have agreed to do it.'

If that is not the greatest shemuzzle of all time, I do not know what is. Our transport system was disrupted for nearly five weeks; the Minister went to Brisbane in the middle of the strike; and then there was a backdown on Government policy. In 1984 the new Crouzet ticketing system was estimated to cost \$4.5 million. Today it has an estimated cost of \$10.5 million—a \$6 million increase. The Minister sent unionists to Paris in springtime to look at the Crouzet system. When they left for Paris they were opposed to it; when they returned they were in favour of it—for a week; and then they again opposed its introduction because they could see some economic advantage for their members through a technology change argument before the Industrial Commission.

What happened? The Government through the STA gave in and we have now a \$10 per week increase for transport workers. That will add \$1 million to the cost of introducing this ticketing system. This system was supposed to eliminate fraud and save \$1 million. So, with a wage increase of \$1 million and the saving of \$1 million through the elimination of fraud we have broken even already. But it will cost an extra \$700 000 a year just to finance the \$6 million increase over 10 years. And, as I said earlier today, what about the comments on fraud that were made by the people who went overseas? I will repeat some of them, as follows:

Elderly passengers were confused on whether they were required to validate their ticket which they carried in a plastic wallet, similar to pensioners in Adelaide. Most failed to validate their tickets.

That would be good for fraud. It further states in relation to schoolchildren:

Young passengers, although obviously conversant with the system, blatantly abused or ignored the system.

That is another group of people who should be watched if we want to eliminate fraud in the system. The report continues:

Adult passengers mostly validated their tickets... with the exception of obvious fare evasion until noticing the two local bus officials travelling on the bus.

They then validated their tickets. So, the report mentions elderly people, schoolchildren and adult passengers. It then states:

Bus operators took no interest in the passengers or tickets and ignored or failed to hear the validators.

The report from the union members who travelled overseas to investigate this system which is supposed to cut out fraud indicates that one of their major concerns is that the system that we are implementing is highly unlikely to cut out fraud. However, implementation of the system will cost some \$10 million—\$6 million over estimate—and the operators will be paid an extra \$1 million a year to operate it. Yet it is said that it is a good system! Finally, the report states:

Really, the only way that you can check the validation is if you make sure you have three inspectors on the bus at any one time.

These are not my comments but those of a union member who went on the 'springtime in Paris' trip. It cost the State Government \$21 000 to send those four unionists on that trip. When they returned they said that one reason for implementation of the system—to prevent fraud—is not going to work. It is a very interesting report, and on this issue the Government is adopting a very interesting attitude.

The Minister of Transport is strongly supporting this system, but he is not supplying the public with answers to the questions that I am asking. Earlier today the Premier criticised me because I said that the Government would spend \$150 000 promoting the scheme. I believe that a promotion scheme costing \$150 000 is fairly expensive. Surely we can promote this system and educate the public in its use much more cheaply than that. Yesterday on 5DN the Minister was asked about the saving of \$1 million through the elimination of fraud. He said that he could not be sure that it would be \$1 million until the system was set up. Yet, the union representatives, the operators and the people who have observed what is happening in France have said that it is highly unlikely that the system will stop any fraud at all. It is a very interesting system that we are introducing.

Let us consider the signals associated with these problems and look at the sort of evidence before the Minister over the past two or three years which should have given him some idea of the problems that were already showing themselves in the State Transport Authority. First, I refer to the Consolidated Account, the account that the Premier publishes every month as part of his Treasury documents. At the beginning of this year that document stated that the cash estimate required by the Government to keep the STA afloat would be of the order of \$84 million. Forget the first six months of the year, because considerable variations may occur in any business in that period. Even then the trend was showing 'up', and it would be unfair to use the first six months. So, beginning at December 1986 we find that, instead of the \$42 million-odd that one would expect (or half of the \$84 million), the fund—at \$47.5 million—was already over-budget by \$5.3 million.

In relation to what I said in my press release to the *News*—that one of the problems with the STA was its mismanagement by the Minister—I noticed today that the Minister came back and said:

The budget was exceeded because of factors not foreseen when initial estimates were drawn up.

That sort of statement is quite amazing, because in December, only halfway through the year, we were \$5 million over

budget. If it was unforeseen you would expect that it would remain at that level of \$5 million, because that is what the Minister has just said. But that is not what has happened. In March, three months after that, we were \$7.1 million over budget. One month to go, in May, we were equal with the estimated budget for the year. Finally, we come to the figure which, of course, we do not know—the figure which I estimate as being \$95 million. That figure was substantiated two days ago by David Sweet when he said that the figures were nearly right. It shows that we have probably not had an unforeseen budget problem. We have had a continual blow-out of the expenses of the STA. We have a Minister who suddenly in the past three months has said that we have a problem with the STA. This problem with the STA blow-out and cash for the Government has been evident during 1986-87 and the Minister should admit that.

I would now like to look at another indicator of which I feel the Minister should have been aware. If he was not aware of it, he has been negligent in his duty. I refer to the trend that has taken place over the five years of the Bannon Government. To be reasonable, I have included 1981-82, the last year of the Tonkin Government. When we look at the overall income of the STA, particularly as it relates to traffic receipts, we see that over that five year period from the budget year of 1981-82 to 1985-86 we had a 78 per cent increase in fares. That has been a very significant increase in traffic receipts—from \$28 million to \$50 million. So, there has been a significant increase in fares over that time. However, an interesting aspect is that we note that interest on investment has dropped from \$5.8 million to \$1.19 million.

That raises an interesting point that I made today. In March 1984, SAFA took over the financing of the STA. It is reported in the annual report of the STA that in March 1984 SAFA took over the \$77 million Government debt. The report goes on to make a very interesting statement, as follows:

We however note that SAFA increased the rates of interest for STA from 10.3 per cent average to 12.2 per cent average.

If those figures are added up over three years, it can be seen that, because of the compulsory reorganisation of STA and finances (there was no choice to use anything other than SAFA), the extra 1.9 per cent required to pay interest on loans has cost the STA in the order of \$4.75 million. Today the Minister said that one of the biggest problems with the STA was its increase in interest debt, and we now have the Government of the day increasing the interest debt on one of its authorities by \$4.75 million in three years.

It then states that capital interest was one of the STA's major problems. Of course it is, but that has been created by its own Government because it has forced a very efficient investment group (STA) to pay interest at a higher rate than it would have been able to get in the marketplace itself.

The next thing that I will consider briefly is the cost to the STA of earning an income over five years. It is interesting to note that the Premier said again today that the operating cost of the STA was decreasing. The Premier and the Minister said that that was occurring when in fact it was not. What has happened is that the percentage of operating costs to the overall cost is decreasing; in other words, it is again a play on words and statistics. The reality is that over the five-year period the operating cost of the traffic operation increased from \$36 million to \$49 million, maintenance from \$24 million to \$35 million, and administration and general expenditure increased from \$16 million to \$32 million. I will pause here, because it is in that area that the Collins report clearly highlighted that the STA and the Government needed to do something.

There has been a 104 per cent increase in management costs. That is the sort of thing that the Minister should have picked up, because that trend has existed for the past four years. Fuel and power costs have increased from \$7 million to \$11 million, depreciation from \$5 million to \$6 million, amortisation on lease property from \$1.1 million to \$3.5 million, interest on leases from \$1.1 million to \$4.7 million and interest on loans from \$7.5 million to \$13.9 million. As I said earlier, a significant amount of that increase is due to the refinancing costs of SAFA: in other words, the Government has significantly increased STA costs.

The other important and interesting trend is that the Government's contribution towards STA costs has increased from \$55 million in 1981-82 to \$81 million in 1985-86 and, as I said earlier, there is a projected figure of \$95 million for 1986-87. So, there has been a significant increase in the Government's contribution to the operation of the STA. As well as having those trends available to him, the Minister in 1985 received a policy document issued by the Department of Transport on behalf of Dr Scrafton which states:

The management of the transport system must be capable of responding to the changing environment of the late 1980s and 1990s, the demands of the community, and the need to support sound economic development within the State and beyond.

To achieve this objective the total transport resources available in the community have to be used. For example, it is not enough to perceive metropolitan public transport as only the STA services; there is a range of other resources which do or could contribute to the provision of public transport. Those which already exist include private buses, community buses, school buses, taxis, car pools, rental cars and even delivery vans. Other techniques are available but do not yet exist here in South Australia but, as the existing system becomes more expensive, their introduction must be considered.

Do not forget that this was given to the Minister in 1985. There is no excuse for his not knowing this sort of information. The policy document continues:

In effect, the term 'public transport' takes on a new meaning to cover all forms of transport available for public use, replacing the narrow definition of public transport as Government owned transport, a view that is still prevalent in the metropolitan area.

The report also states:

Labour cost is the main component of the STA's operating costs and the very high cost of peak-period operations contributes substantially to the deficit. Parts of the public transport system are operating with similar industrial rules to those which applied some 30-40 years ago during the days when transit had a dominant role in urban passenger transport. The same manning and safety rules apply, including no broken shifts on the rail system and no use of part-time labour. The significant change has been one man operation of buses which was introduced in 1967. A strong private sector is one basis of economic growth in South Australia and opportunities exist for the private sector to provide services in the metropolitan area within and beyond the STA's operating area. The option of using private sector operators should be pursued in preference to one which requires the authority to provide services which will result in a disproportionate increase in deficit.

The report continues:

Another option is the use of paratransit, i.e. all forms of public shared transport except for conventional fixed route, fixed schedule services. It embraces all the forms of passenger transport which fall between the private car as an individual privately-controlled mode, and the fixed route, fixed schedule bus, train and tram services which presently operate. Taxis are one form of paratransit, community buses and car pools are others. Paratransit therefore provides an option whereby passenger capacity available to satisfy transport needs is widened to include the potential suppliers of transport services to be found in private buses, work buses, rental cars, social service agency vehicles and private cars. Finding the right solution for a particular market and organising the operation of paratransit services are two areas which warrant further consideration.

Those comments were made in 1985. Since then, there has been only nibbling at the edges of the transport system. No



attempt has been made to look at the very important suggestions that were put forward in 1985.

In 1983, a Mr Kain, when studying for his economics degree, produced a research paper on the transport system in which he said:

The Adelaide experience demonstrates that, other than offsetting benefits of improved service routing and coordination, Government production of ex-private services was achieved at the cost of a greatly increased deficit. Even social service objectives may have been better met by (lower) subsidies to private operators than to the STA. Assisting disadvantaged groups may require some deficit financing, because concession fares will not ensure provision of sufficient services to adequately assist the disadvantaged. However, it was argued that other—less costly—ways of assisting the disadvantaged may be available.

In the light of this discussion, it is apparent, first, that, as the current deficit is a substantial subsidy to bus transport users, it should be up to the proponents of subsidies—where market failure is suggested—to prove that output would be otherwise sub-optimal. Second, as real subsidies are likely to continue to rise in the future and that Government production is more costly . . . the criteria for Government intervention/production seems to stand in need of review.

As many members would know, private sector involvement in British Rail and other parts of the British public transport system has increased. In Canada, Conrail is being transferred to the private sector. In several of the southern States of America there is much wider use of private sector buses. Most of the studies carried out by the American Department of Transport have shown that the savings have been about 50 per cent. The question is: why is the Government not looking at involving the private sector in its rationalisation and improvement of STA services?

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I support the motion. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his opening speech to this the third session of the forty-sixth State Parliament. Before responding to His Excellency's address, I express my condolences to the families of the Hon. Ron Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons. Both members served this Parliament as Ministers, and also served their respective electorates and the Labor Party with distinction.

All South Australians should take note of the timely statements of His Excellency the Governor, who said in part:

The economic situation facing our nation and this State is again the most important issue before my Government.

Overseas factors coupled with a reduction in the price for our raw materials, and a significant reduction of \$200 million by the Federal Government to this State will mean, in the Governor's words, that 'there inevitably will be difficult and unpopular decisions in the allocation of State funding, but this is a challenge my Government has accepted'. It is important to put on record that South Australia receives at least 40 per cent of its recurrent funds from the Commonwealth and requires approval for loan funds from the Federal Government. As I have said, South Australia received a cut of about \$200 million from our current expenditure, representing a drop in real terms of 6.4 per cent in grants.

As a Government, we now have a choice between a reduction in the scale of services or an increase in taxes or charges—or a mixture of both. This Government is very much aware that future strategies and directions are critical to the economic management of our resources and to the wellbeing of all South Australians. The forthcoming 1987-88 budget allocations and, indeed, future budgets are a serious challenge. The need to bite the bullet is self-evident. Failure to do so will leave this Government open to charges of economic mismanagement, and future electors of South Australia—and, indeed, existing electors—would correctly judge us harshly at the next election.

Despite these factors, I do not wish to be a party to the doom and gloom which has pervaded the Opposition benches for the past four years. On this side of the House we get sick of the constant knocking and carping criticism of the Liberal Opposition. The Bannion Government has sought to increase and strengthen the economic base and redevelop the South Australian community. The Premier's purposeful and positive approach to this cause has been recognised by the business community in this State and has earned him a reputation as the quiet achiever. It is interesting that, while the Premier was in Japan, we saw the response he received from the Japanese business people. I quote from the *Advertiser* of 9 May, under the headline 'Bannion Seeking SA-Japan Trade Boost', as follows:

The South Australian Government is looking for a larger slice of the lucrative export market to Japan.

It states that, amongst other things, the Premier was in Japan to raise South Australia's profile, particularly the role of the South Australian Financing Authority, amongst big Japanese investors; to follow up previously established trade and investment contacts; and to explore possibilities for further trade and investment.

The article goes on to say that the Premier would be a guest of honour at a special dinner hosted by the Minister of State for Economic Planning and would represent South Australia's investment opportunities to major Japanese financial institutions. It continues:

The presentation has been arranged by Nomura Securities, one of the biggest financial institutions in the world. It is capitalised on the Tokyo Stock Exchange at more than \$A100 000 million.

This shows that the Premier has not been idle: he has been overseas and is looking for every opportunity to encourage business to invest in this country.

As I said, the Premier has earned a reputation as a quiet achiever and whilst he was in Japan, most of us would recall that the Japanese referred to him as the Prime Minister of Australia. I have no doubt that he has the capacity to hold that office should he ever enter into the Federal arena. We do not have the mineral deposits and revenue earning royalties of other State Governments, but it should not be forgotten that a great deal has been achieved in the first four years of the Bannion Government.

Business investments, coupled with the State Government's involvement and/or support, have seen the following achievements by the Bannion Government: the submarine contract, which I will mention later in my contribution; the ASER redevelopment; the opening of the Adelaide Convention Centre and the employment opportunities created from that; the Grand Prix, with more than 40 000 visitors each year, not to mention the economic benefits in revenue to this State. Business and tourism have benefited enormously also from the Grand Prix. The next Grand Prix will be viewed in about 400 countries with a viewing population of some 700 million people. That sort of publicity is certainly hard to come by and speaks volumes for the decision of the Premier to go overseas to obtain the 1985 Grand Prix.

Further achievements by the Bannion Government include its support for the Galaxy Oil Refinery near Whyalla and the guarantee that up to \$20 million will be provided there, and the Kimberley Clark investment and expansion of its facilities at Millicent at an expected cost of \$70 million would also create up to 150 employment positions.

It is also interesting to note the amount of property investment in metropolitan Adelaide. Adelaide city property investment is booming with buildings worth more than \$492.4 million proposed or currently under way. That figure is quoted from the *News* of 14 April 1987. Just as a rough calculation, approximately \$114 million in office building

expenditure is allocated for the inner city business district. I suggest to the House that this is an indication of the commercial support and anticipation of an upturn in South Australia, and one could look forward to additional investment in the central business district area.

The planned marina and housing development at Wellington, coupled with the proposed international hotel and redevelopment of the East End Market, is estimated at \$300 million. The Victor Harbor proposed development at \$40 million plus \$19 million in other proposals is something that the Opposition has failed to mention.

The announcement by Mitsubishi to call on its Japanese shareholders to inject \$150 million in new investment capital for South Australia has been overlooked by the Opposition. It failed to mention that manufacturing facility and the investment on research and development that will be spent over a five year period. The Premier's signing an investment package with Japan to promote Japanese investment in South Australia is also another success for this State, plus the potential for South Australian exports of horticultural products, minerals to be used in high technological industry and manufactured products. Our present sales of \$250 million represents approximately 12 per cent of our exports from South Australia to that country.

The potential of course is much higher. Castalloy, Adelaide's automotive component maker, won three overseas contracts worth over \$10 million a year, lifting its export business to \$25 million per year, which is another benefit to this State, particularly in terms of employment opportunity. The \$14 million upgrading of the ICI Osborne operation was another achievement overlooked by the Opposition—this Opposition that continually harps, carps, criticises and preaches doom and gloom in order to gain some cheap political point. The potential of Australia's first software centre is again encouraging news, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 20 February of this year, in which it was stated:

South Australia will be the home of the nation's first software centre—an information and resources bureau to promote the State's multimillion dollar computer software industry.

Again that development was overlooked by the Opposition. ROH Industries has announced a \$20 million contract for the supply of alloy wheels to Japan. Again it was mentioned in the media but overlooked by the Opposition, which fails to give recognition to what is happening in this State. The article, on 13 June this year, states:

Nissan Australia's managing director, Mr Ian Deveson, who was a guest at ROH's celebrations, said that of all Nissan motor vehicles built world-wide, 17 per cent had some Australian componentry.

He goes on to say:

At least 20 per cent to 25 per cent of Australian car production should be exported but it is a very tall task.

Such opportunities are available to South Australia, and we are on the way to gaining support and recognition in this State because of this Government's involvement and assistance to industry.

The winning of the Defence Department's contracts, including an infra-red eye in the dark surveillance system has non-military applications world wide and could prove invaluable in search and rescue operations all over the world. It also could be a great exporter and income earner to this country, in particular to South Australia.

The opening of the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing at the old GMH plant at Woodville, with a proposed expenditure of some \$300 million to cater for the needs of the next few years, was also overlooked by the Opposition in its attempt to talk down the economy in this State. This centre is part of the State Government's drive

to attract new manufacturing industry to South Australia and to revitalise existing industries. The success of the centre will generate employment and growth in many other sectors of our economy. It is also pleasing to note that it will generate much work in the western suburbs of Adelaide which, over many years, has been of growing concern to successive Governments.

The export potential of Teknis, housed in the old Philips Hendon works, was also overlooked by the Opposition. In the *Messenger Press Weekly Times* of 4 March 1987 under the heading 'Upgrade to start export boom' an article stated:

A Hendon company's expansion program, expected to generate millions of export dollars for South Australia, has been unveiled by Industry, Technology and Commerce Minister, Senator John Button. The expansion, by Teknis Limited of Hendon, makes the company one of the most advanced makers of printed circuit boards in the Southern Hemisphere. The new plant is regarded as a 'jewel' on the Australian manufacturing scene. It will enable Teknis to match high quality products from the US, Europe and Asia to save much-needed foreign exchange that is now being spent overseas.

Printed circuit boards are the 'building blocks' of electronic equipment of all descriptions... In competition with [market dominated multinationals] it recently won a \$1m contract to supply control and supervisory equipment for RAAF airfield facilities throughout Australia.

Once again, we see the knocking of the Opposition when it does not mention what is taking place in South Australia. The submarine contract is important to this State for many reasons I will not elaborate on, and it is especially important to the western suburbs. The catalyst and multiplying effect of winning the submarine contract is yet to be fully appreciated in South Australia.

An enterprising person in the western suburbs, endowed with entrepreneurial skills, has been selling submarine badges to business persons and residents in celebration of this magnificent achievement—and rightly so. I understand that that enterprising young person has sent badges to the Prime Minister and the Premier. It is interesting to note that my colleagues the Minister of Housing and Construction, the member for Price and indeed you, Mr Acting Speaker, are wearing the badges. However, I note that no Opposition member has one, but no doubt this enterprising person will approach them in the next few months asking them to part with a few dollars. The number is 268 2680, so if members make inquiries I am sure that badges promoting this wonderful contract will be supplied.

The submarine contract will bring a new lease of life to the western suburbs and 3 500 jobs will be generated. Existing industries will receive a massive boost and new industries will be attracted to our State, hopefully to the western suburbs and closer to the submarine base. Like the member for Price, I believe it is important that we have a large sign, containing all the particulars, situated in the median strip near Port Adelaide, indicating that Port Adelaide is the home of the submarine contract. I believe that the member for Price (the elected representative of the area) and the Federal Minister, in conjunction with the local government authority, should erect that soon to remind people who go down to the Port of the costs involved in the contract and the jobs that it will generate. I look forward to seeing that sign hopefully in a section of the Port Road plantation.

Commercial and residential areas will receive a boost with new housing, while small businesses and new companies will be attracted to the western suburbs. When one looks at the impact that the West Lakes development on places like Royal Park and Semaphore Park one notices the upgrading and refurbishing of many old homes, and a similar situation could occur around Osborne and Taperoo. The immediate expenditure of \$80 million to \$100 million on the sub-

marine site will bring increased employment opportunities. It is also important to note that the Australian Submarine Corporation is to have its business offices in the former GMH plant at Woodville.

An article in the *Advertiser* of 8 July states:

The offices would hold about 250 people and act as the nerve centre for the submarine project until work at the \$100m submarine construction facility at Osborne was completed.

Like many of my colleagues, I look forward to the benefits that will flow to other business houses in South Australia. Further, it will attract also many other businesses to this State. In that vein the *Portside Messenger* of 5 August states:

Premier John Bannon said there was an upsurge of interest in the potential of Port Adelaide as an industrial area as a result of seminars he gave in Melbourne and Sydney last month. Mr Bannon and a team from the State Development Department visited both capitals to explain to investors the potential of Port Adelaide in the light of the submarine replacement contract. 'Many of the investors who attended the seminars were surprised at the infrastructure present at Port Adelaide,' the Premier said . . . 'We had more than 600 investors, some of them from Australia's top companies, attending the seminars. They are now aware that the Port offers cheap industrial land and is at the centre of an integrated communications and transport system.'

We have the siting opportunity to capitalise on this submarine contract and to create more than the projected 3 500 jobs.

I think it is important also that I remind people of some of this State Government's achievements, particularly in my electorate of Albert Park. The allocation of more than \$225 000 for the multi-sport clubrooms at Hawkesbury Reserve at West Lakes was certainly an achievement. I can recall that, after we were returned to office, at the end of 1982 I talked to the members of the board of the West Lakes Community Club as it was to be known. They were somewhat agitated that no money had been provided to that particular organisation. The now Minister of Housing and Construction came down with one of his officers and met with members of the board. We were told that, despite promises and undertakings, in their budget not one red cent had been allocated to this program. This Government honoured that undertaking and, of course, those multi-sport clubrooms at what was known as Hawkesbury Reserve (and now Jubilee Reserve) are today a reality. The support of the Woodville council and the Federal Government also should be recognised in that regard. The complex caters for all age groups interested in tennis, netball, lawn bowling, croquet, football, hockey and numerous other sports.

It should be appreciated that this Government put its money where its mouth was and provided \$300 000 for a hydrotherapy pool at Royal Park. One only has to see my utterances on this subject over the years to appreciate how strongly I feel about this matter because, despite those statements from the Opposition that it was interested in the rehabilitation of workers, once again when it came to the crunch it came up with zilch. I was delighted to be given the opportunity to officially open that hydrotherapy pool.

The West Lakes Boulevard extension is almost a reality and should be completed by the end of the year at a cost of about \$1 million. As a result of the Government's support and my pushing that project, which was promised as far back as 1968, it is soon to be a reality.

As to Seaton High School and the commitment to upgrade the library resource centre at a cost of \$100 000, after many years that has been achieved this year. Indeed, that project predates my coming into this Parliament. Once again, persistence and doggedness have achieved the desired result and, in that regard, I must give recognition to the Chairperson, Maureen Fagen, and the Principal at that school, Mr Linke. The project has been achieved through a three-way involvement, which has certainly paid off. Last week

the West Lakes Primary School received \$20 000. Another achievement was the \$20 000 allocated by Woodville council on behalf of West Lakes High School for rental of the aquatic reserve building. The pressure of time does not permit me to go through in detail the traffic control measures; suffice it to say, they are many and varied and they have been beneficial to my constituents and many other people who use the western suburbs.

I wish now to highlight the relocation of Allied Engineering from Royal Park to Enfield. Again, this project predated my entry to this place. However, after much involvement and intense lobbying this relocation has been achieved. In fact a constituent came to my office and said that if we did not shift the factory he would shoot the manager. That is how intense the situation became in terms of noise problems affecting people in the area.

Another project was the resolution of lighting for Football Park, which once again was left to this Government. Further, new bus services were implemented in Semaphore Park, Royal Park and West Lakes, and the new service to Delphin Island was begun in March 1986. The expansion of the South Australian Brush Company is also worthy of note, and I also wish to commend the South Australian Housing Trust's redevelopment and building of new homes in my area, which are other achievements that must go on the record.

In the remaining two minutes I would like to mention the success of the Neighbourhood Watch program. I can remember in November 1983 asking the Government to investigate the feasibility of introducing a Neighbourhood Watch program in South Australia. The Government picked up that idea and last Monday week I had the pleasure of attending the opening of the forty-first program, which was in my electorate. We had to wait many years for that achievement.

I wish to turn now to some of the needs in my area, especially after school child-care. I have three Housing Trust estates in my electorate and many of the residents of those estates are single and sole parents who require assistance. I realise that resources are at a premium, but I must record the needs of my constituents. Last, but not least, I am delighted to have been informed unofficially that in the near future the Government may well agree to my proposal for advertising on school buses. This program could assist more than 700 schools in South Australia, or at least those with school buses. It will assist in relation to the running and maintenance of those vehicles. It can go even further than that, and one would hope that it would include sponsorship.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I call on the member for Flinders.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing, I express my condolences to the families of the late Hon. Don Simmons and the late Hon. Ron Loveday. I knew and had the highest respect for both men. I must say that I knew Mr Simmons much better than I knew Mr Loveday. However, from my brief association with Mr Loveday I recall that he would have been the last member of the Labor Party in the House of Assembly who was a farmer. I stand corrected, but I think that it has been 17 years since the Labor Party had a farmer in the House of Assembly.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** I note from the interjections a reference to the other Chamber: I recognise the Hon. Brian Chatterton was a farmer, but in the past 17 years he is

probably the only other member of the Labor Party who was a farmer. I do not wish to make a point on this except to say that I believe that the feeling in the rural community reflects the lack of rural-based or rural experienced personnel in the present Parliament. However, I express my deepest sympathies to the families of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday.

I have read and re-read His Excellency's speech, a report on the Government's program for this session. I found encouraging aspects of the speech, but I believe that it was disappointing in that, in relation to small business, practically nothing was mentioned that would encourage businesses to expand and give them much hope for the future. I was somewhat disappointed from that point of view. Basically, matters raised were a restatement of past issues. Details on many issues were repeated. The Finger Point sewerage proposal in the South-East is a classic example of that.

I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee between 1979 and 1982, during which time the Finger Point sewerage proposal was put before that committee. I recall that I was the only member who actively supported the proposal at that time, and when I indicated that I intended to bring in a minority report three other members decided that they would support me. In the meantime, an election was called and the Finger Point sewerage proposal was put on the back shelf. It has since become the subject of political debate; the matter has been raised on many occasions, with little or no action actually taking place.

The encouraging part of His Excellency's speech was obviously the Government's commitment to the submarine project. I am pleased—as would be every other South Australian—that the project was secured for South Australia. I just hope that the maximum benefit from that project can be achieved and that we can get many South Australians employed, not only on the base project itself but in ancillary and flow-on industries that could well develop from it. A \$4 billion program is indeed one of massive proportions. I have been trying to weigh up in my mind how extensive that is: when one considers that the whole of the Australian wool industry will gross only \$4 billion in one year, I think we can understand the magnitude of the submarine project—provided that we can channel it along the right tracks. I only hope that that will come to pass.

I noted comments in His Excellency's speech about the rural sector. I guess the only reference to Eyre Peninsula was that there is an area there that is still quite dry and, unless we have late rains and a late finishing season to follow, obviously that area will be in difficulties. However, generally there is no other comment in relation to the rural aspect. The other encouraging matter from the point of view of my electorate is the commitment to complete the TAFE college. I hope that it will open in September and that the Government does not have second thoughts about that project. The project will be of immense benefit to the further education of people living on Eyre Peninsula. The TAFE college at Port Lincoln has campuses at Ceduna, Wudinna, Cleve, and at other outlying areas, with Port Lincoln being the central focal point. I believe that that project will assist many people, particularly in these times of rural constraint and high unemployment, and I believe that the college can play a very important part.

Reference is made in His Excellency's speech to 17 child-care centres, one of which is currently being constructed at Port Lincoln. I have some reservations about the extensive building or widespread use of child-care centres. I say that because, whilst I recognise that there are within the community people who desperately need child-care centres—

and I fully support those persons in need—I do not believe that child-care centres should be built to enable people to become two income families and to place their children in child-care centres, which are subsidised at taxpayers' expense. Somewhere along the line a balance must be arrived at in relation to that project.

Reference is also made in His Excellency's speech to pending legislation on child sexual abuse. I have been deeply concerned at a number of cases that have been brought to my attention. No doubt every member of Parliament has had similar experiences where cases such as this, which we would like to think never occurred within our community, regrettably do occur. To that end I hope that commonsense does prevail and that greater support is given to the victims of child sexual abuse and greater penalties are imposed on offenders, so that there is at least some deterrent aspect to it.

The Finger Point sewerage proposal is to be established, and I fully support that. I support it not because it is just another sewerage treatment works but because there could be a very detrimental effect on the lobster industry should contaminated fish emanate from that area. We require only one contaminated lobster to go onto the world market for serious and irreparable damage to be done to the lobster industry. For that reason, I have been an active supporter of the Finger Point sewerage proposal since 1982, when the matter first came to my attention.

One interesting aspect in paragraph 27 of His Excellency's speech relates to new management proposals for the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I note that the Government intends to introduce a new classification of reserves, which are to be known as regional reserves. I have already received correspondence from persons who are very concerned about this aspect. It was once believed that national parks and wildlife areas when dedicated were, in fact, untouchable and could not be transgressed at any price. I personally had some reservations about that, as I believed that there was room for joint use. I note that the Government is doing what some might call a complete turnaround in allowing for regional reserves to be established for the multiple use of natural resources within such areas. I look forward to observing the Government's stance on this issue so that I can see which way it will jump and whether it will allow multiple use—and by multiple use I mean mining and other activities—within those areas. Until we see the legislation, it is difficult to know exactly what is intended.

I mentioned earlier another matter that arose in His Excellency's speech, and that was basically a restatement of past activities. I am referring to the ASER site development and the new Hyatt Regency Hotel. The Olympic Sports Field would also be involved. Those aspects of His Excellency's speech needed to be highlighted because some comment could or should be made in relation to most of those issues.

The issue which I now seek to raise has been brought to my attention in the past few weeks, and in this respect I refer to the activities of the Meat Hygiene Authority. From my recollection of the original debate, I understood that the Meat Hygiene Authority was established primarily, for health reasons, to bring about the upgrading of slaughterhouses and abattoirs or to have them rebuilt to standards of excellent hygiene. That is a matter on which I think we all agreed.

Most members on the Opposition side were concerned that bureaucracy would run wild and that another bureaucratic empire would develop for questionable reasons. That assumption of some years ago when the Act was implemented is now coming to pass. The authority finds itself unable to recoup funds to enable it to go even part way

towards the maintenance of its operation. It is now suggesting a 100 per cent increase in fees as well as on-site inspection fees after the first hour. This means that the meat hygiene authority, instead of cutting back on its activities when it has done its job, is flagging the idea that it will fleece slaughterhouse operators to ensure that they pay their own way. I say 'fleece' the slaughterhouse operators advisedly, because it has been suggested to them that they will be set a fee of \$200 and will be charged \$75 an hour, after the first hour, for each inspection.

I understand that the Meat Hygiene Authority makes regular inspections of slaughterhouses about three times a year. It has been suggested that that could increase to six or seven times a year. If a meat inspector decides that what he has traditionally done in an hour will now take three hours it will cost the slaughterhouse operator an extra \$150. The corollary to this is that at the end of the year, if the Meat Hygiene Authority cannot balance its budget, it could send its meat inspectors around the slaughterhouses and could pick up \$30 000 just like that, and that is what worries everybody.

The slaughterhouse industry is suffering the effects of the rural crisis. They are finding it extremely difficult because they are in a food processing area in which people are having difficulty making ends meet. There have been a number of meetings in the community to argue the suggested points. I believe that there are good reasons for asking the Government to say that this is an area in which they can show some restraint. It has not been demonstrated that there is a need for an increase in the activities of Meat Hygiene Authority inspectors, because they have failed quite singularly to combat backyard operators.

I am sure that slaughterhouse operators would be quite prepared to accept increases in fees, although very reluctantly, if they could see value for money. In the vast majority of cases slaughterhouses have been upgraded to quite satisfactory levels and to the standards required by the Meat Hygiene Authority. Slaughterhouse operators have done this in the belief that the authority would protect them from backyard operators. I understand that some backyard operators even go to local markets and buy truck loads of stock. I also understand that skin buyers pick up skins from backyard operators and that, although many of the offenders have been reported to the Meat Hygiene Authority, nothing has been done about them. If the authority cannot police the activities of backyarders and, if it is not prepared to take stronger action to ensure the protection that is demanded by the law through an Act of this Parliament, one must question the wisdom of having the authority at all.

At one of the meetings that has taken place to discuss these pending proposals, several recommendations were made, as follows:

1. The controlling authority should remain as its original concept, to be constituted of the Chief Inspector of Meat Hygiene, a nominee of the Minister of Health and a nominee of the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated.
2. Two slaughterhouse inspectors be engaged Statewide.

It has been indicated that one inspector could, in 180 days, do all of the inspections that have transpired in the past 12 months. I understand that seven inspectors are on the payroll. There might be other explanations for that, but, if what I have been told is right, obviously there is need for very grave concern. I suspect that there is a surplus of meat inspectors and that the Government has not been prepared to bite the bullet and state that jobs are unavailable. Instead, it has used the Meat Hygiene Authority to try to absorb people from elsewhere. The other recommendations were:

3. That local government health officers be utilised in an effort to control rising costs and comply with the Federal Government

funding cuts. The availability of the local government health inspector in preference to an Adelaide based inspector surely must warrant consideration purely on cost benefits.

4. The subject of backyard operators be addressed immediately.

That issue should be taken into account and treated much more sincerely than it is at the moment.

I could go on at length discussing some of the activities that have occurred and, more particularly, some of the proposals put forward by the Meat Hygiene Authority. To me, it is purely a blatant act of further taxation of meat processors. It is an open-ended ticket for inspectors or, in this case, a Government authority to be able to recoup whatever expenses they like. As I mentioned earlier, if at the end of the financial year they find that they are running a little short, they have only to demand a further inspection.

Whether that inspection is called for does not matter. They just have to do the run around and pick up another \$30 000 to balance the budget. That is wrong. I do not believe that it can be justified, particularly when the past history of the Meat Hygiene Authority has been that only three inspections per year are required. Given that the proposal is that six or seven inspections be carried out per year, it is a blatant revenue earning measure. The proposal to double licence fees alone is bad enough but, when inspection fees are charged as well, that is bleeding those who cannot otherwise afford to pay.

I turn now to another issue that is of great concern to my community: the threat to close the Cowell Hospital. I raise this issue because it has been a matter of some controversy for 12 to 18 months since the first report was released on the obstetric and neonatal services at the Modbury and Lyell McEwin Hospitals. A flow on from that has been the suggestion that many country hospitals be closed because they do not look after 20 births a year, and therefore cannot maintain a certain standard and expertise within the staff. That was the subject of a lengthy report by the Government, which said that all persons should be within 45 minutes driving time from a hospital. Whilst there have been conflicting interpretations of that report, there was some general acceptance that, if that rule were applied, the continued existence of country hospitals as we know them, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, would be relatively secure.

Since then, further rumours have circulated about the closure of the Cowell Hospital. As a result of those rumours, on 9 April I asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health in another place whether he would give us an assurance about the future of hospitals specifically on Eyre Peninsula.

The Minister indicated that he was aware of my concerns and that he would contact the Minister of Health and bring down a report. Regrettably, at this stage I do not have that report. However, in the interim a couple of other developments have concerned me. I attended the recent UF&S annual conference, where a delegate from the Cowell area said, 'We have been told that the Cowell Hospital will amalgamate with the Cleve Hospital.' Later that week the same gentleman put an article in the local paper claiming that he had been given such an understanding, and also quoted Dr Bill McCoy, Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, as stating:

The South Australian Health Commission has suggested closing the Cowell District Hospital or amalgamating its services with the Cleve District Hospital. This startling revelation was made by Dr Bill McCoy, Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, at a meeting of Eyre Peninsula hospital boards held at Elliston.

I was present at that meeting and I do not recall that sort of allegation. I quote further:

At that meeting Dr McCoy suggested that Cowell Hospital becomes a 'long-term' hospital for the region, while Cleve hospital

handles all surgery and short-term patients. After the meeting, in a private conversation with a Cowell Hospital board member Dr McCoy said the total closure of the hospital was also being considered.

That worries me, because either we have the Chairman of the Health Commission giving private members information that he was not prepared to give to the general meeting of the Eyre Peninsula hospital boards or we have a misinterpretation or misquotation of Dr McCoy's actual statement. I am very worried, as are the members of the Cowell community, about this statement, and all I ask is that the Government does whatever it can to honestly tell the people of the area what is the true position.

When this article first appeared in the paper, I immediately contacted the Health Commission. Dr McCoy and the Minister at that time were both overseas, and Mr Ray Blight from the Health Commission responded to that article with a letter to the editor of the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* on Thursday 6 August, just six days ago. I have since been in touch with the Health Commission and the Minister's office, and I understand that a report will be coming, but I just place on the record my very grave concern about what has happened and the fears which have been generated within that community, either because the local people have been deliberately misled or because they have misinterpreted the statements made. Either way, I believe that the people of that community are entitled to a clear statement of fact as to where they stand, and I trust that that statement will be forthcoming before long. I could go on further. However, I have been given an assurance from the Minister's office that some communication will take place within the next few days, and I look forward to that.

An issue I raised during an earlier debate is my concern with what has happened in the education field and, more particularly, the way in which certain teachers can avoid their obligations for teaching in the country simply by taking four years leave without pay. It occurred on Eyre Peninsula and involved five teachers. They were given country postings, but, rather than take those postings, they immediately took four years leave without pay. Whilst I do not deny anyone the right to take four years leave without pay, the problem is that the department has recognised that, having taken that leave without pay, the teachers have effectively absolved themselves from any obligation to undertake country teaching service. To further complicate the matter, I understand that in at least one case and probably two, two of the lasses involved were expecting a family and have effectively taken four years accouchement leave.

A further complicating factor, I am given to understand, is that in one case in a near metropolitan area, a teacher chose to take four years leave without pay but remained in his immediate community and was then offered a one month contract job immediately school started. At the end of the month, he was put onto a 12 month contract in exactly the position from which he had taken four years leave without pay. To me, it is utterly wrong that that person has effectively avoided any form of country service but at the same time, whether or not it is fortuitous, has been able to maintain full employment in the same position that he had originally.

I raise that point because I believe that the principle is wrong. First, I do not believe that there should be two classes of people in the community. Secondly, the application of that principle could deny country people a standard of teacher that they rightfully are entitled to. I believe that that has happened, where—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler):** Order! I ask members on each side to keep their conversations down.

**Mr BLACKER:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, I was having some difficulty. I believe that it has happened. I am talking in the commercial education field, where a teacher took four years leave without pay and therefore denied an area school the opportunity to have commercial classes. That is the implication. We may well get a lower standard of teacher in country areas if this principle is allowed to continue. I trust that that will not be the case, although I understand that there has been an agreement between the Government and SAIT—whether or not we call it a sweetheart agreement—to allow this to continue. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech.

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** Tonight I wish to join other members who have spoken in this debate in expressing deep regret at the passing of former members Ron Loveday and Don Simmons. I have to say that, although Ron Loveday came from the same part of town as I come from, I knew him basically only by sight as a figure seen in and around the Party. I did not know him intimately.

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

**Mr ROBERTSON:** He retired down to the Brighton area, for the information of the Minister. I knew the second former member, Don Simmons, a good deal better. I had the good fortune to spend a number of years associated with the West Beach area of the Labor Party and ran across Don Simmons in the course of my activity within the Party. I also knew him, for a number of reasons, much earlier than that. I taught with his wife, Betty, at the Henley High School from 1973 to 1976 inclusive, and I knew him partly through his daughter, Pam, who was involved in a number of Party activities with me.

I also ran across Don in my period as an environmental lobbyist for various voluntary conservation groups in South Australia, and I must say in that rather adversarial situation I found him to be the most humane and gentle of people. It was not uncommon to go to him as a lobbyist with an environmental problem and receive advice on how it could be solved and in fact lobbying advice—teaching the lobbyist how to lobby, if you wish. He was always free with his advice, both constructive and concerned about environmental issues, and a very dedicated and genuine environmentalist. I regret his passing very much and, as other members have said today and yesterday, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Betty and her family.

I wish to use the remainder of the time allocated to me tonight to put forward a personal agenda for the electorate of Bright for the indefinite future. This is my version of the Governor's speech and indicates some of my hopes for the area of town from which I now come. One of the great aims in the southern area in the next 10 to 15 years is the construction or installation of the linear park system—the second generation of parklands. It is my ambition to see a linear park established on the Field River, which runs through my electorate. I regard that as an excellent opportunity to give public access to a very beautiful area of the Adelaide foreshore and to open up an area that has hitherto been protected by a combination of pastoral and quarrying interests. It seems that as part of the linear park it is imperative that we give consideration to the protection and preservation of the historic Worthing mine site. That issue will certainly be occupying a good deal of my time in years to come.

Closer to the coastline, a marvellous project has been instituted over the past couple of years, namely, the completion of the Tjilbruke trail, Tjilbruke being one of the creation heroes of the Kaurna people, the people of the

Adelaide plains. As a creation hero, Tjilbruke is responsible for creating a number of springs, beaches and landscape features all the way from Glenelg to Victor Harbor and beyond. Measures have been taken to date to mark the various creation spots along the Tjilbruke trail and it is my hope that in the fairly near future the remainder of the points will be marked and the trail established and marked out linking the various high spots to the Tjilbruke trail.

One of the high spots occurs at Kingston Park, in the middle of the Bright electorate, and, fortunately, the area is already marked by a monument to Tjilbruke. It abuts the historic Kingston House, the home of George Strickland Kingston and Charles Cameron Kingston. The Government's participation in the restoration and refurbishment of Kingston House over the past two or three years has been remarkable. In excess of \$100 000 of public money has been invested in Kingston House, and it is now beginning to reach a point where it is an outstanding example of middle to late nineteenth century domestic architecture. It is very much a product of Adelaide and a place of considerable significance in the political and social evolution of our society in South Australia.

It is my hope that when the Kingston House project nears completion it will house some form of museum to mark the significance of the Kingston family in the social and political history of this State and will also continue to be used by a wide variety and diversity of community groups, not the least of which is the Marion-Brighton CYSS group, which presently uses it as its headquarters. It is also my hope that the succession of small but successful chamber music concerts that have been held in the Kingston House grounds and inside the house will continue. It seems to be a marvellous venue for such events.

I also hope that the Australia Day carnival that has become part of the suburban landscape in that area of town, organised capably by the Kingston Park Rotary Club, will continue as it has over the past two years and will be a means to weld the local community together. Kingston House is one of the few community focuses in that part of town, and it is essential that it continue to be developed and serve that role. Adjacent to Kingston House the Kingston Park reserve, in which the Tjilbruke monument stands, has passed from the care and control of the State Government into the hands of the Brighton City Council.

The council has begun to maintain and upgrade that area, and it is my hope that it will continue that process so that that reserve ceases to be a hang-out for people on the weekend and becomes a valuable community resource where people can spend a quiet Sunday afternoon watching the sea, the windsurfers and others who use that strip of the coastline.

Of particular satisfaction to me over the past several years has been my involvement with a number of schools in the Bright electorate which are doing their part in the greening of Adelaide. A number of schools have enthusiastically taken up the idea of planting trees in their local areas. Although the project is not yet off the ground the communities surrounding the Seaview Downs Primary School and the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School are considering the replanting of areas of public land adjacent to the schools. The Seaview Downs Primary School is fortunate in that it lies adjacent to the hills face zone reserve and children from that school and the school council have expressed interest in planting and maintaining trees in that area. This will teach the children some of the values to be gained by husbanding plants as they will be planting, nurturing and protecting the trees until such time as they are capable of survival on their own.

Of course, those same skills will be inculcated into the children at the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School, and its school council has shown an alarming keenness to become involved in planting trees in the Christie Creek Reserve adjacent to the school.

The Hallett Cove school (which my two children have attended for the past year) caters for children from reception to year 10. It is a great credit to the Hallett Cove community that that development has gone as smoothly as it has. The school, which is to be built in three stages, ultimately will take children up to year 10. The second of three stages of construction has now been completed and at the beginning of next year the school will take year 8 children for the first time and will become a true community high school which will service Hallett Cove and the adjacent areas of Trott Park and Sheidow Park.

It is probable that the second stage will be completed ahead of schedule and will certainly come in under budget. It is of satisfaction to the school council and me that stage II has come in with a surplus which has resulted in the Education Department completing a parking lay-by for parents dropping off their children in the morning and picking them up in the afternoon. This will provide a safe facility for children being dropped off and picked up and avoid the present crush that occurs in the schoolyard every morning.

The other great achievement is that the school council during the past month or so begun a before and after school care program. In an area containing a large number of two income families such a program is important. It will enable the community to be sure that the children of Hallett Cove families will have a level of supervision after school that previously may not have existed. Also, it will take some of the load off grannies, friends, and neighbours who hitherto had to look after the children of the two income families. The other great benefit is that the school recently received funding to buy computers and, following current trends, those computers will be installed as stand-alone units in the classrooms and will become part of the teaching furniture, much in the same way as blackboards, dusters and maps have been in the past. While computers will be part of the classroom furniture—and hopefully ultimately every classroom in every school will have access to one—it seems to me and many people on the school council that those computer facilities should be opened up to wider community use.

It has been suggested that it might be possible in a closed community such as the one at Hallett Cove to integrate some of the information available from businesses, such as the price of various commodities, the services of various professional offices, and so on, into some sort of information network that can then be accessed by the community. I hope that the local community in fact will be able to organise a local Viatel system whereby local businesses and professional people can feed information into the system and local people with their own personal on-line computers can access that information as consumers.

Indeed, I hope that local community groups and sporting clubs also will be able to put details of their meetings, their training sessions and their activities into that information system in such a way that people will be able to simply dial up the information system and find out, for example, where the under-10 soccer team trains, the time it finishes, who coaches it, and who is in the team next Saturday, etc. I believe that that sort of information should be available to communities of that kind. It seems that in Hallett Cove the wherewithal exists for the establishment of that sort of system.

Further, I have made a point of extending that idea to the Noarlunga area and using the facilities at Noarlunga TAFE. I suggested that businesses in the Noarlunga council area also contribute information that can become part of an information network in the Noarlunga area. That would be a bigger project than the Hallett Cove one, but it would be rather similar, and the computer facilities that exist at Noarlunga TAFE would be better equipped to handle the sort of information that would need to be stored.

Again, on the topic of the Hallett Cove school, I regret that the Marion council and the Education Department were unable to negotiate a joint use agreement for the new library. It seems a great pity that a public resource such as the school library will not be open to parents and to other people in the community in the general course of events. However, to some extent that situation has been corrected by the fact that Marion council has developed its own library in the vicinity, and that should be opened by about the end of next year.

It is hoped that the other facilities to be built in stage 3 of the school, including technical study facilities, and so on, will be available for community use. I hope that parents and other people in the community will use the facilities of the domestic science wing, the metal and woodwork centre, and so on, where they could learn from WEA tutors and TAFE lecturers, etc. A whole range of adult education courses could be based in that school, and I hope that it will be done in that way. Further, I hope that the university of the third age, which is now beginning to gather momentum in the southern suburbs, will use school facilities of that kind as a teaching venue. As we move from a young to middle aged community at Hallett Cove to an aged community, we need to give more thought to the provision of aged facilities of all kinds.

One of the great deficiencies at the moment in that community is the complete lack of housing for the aged. While the area is quite hilly and difficult to get around, it is great if one happens to be young, but if one is a little older, a little dodderly on one's legs and a little unsure in walking long distances, it is a problem. In that community, as we do not have a great deal of housing for the aged, it is of considerable satisfaction and delight to me that the Housing Trust proposes to build six attached units in the Hallett Cove Estate, and that will go some way towards meeting that need.

Also, it has been a pet project of mine to encourage the local churches to pool their resources on the so-called PATPA land adjacent to the regional shopping centre, with a view to building joint aged housing on that site. It seems to me that that would be a valid use for church property. In fact, that should be an aim of churches in the area. I have taken some part in moves to encourage that, and it is my great hope that local churches and their communities will join hands and create that kind of situation for the older people of the area.

Also, I welcome the development of commercial and professional services in the Hallett Cove area. I make a plea for the retention of the bus service that was commenced on 18 December 1984—the 681 bus, which does such a good job in servicing the growing commercial and professional services in the area.

Whilst it is true that patronage started at a relatively low level, it is also true that it has grown remarkably and now provides what might be termed very efficient cement in welding the community together and providing people from the outlying parts of what is jocularly called the 'greater Hallett Cove'—that is, Trott Park and Sheidow Park—into

one single community around the commercial and professional centre.

It is also worth noting that the community at Hallett Cove enjoys an excellent rail service. Two new car parks have been constructed in the past couple of years at Hallett Cove railway station to service the two suburbs of Karrara and Hallett Cove Estate on either side. At Hallett Cove railway station further south the car park has been resurfaced. On the subject of improvements along the southern railway line it is also worth pointing to the excellent 'kiss and ride' facility established at Brighton, with a similar facility at Lonsdale station. I can assure the House and the Minister that those services are used comprehensively at almost all hours of the day, and they are well and truly appreciated by the communities concerned.

It is also worth pointing to the fact that at the Lonsdale station, which services the O'Sullivan Beach area, the STA in the past couple of months has gone to considerable lengths to erect railings and special footpaths for the older people who live in the area and who patronise the service extensively, so that they can make their way uphill from the train along the 30 or 40 metres to the bus.

Dealing with buses, one of the other uses for retired STA buses is their employment as youth buses, or youth mobile bus lounges. There are a number of projects of this kind in various areas and in the past I have gone to some lengths to point out to Noarlunga council that O'Sullivan Beach ought to be serviced by one of those youth buses. It is of some satisfaction that a local church group in the Bright electorate based in Seaview Downs and Seacombe Heights has taken up the project and is at the moment building a bus lounge to provide a mobile drop-in centre for young people in the southern suburbs. This project is of particular credit to a young gentleman called Mark Reynolds, who has put this project together. It is also a credit to the STA, which helped him in providing a space for that bus at the Morphettville depot and also to Lorenzin Constructions, one of the local businesses, which is now giving him the working space required to complete the bus lounge.

A number of other initiatives throughout the electorate deserve a degree of attention. In the O'Sullivan Beach area the school and general community came together to arrange vacation care programs over the last school holiday period. That project has developed into a parent drop-in centre. At night the school uses the spare room as a drop-in centre for the whole community. The establishment of that drop-in centre, known as the 'Welcome Inn', does great credit to the parents, teachers and kids of O'Sullivan Beach who have supported it so well.

Further north at Karrara kindergarten a similar facility has been established for a similar reason, namely, because there are not a great many community facilities available in the suburb of Karrara. Kindergarten teachers are available every second Tuesday night to supervise and arrange the general talk sessions, cards, macrame and craft work which are attended by many parents in the district. It is worth noting that the Minister of Children's Services, through his department, has contributed \$300 towards the establishment of that drop-in centre so that it can continue to serve the cultural and social needs of that community.

Of course, there are other associated problems in relatively isolated suburbs such as Karrara, and it is to that end in the past couple of months that I have become involved in a campaign to enlist the support of local clubs, businesses and the local council to establish a community bus to service that area.

It is my hope that it would provide transport to the shops and professional centres around the place and also a means



of transport for Karrara children to and from school. It is also worth pointing out that the Catholic Education Office has been approached because a number of children from the Karrara and Hallett Cove communities in fact attend the St Martin de Porres parish school on the eastern side of the Lonsdale Highway. The bus service will provide an excellent way of getting those children to school.

The other problem in relation to the St Martin de Porres school concerns those children not serviced by a bus: the other way in which they could get across Lonsdale Highway (which, of course, is a 110 km/h road) would be for them to traverse the road via an underpass or an overpass. My colleague, the member for Fisher, and I approached the Minister and suggested that an underpass be built beneath Lonsdale Highway, to service not only those people in the Hallett Cove community wishing to get access to the St Martin de Porres parish school but also those people in the Sheidow Park community wishing to access the R to 10 school at Hallett Cove as well as the community facilities and, in fact, the shops and the professional centre on the western side of Lonsdale Highway.

It is worth pointing out that all is not gloom and doom in relation to highways. Considerable efforts are being made within my electorate to improve the safety of people on the roads. The traffic islands on Brighton Road have been extended considerably and will continue to be extended to provide safer and quicker movement along that road, which carries a considerable volume of traffic from the southern suburbs. In fact, it is hoped that some attention will be given to the traffic islands on Lonsdale Road farther south, and I refer to the accesses to Barramundi Road, Ramrod Avenue, Cove Road and Gretel Crescent, so that people from Hallett Cove and the Karrara communities can safely exit from Lonsdale Road and turn off into their chosen suburb.

On the subject of roads, I wish to make a very brief recognition of the work that the Marion and Brighton councils, in the northern part of my electorate, have done to improve the safety of roads in their areas. The Brighton council deserves considerable credit for its patience in undertaking a traffic study on improvement of traffic conditions on sub-arterial roads in the Brighton council area. Likewise, the Marion city council has undertaken a number of measures to improve the rate and safety of traffic flow along Cove Road.

In conclusion, I point to a number of examples of work done by councils, for which I think they deserve credit. In the past couple of weeks the Marion city council has released a supplementary development plan, certain parts of which I believe deserve considerable endorsement. First, I refer to the council's commitment to the preservation of sun rights, that is to say, solar access to buildings situated in that council area. Secondly, I refer to the council's protection of the views of residents in existing houses and, thirdly, to the commitment of council in that supplementary development plan to provide that no more creeks will be enclosed in concrete and that natural features within the council area will continue to remain natural features and not be submerged in concrete in the way that has occurred in the past.

**Mr D.S. BAKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** On Sunday 16 August the Box Factory Community Centre in Regent Street, in the south-eastern part of Adelaide, will celebrate the beginning of its fourteenth year by holding its 1987 annual general meeting. It was 13 years ago that the Federal Box Factory, the former centre of Federal match box production, was converted by the Housing Trust for use as a community centre. It was part of what was then a program to revitalise the south-eastern corner of Adelaide.

The revitalisation was taking place at that time as a result of a substantial injection of funds which had been made into public housing initiatives by the then Federal Labor Government—an initiative which was taken up by State Labor Governments. The initiative was to use the funds under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for the purchase and refurbishment of existing premises to prevent their demolition and the continuing decline of population that had been taking place in the city of Adelaide and in other inner suburbs up until then. That initiative of the two Governments, supported very strongly and promoted very heavily by the then Minister of Housing, who is now the Deputy Premier, has spread considerably throughout other parts of the inner suburban area of Adelaide.

The Housing Trust's method of purchasing, refurbishing and reletting inner suburban houses is now a model for that type of public housing program throughout Australia. As part of that refurbishment program it was necessary for some community focus to be provided for, on the one hand, those people who were being encouraged to stay in the area which had been the place of their residence for many years, and, on the other hand, for those people who were being encouraged to come back into the city. Then, as now, the list of people wishing to come back to live in public housing in the inner city area knew no bounds. Many people wanted to move back into the city to re-establish contact with people who had been their neighbours over the years, but who, as a result of increasing commercialisation during the 1950s and the 1960s, had moved out of what were once very highly desirable and densely populated residential areas in the heart of the city to areas farther away from the city and were very happy to come back.

The other characteristic about the refurbishment and revitalisation of the south-eastern corner of the city, quite apart from the fact that it began as a public housing program, was that it was a public housing program designed originally for pensioners and people with low incomes, and it was as a result of that initiative that other housing types were developed in the south-eastern corner. That has now reversed the population decline that had been taking place in that area of the city of Adelaide until then.

As we enter the fourteenth year of the history of the Box Factory, I think that it is relevant for me to bring to the attention of the House the role that the Box Factory has played as a major community centre in the city of Adelaide area. There have been many changes in the area, and the Box Factory management committee, which is a very open and liberal management committee, and upon which any member of the local community is able to serve or attend as an observer, has seen the nature of the community change. As it has changed they have tried to provide that its range of services kept pace with those changes, that it was able to respond to new needs of new groups moving into the area, and to respond also in the mid-1980s to a particular characteristic, namely, the ageing of those people, who, as a result of those initiatives in the early 1970s, were lucky enough to be able to stay there. The Box Factory is supported by both the State Government and local government authorities.

The annual report of the Community Welfare Department, tabled in this House in December last year, indicated that a grant of some \$10 500 was provided to the Box Factory from the Community Welfare Grants Fund. Also, a considerable contribution of the order of \$50 000 was made to the Box Factory by the Adelaide City Council. In addition, the Box Factory was able to apply for a number of specific grants to help some of its programs. One of its major programs is the day centre, which is run on Wednesdays and Fridays and which provides a recreational outlet for the elderly, the socially isolated and the partially infirm.

I was fortunate to be able to bring 20 of these people to Parliament House some six weeks ago. They thoroughly enjoyed their first visit to Parliament House, despite the fact that they had lived in the city for periods ranging from 60 years to 75 years. The people who participate in the program are able to use the Adelaide City Council bus for transport to and from the Box Factory. This program provides for the elderly and socially isolated a social environment in which they can more fully participate in the activities of their neighbourhood.

The second major program is the Box Factory's community creche, which is an occasional and regular part-time child care facility for children under five years of age. This service allows local parents to participate in the activities of the centre—activities such as sewing and other classes. More particularly, it allows an opportunity for local children to socialise and experience activities which they cannot experience at home, and to develop relationships with children living in close proximity, as well as allowing their parents time out to either attend to domestic chores in the city or to participate in educational programs. It is a low cost program that is designed to help those people in the inner city area whose income is low.

The third major program run by the Box Factory is the disabled persons program, which meets twice weekly on Sundays and Wednesdays. It is supported independently by a DCW grant. The disabled people who participate in the program have access to the medical profession as well as to social workers, and a whole range of day care facilities to which they are given vehicular access by the coordinator of the program and the volunteers who work on it.

Probably one of the most important programs run at the centre occurs on Sunday nights and is known as the Regent Street Irregulars. This is a recreational program that has been set up for homeless and itinerant men within the city of Adelaide. It provides them with an opportunity for some socialising, a sense of community spirit and a Sunday night of entertainment, as well as a meal at a time when a number of other social and religious institutions within the city of Adelaide are not providing a regular meal for them.

The 'homeless' tag applies not only to people with no fixed abode but more particularly includes people who have no family life or sense of belonging to a particular place and for whom the Box Factory becomes a real community centre and the focus of a larger family of people living in and around the city and using its social facilities. A large number of other programs and activities are run from the centre, including school holiday activities, a market run for those who cannot get to the market, and a whole range of other programs that are of great benefit to the residents of the inner city area of Adelaide.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House and, more particularly, the Minister of Water Resources a very real problem—a dilemma—confronting irrigation boards constituted under the Irrigation on Private Property Act. In a

nutshell, the problem is that the provisions of the Irrigation on Private Property Act and the Loans to Producers Act do not allow the State Bank, under normal banking practice, to lend to these organisations. I will read a letter that I received from the Sunlands Irrigation Board, which is constituted under the Irrigation on Private Property Act. The problem was first taken up with the Government in 1983, and the letter reads:

In 1983 the State Bank of South Australia pointed out to us that they believed the Irrigation on Private Property Act did not allow boards of management constituted under that Act to provide sufficient security for advances made to them on overdraft or under the provisions of the Loans to Producers Act.

Four years ago the State Bank brought this problem to the attention of the irrigation boards, which took the matter up with the Minister of Water Resources. The letter continued:

There have been prolonged discussions and correspondence between the Irrigation Boards, the State Bank, the Crown Law department and representatives of the Minister of Water Resources regarding possible amendments to the Irrigation on Private Property Act so that the requirements of the State Bank can be satisfied. There have also been joint meetings between irrigation boards affected by the proposed amendments and it has been accepted that the situation as it exists at the present time is unsatisfactory and that the amendments are necessary.

That situation was pointed out to me by the Sunlands Irrigation Board, which also provided me with a copy of a 1983 submission to the Minister of Water Resources. To this day there has been no satisfactory resolution of the problem. That submission was presented by the Sunlands, Golden Heights and Greenways Irrigation Boards and reads:

It is the practice of certain boards incorporated under the provisions of the Irrigation on Private Property Act to borrow moneys from the State Bank of South Australia under the provisions of the Loans to Producers Act and otherwise. It is the invariable requirement of the bank that such borrowings be secured by charges over the board's assets and rates.

The bank has recently received legal advice to the effect that the provisions of the Irrigation on Private Property Act are such that the securities required by the bank are not necessarily available to it in acceptable form.

Specifically, the objections raised by the bank are as follows:

1. Section 37a provides for borrowings under the Loans to Producers Act and for security to be given by way of mortgage, charge or other form of security over the boards interest in land, goods and chattels. The bank invariably requires its security to include a charge over rates for which no provision is made in the section.
2. Section 48 provides for general borrowings on the security of debentures over rates. The debentures are required to be in the form of the second schedule which is inappropriate to bank finance, in that it:
  - (a) imposes an inflexible method of repayment of principal
  - (b) calls for a coupon system to evidence periodical repayments
  - (c) does not provide for variations to interest rates during the currency of a loan.
3. Section 49 provides for general borrowing from a bank on the credit of its revenue. A charge over assets is usually required by the bank and the section does not provide for such a charge to be given. Further, the bank considers it necessary to have clarified the method by which the charge can be taken over rates.

The bank has advised the boards that it regards the situation as unsatisfactory and is not in a position to make further financial accommodation available to the boards under the Loans to Producers Act or otherwise until the position is clarified.

The availability of such finance is essential to the boards and, accordingly, they consider it necessary to seek an amendment to the Irrigation on Private Property Act aimed at satisfying the bank's objections.

A form of amendment is enclosed which, if enacted, would meet the requirements of the bank and reopen to the boards sources of finance which are essential to their effective operation.

The position in which the boards find themselves is that, certainly for the past four years, their avenue of finance—and they are normally financed through the State Bank under the loans to producers—has virtually been cut off.

This means that for those boards to effectively continue to carry out the requirements of their members they must have the necessary finance available to remain a modern irrigation distribution organisation in order to provide the services needed.

We have heard the Minister of Agriculture say on a number of occasions that we must be more competitive and must be able to provide quality produce for the world markets. Yet in this case everything is totally bogged down in the Government bureaucratic system whereby the State Bank has been repeatedly calling on the Government to make the necessary amendments to the legislation to enable that bank to go ahead and legitimately lend money to irrigation boards constituted under the Irrigation on Private Property Act.

At the time of that deputation, the boards not only made a submission to the Minister of Water Resources but also provided the Minister with the necessary amendments to satisfy the needs of the State Bank. Unfortunately, some four years later we still have had no action taken by the Government. If the Government has so much difficulty in getting its legislative program together, I am quite happy to move the necessary amendments to the appropriate Act as a private member. If the Minister of Water Resources does not have the time to introduce the legislation, for goodness sake let him tell me and I will be more than happy to do so. It appears to me that the amendments to the Act have been carefully prepared and drafted. They have been available to the Government for some four years, and that is long enough for anyone to wait.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Why didn't you do it when you were the Minister?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Because the approach was not made to me during that time. The approach was made to the present Minister of Water Resources in 1983. I would have been more than happy to do it had the approach been made to me. I was unaware of the problem, but I am more than happy to use my share of private members' time in this House to facilitate legislation which the Government should have undertaken four years ago.

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** I want to use today's debate to raise a number of issues concerning the O-Bahn busway to the north-eastern suburbs, in spite of public transport having been a matter much discussed of late. A recent letter from a Plympton gentleman to the Editor of the *Advertiser* damned the O-Bahn service, particularly for not achieving anticipated travel time savings for commuters and for being a more expensive service to operate than rail systems. I took the opportunity to reply in my own letter to the Editor but, unfortunately, it was not published.

First, on the question of travel time, it is true that anticipated travel time savings have not yet been realised. However, the real benefits in travel time savings for north-eastern suburbs commuters were always going to arise when the O-Bahn is extended its full length to Tea Tree Plaza. At present, only half of the route beyond the parklands is along guided busway, where speed means time saved. Until the full length of the O-Bahn guided busway is in operation, the anticipated saving of up to 15 minutes on some routes will not arise. Work on stage 2 to Tea Tree Plaza is, however, well under way. Meanwhile, the route within the border of the parklands inevitably is carrying increasing traffic and is probably adding somewhat to the journey time, an observation which is borne out by the increased running times from the city to Hackney Road bridge being experienced by O-Bahn drivers.

On that note, it is also true that queues and delays are arising at Grenfell Street stops and at Klemzig and Paradise

interchange bus stops. Those queues and delays reached a peak during the recent work to rule by the St Agnes drivers under the auspices of their union, the AT&MOEA, over the Hackney Road bus stop three month trial period. I very much regret the work to rule action which caused so much anxiety, distress and inconvenience to so many passengers. It is worth noting that even passengers who essentially sympathised with the St Agnes drivers' arguments against the additional stop on Hackney Road were incensed at the work to rule action. It is my view that the O-Bahn's prime objective of providing a rapid transit system between the city and the north eastern suburbs for commuters should not be compromised by additional stops if they undermine that prime purpose.

For example, I have already had commuters having difficulties missing their connecting buses in the city because the Hackney Road stop applies until 8 a.m. Many of what I regard as morning peak commuters reach Hackney Road shortly before 8 a.m. These commuters are being disadvantaged because of the additional delay at the Hackney Road stop and having to wait for traffic to pass before buses can pull into the centre lane again. On the other hand, some travellers use that Hackney Road bus stop. I will be keeping a close watch on the three month trial period of the Hackney Road off-peak stop and I will monitor its effect on travel times and safety.

On the question of boarding and other delays at busy peak hour spots along the O-Bahn service, the Minister of Transport has in mind a number of measures. These plans include introducing evening peak express buses departing from Victoria Square so as to relieve pressure on the already congested Grenfell Street and, secondly, speeding up boarding at Grenfell, Klemzig and Paradise stops by allowing passengers to embark in two rows through the front doors and possibly via the centre door once the new ticket validating machines have been installed and in operation for an initial period.

The third plan involves providing an improved right hand turn for Paradise-bound traffic at the Darley Road intersection. This last point would not only speed traffic turning right to go to the Paradise interchange and into the city, but it would also mean reduced delays for motor vehicles travelling into the city along Lower North East Road. These moves will improve further what is a fine public transport system which is appreciated by most passengers and drivers alike.

I understand that bus drivers have some reservations about the idea of passengers boarding via centre doors, apparently on grounds of safety and security from larrikins. I am sure that their concerns will be considered before any changes are made. The Minister of Transport and the STA will be determining whether the idea is in the best interests of the travelling public.

I have also had many representations suggesting that ticket vending machines are needed at Paradise and Klemzig stations in particular because of the long queues that occur in peak periods. Many O-Bahn users want vending machines, and I support the proposal and urge the Minister and the STA to give it early consideration.

Finally, on the efficiency issue raised in the letter to the *Advertiser*, O-Bahn may be more labour intensive than rail, particularly as more drivers are involved, but it is also convenient and flexible for travellers, it uses less energy per passenger and is cheaper to run. I will be commenting further at a later date on the economic efficiency argument of the various systems. The letter to the Editor writer urged caution against introducing O-Bahn systems in other parts

of metropolitan Adelaide. While I too believe in horses for courses I am unashamedly a north-east O-Bahn supporter.  
Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 13 August at 11 a.m.