

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 September 1987

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

### PETITION: MAGILL CAE SWIMMING POOL

A petition signed by 808 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the South Australian College of Advanced Education Magill campus swimming pool remain open was presented by Ms Cashmore.

Petition received.

### PETITION: GAWLER DRIVING TESTS

A petition signed by 442 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the facility for practical driving tests at Gawler was presented by Dr Eastick.

Petition received.

## QUESTION TIME

### SUPPRESSION ORDER

**Mr OLSEN:** To ensure that public confidence in the Police Force is maintained, will the Minister of Emergency Services ask the Attorney-General to initiate a Crown appeal against the court suppression order made today in the case of a senior police officer charged with a further 10 drug related offences and four other offences involving making false entries in a Government property book and stealing drugs from police exhibits?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am only too happy to take up the matter with the Attorney-General and for the Government to determine a position on this matter. The Government's position, I imagine, would be similar to that adopted on the earlier suppression order. We regard suppression orders of this type largely as being undesirable. We also regard the area of discretion in which the courts can operate as an important one that must be respected. However, I am only too happy to take up the matter with the Attorney-General.

### LONSDALE ROAD

**Mr TYLER:** Will the Minister of Transport ensure that his department conducts an investigation into having a suitable facility to enable residents of Sheidow Park, Trott Park and Hallett Cove to cross Lonsdale Road in safety? The Minister will recall that I have discussed this problem with him in the past, and he will also recall that I presented him with a petition signed by 1 600 residents, urging that an underpass of Lonsdale Road be built. My constituents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park are very concerned about their children being able to cross Lonsdale Road safely to attend the new regional R-10 school at Hallett Cove. Conversely, a significant number of students from the member for Bright's electorate at Hallett Cove cross Lonsdale Road to attend the St Martin de Porres school.

My constituents also inform me that Lonsdale Road divides the greater cove area, depriving residents of my electorate, without private transport, of using the regional shopping centre at Hallett Cove and other human and community services. With a significant increase in the number of children next year having to cross this busy highway, my constituents urge the Minister to investigate this situation urgently.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I certainly acknowledge the representations that the honourable member has made, along with his colleague the member for Bright, in trying to achieve a safe crossing of Lonsdale Road for their constituents, whether they be people who want to access shopping centres or, more particularly, children who will need to cross the highway as a result of education complexes being built where they are. I have asked the Highways Department to look at providing adequate safe passage across Lonsdale Road, which, as the honourable member has described, is a busy road which will become busier. I am not sure what the most appropriate method should be, whether it should be an at grade crossing with traffic lights, or whether it should be by overpass or underpass. These latter two options are expensive and, as I understand it, their cost would be very much in the same ballpark.

I do acknowledge the concerns of the local members and the evidence that I have had given to me to this date would suggest that, whilst the problems are certainly not acute at the moment, they will build up as the years go by, so that sooner or later an adequate crossing has to be provided. Both the member for Fisher and the member for Bright would seek to have that achieved as early as possible. I acknowledge their concerns and it is because of that and because of the concerns of their constituents that I have asked the Highways Department to provide me with the earliest report possible.

### DRUGS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In the light of charges laid today against a senior police officer involving false entries in a Government property book and stealing drugs from police exhibits, will the Minister of Emergency Services explain what procedures apply for recording and auditing drugs which police officers take into their possession in the course of their investigations and will he indicate whether any changes to those procedures are deemed necessary in view of the charges laid earlier today?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is a very serious question and I think that I should treat it sufficiently seriously to get a detailed and considered reply for the honourable member.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** By tomorrow?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** If at all possible, yes.

### SCHOOLS COMMISSION REPORT

**Mr KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Education indicate what action has been and will be taken to encourage girls to take the so-called 'tough' subjects at school? I refer the Minister to an article in Monday's *Advertiser* in which the Australian Education Council is reported to have approved the final report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission regarding a national policy to encourage greater participation by girls in mathematics subjects and the mathematical sciences, as well as in sporting activities. I should add that this is a policy that is national in so far as it has been agreed to by all States except Queensland.

As a secondary teacher in the subjects of mathematics and physics for 18 years, I know that girls in those subjects were every bit as competent as boys, but that the number of girls choosing those subjects was always very limited. I would appreciate an outline of what is involved in South Australia's implementation of the national policy.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for this most important question. I can confirm that at the Australian Education Council meeting in Queensland last week all States except Queensland agreed to the report prepared by the Schools Commission on this matter. I will make a copy of the report available for all members and place it in the Parliamentary Library. It is indeed a very valuable report. As we know, a good deal of effort has been put into this area in the South Australian education system and all sectors of education—not only in the structuring of schools and classes within schools but in the area of curriculum, teaching methodology, and the like—so that there can be greater equality of opportunity for girls, particularly in a number of subject areas where that participation has been seen to be somewhat wanting.

This relates also to the general life of school communities, whether in the sporting sphere or other spheres in the life of a school, so that there is the fullest of equality of opportunity for girls in our schools so that they can then take their place in tertiary institutions and in other spheres of life in post-school situations to use more fully their talents and abilities and serve the community. I will obtain more detailed information for the interest of the honourable member and, as I said, I will place the report in the Parliamentary Library.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is to the Premier. Following the Auditor-General's revelation in his annual report that he has raised with the Premier his concern at the 'growing tendency for some public sector activities to become removed from parliamentary scrutiny', will the Premier say which activities in particular the Auditor-General nominated as examples?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not have the actual communication from the Auditor-General but, in fact, he was speaking generally. In the light of the increasing resort to commercial activities—and I think it is absolutely necessary for the public sector to undertake this if we are to relieve the tax burden—quite clearly these are areas where this question of commercial confidentiality as against public interest is raised. That has been put to me on a general basis. I can describe one specific example, based on what the Auditor-General said to me, where my interpretation of his remarks varied from comments by many people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** In his report the Auditor-General states that, first, if he believes that it is in the public interest for him to report on these matters then, commercial confidentiality notwithstanding, he will do so. Secondly, the Auditor-General does not share the criticism of the commercial confidentiality of the ETSA loans, the Torrens Island power station financing arrangement and others. In fact, the Auditor-General has not referred to them for that particular reason.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### O-BAHN

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister of Transport advise my constituents when the proposed new O-Bahn bus service involving shuttle buses in the evening peak period from Victoria Square to Paradise will begin operation?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Newland will resume her seat for a moment. It is most unseemly for the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier to conduct a dialogue across the floor of the Chamber, and I ask them both to desist. The honourable member will resume her question.

**Ms GAYLER:** My constituents have been urging over many months that steps be taken to overcome evening peak period delays and long queues at the O-Bahn bus stop in Grenfell Street. One measure recommended by the STA consultants, Pak-Poy, is the provision of express buses from Victoria Square during that evening peak period.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I leave the dispute in the Opposition benches to resolve itself, as there is quite clearly a difference of opinion among the members there. To address the question that has been directed to me, let me say that, because of what one would have to call the popularity of the O-Bahn services that has been generated, as the honourable member has pointed out to the House, we will be introducing shuttle bus services from Victoria Square for the evening peak. The State Transport Authority has advised me that those services will commence on 20 September.

There will be three buses, and that will, of course, lessen the demand being experienced in other parts of the city. I think that the commuters of Adelaide, particularly those in the north-east, will welcome this decision, and I congratulate the honourable member for her consistent representation on behalf of those commuters.

#### MISUSE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** My question is directed to the Premier. In view of concerns expressed by the Auditor-General that there may be rorts on various Government concession and financial assistance schemes involving the misuse of possibly millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, what further action does the Government intend to take?

The Auditor-General has raised a number of specific concerns, including 'incomplete financial control procedures' in the Emergency Housing Office, where more than \$4 million in security bond assistance has not been recovered and there has been a 243 per cent rise in total spending since 1984; electricity concessions going to people who may be ineligible—at least \$300 000 a year may be involved; the failure of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to keep eligibility checks up to date for recipients of water rate concessions which last year amounted to almost \$11 million; a survey by the Housing Trust of 93 randomly selected rent relief recipients showing that more than \$400 000 may be being paid to people who do not qualify for the relief; and the need to check the eligibility of concessions for motor vehicle registrations and drivers licences, which last financial year amounted to more than \$12 million. The comments by the Auditor-General cover various forms of financial assistance, including rental rebates, which last year amounted to more than \$80 million.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, we have noted the comments of the Auditor-General. In fact, a wide-ranging review of our whole concession structure has been undertaken with a view to—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—addressing some of these anomalies. I could address each of the issues in turn, on notice, but I am not in a position to answer in detail in some of these areas. No doubt the appropriate Ministers would be quite happy to respond if the questions were put individually. Incidentally, the list that the honourable member gives involves not just costs to the Government but in some cases savings. In other words, there may be some instances where a person who is eligible for concessions is not actually getting them. I do not know what the balance is. I do not believe that there is evidence of massive problems in these areas.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Because the Auditor-General does not say that there are massive problems in these areas. That is one of my pieces of evidence. The other is the evidence of our administrative procedures.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, quite properly, the Auditor-General flags areas of concern.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I just point out the many hundreds of thousands of people receiving concessions whose circumstances change from week to week, month to month, and year to year. This means that we have to be very careful to ensure that we have administrative procedures that can respond to those changes. Ultimately, as is the Commonwealth Government, we are in the hands of those who are providing us with information—their honesty and their approach. We can monitor and we can check, but I assure the House that, if we were going to do that on each and every occasion—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—the cost of that could well be greater than some of the problems that are there. I assure the House that these questions are being addressed very specifically.

### SEWAGE TREATMENT

**Mr PETERSON:** Can the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Water Resources and Minister for Environment and Planning, tell the House whether there are any proposals to bypass the waste material filter mechanism at the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, as is suggested will occur at the Glenelg treatment works? The member for Hanson has been reported as saying that the normal sieving process of sewage will be abandoned and all manner of household waste pumped directly into the sea off Glenelg and West Beach. If the same applied to the Port Adelaide plant, because of prevailing weather conditions any and all pollution would contaminate the beaches on Le Fevre Peninsula. As constituents have expressed fears to me about such a possibility, can the Minister clarify the position in relation to Port Adelaide?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member has sold the member for Hanson somewhat short, because I believe the honourable member was rather more down to earth and specific in relation to the pollution he was talking

about. Perhaps in these hallowed precincts I should not quote him. Certainly, the honourable member was misinformed, and I noticed that, when tackled by the Chief Executive Officer of the E&WS Department on radio yesterday morning, he tried to obfuscate by talking about the Patawalonga and about some leak which had occurred in the effluent pipe last year—all things others than those which were being debated at that time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I thought I might get a bite. I can answer the member for Semaphore by saying, first, that I do not know whether the Port Adelaide treatment works operates in such a way as to allow that suggestion being considered at Glenelg even to be valid. The position at Glenelg, as I have now had explained to me, is that there is a series of grids which filter out the grosser (in both sense of that word) material before it goes into the plant, then the treated material goes through a further grid which can only filter the material that has already been filtered out when it first entered the plant.

There is a proposition in the middle echelons of the E&WS Department, which proposition had not been put to the Director-General as of Monday of this week and has still not been put to me, that would suggest that we can save some money on maintenance if that second grid process is bypassed. As far as I am aware, there is no proposition of that nature for Port Adelaide, and it may be that it would not be appropriate because there may not be two grids in place, anyway. What the officers who were pushing this concept to their seniors are saying is that there is little point in have a second set of grids if the first already does the job. If at Port Adelaide there is only one set of grids, clearly, they could not be taken out of the system. However, I will take up the matter for the honourable member and get the advice sought.

### SALE OF LAND

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give a full explanation for the extraordinary circumstances revealed in the Auditor-General's Report surrounding the sale of a block of land owned by the Department of Environment and Planning? The Auditor-General's Report, at page 69, reveals that the Minister of Employment and Further Education agreed to pay a local council for a block of land which was, in fact, owned by the Department of Environment and Planning, and not by the council. This bungle then apparently resulted in the Government's agreeing to pay the council concerned \$50 000 compensation for the loss of dedicated reserve land.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** This matter had not been drawn to my attention. I note that the Auditor-General does not say whether the \$50 000 was actually paid.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### CHILD-CARE CENTRES

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I address my question to the Minister of Children's Services. Will the Minister again seek to persuade the Federal Treasurer to grant tax exemption to community child-care centres not already exempted under the Sales (Exemptions and Classifications) Act? I draw the Minister's attention to information from the Federal Treasurer in May 1984 indicating that he had in fact approached the Commissioner of Taxation, who confirmed that there was

no specific provision in the sales tax legislation for exemptions such as that, whereas in the following paragraph it was indicated that each request for exemption would be treated on its merits.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I think all members will have received representations on this matter. I have addressed this matter as a backbencher in Government, in Opposition, as Minister of Community Welfare and as Minister of Children's Services. In 1984-85, I discussed it with the then Federal Minister responsible for children's services, Senator Grimes, who made personal representations to the Treasurer, which were unsuccessful. A standing committee has recently been formed to tackle children's services issues on a national basis. If a concession can be obtained it will apply across Australia. The Director of Children's Services represents this State on that standing committee. This matter has been placed on the agenda for its next meeting. We will continue to lobby and argue on behalf of those children and their parents who are beneficiaries of services provided by child-care centres, play groups and other similar programs, to try to iron out some of the anomalies that currently bedevil this area, in particular, the taxation arrangements that apply.

#### TIMBER COMPANY

**Mr GUNN:** I direct my question to the Minister of Forests. Following the revelation by the Auditor-General in his report tabled yesterday that the independent chartered accountant's report upon which the Government based its original decision to invest in IPL New Zealand was a qualified report, I ask the Minister whether he will explain precisely the nature of the qualification and table the report so that Parliament can make its own assessment of the wisdom of the Government's decision.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I do not have that information with me, but I will take the honourable member's question on notice and obtain it for him.

#### ROBBERIES

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Deputy Premier have further discussions with the Police Department, bank employees representatives, employer organisations and bank management to determine what additional measures can be implemented to reduce bank robberies and also to reduce the dangers to which shop assistants and proprietors are exposed when depositing cheques and cash in night deposit chutes at banks located at shopping centres and other localities? Yesterday's *News* carried a report on an attempted robbery at the State Bank's Royal Park branch. Another report in the same edition of the *News* stated that a hooded man snatched a bag containing cash and cheques from a woman in Woodville Road who was in the process of banking the company's takings. Concerning the Royal Park bank incident, today's *Advertiser* states:

It is the third time bandits have struck at the Tapleys Hill Road bank in the past 12 months.

In relation to the Woodville Road incident, I am advised that employees who carry out a company's banking at bank deposit chutes in a similar manner are sitting targets for would-be robbers.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The conjunction of the two or three matters to which the honourable member refers is of course disturbing for people working in that part of the metropolitan area. I am happy to discuss the matter with

the Police Commissioner, but the best advice I can give is that the Crime Prevention Section of the Police Department is always available to give advice to banks, financial institutions or people in the commercial sector generally about security arrangements.

They advise, for example, that at least two people should do the banking, that they should vary their schedules by going out at different times of the day, and that they should not carry what are identifiable money bags when they go. I am sure that other advice is available. Banks are increasingly using the sorts of security screen that have been demonstrated on television as useful devices and already at least one armed hold-up has been foiled by the use of these devices. I am happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Commissioner, but I suggest that he recommend to his constituents that they take advantage of the advisory services offered by the Police Department.

#### ISLAND SEAWAY

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Noting that the Auditor-General's Report has revealed a blow-out of almost \$4 million in the cost, and that the potential operating deficit has yet to be quantified, will the Minister of Marine confirm that the new Kangaroo Island ferry, the *Island Seaway*, described at its launching a fortnight ago by the Premier as a 'radical departure' in shipbuilding, has also experienced the following faults and difficulties: the vessel does not steer straight (but rather like a supermarket trolley) and almost ran down a tug in early sea trials. It is being re-slipped to have side fins, or bilge keels, fitted—work which will alter the steering and require further trimming. It was found to be three inches down at the bow, requiring significant ballast to correct the fault. This additional ballast will restrict the vessel to 9½ knots, compared with an anticipated 11 knots.

Its motors are not big enough to provide all the power required for the hydraulic rams and other vital equipment, as well as to drive the generators. The generators themselves are smaller than specified. The stabilising equipment requires the pumping of water, but when the vessel is under weigh with lights there is inadequate power to provide for pumping. The engine room provides inadequate space for heavy maintenance work on the engines. The bollards are incorrectly placed and will have to be relocated. The vending machines for coffee and other drinks only work when the ship is on the level—a fault the Government was aware of before agreeing to purchase this particular equipment. Two senior ships engineers have already quit: one after about two weeks, the other after only three days, because of dissatisfaction with poor design and performance. If most or all these faults and difficulties are confirmed, will the Minister agree it would be more appropriate to re-name this vessel *Bud's Boat* in recognition of further Government mismanagement and incompetence?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The reports that I have received on the *Island Seaway* trials is that they have worked extremely well with the exception of a problem with the automatic steering. I understand that some alterations are necessary to the automatic pilot of the steering system. That is the only problem that has been brought to my attention. I have not heard of all the many other problems referred to by the honourable member. I will inquire into them and bring back the necessary information.

#### SAFE PLAYING CLUB

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Education ask—  
*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Briggs has the floor—no other member. The honourable member for Briggs.

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Education ask the Education Department and the Children's Services Office to evaluate the highly acclaimed New Zealand road safety program called the Safe Playing Club, which is aimed at teaching young children how to be safe near traffic? The Safe Playing Program has been developed after nine years of research which found that about 50 per cent of preschoolers go on to the road about two to 10 times an hour while playing outside, most of the time without their parents being aware of it. New Zealand research shows that the main reason young children are hit by cars is that playing dangerously is fun and is a way of gaining attention. The Leader of the Opposition does not appear to be interested in road safety. The Safe Playing Program aims to encourage young children to play safely through positive encouragement.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Briggs.

**Mr RANN:** Tens of thousands of New Zealand parents are provided with action story books in which their child becomes the central character in a story which teaches the boundaries of safe play. Pilot trials in New Zealand show that the Safe Playing Program actually reduces the risk of accidents involving young children by up to 90 per cent.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. It might be of interest to honourable members to know that the Cabinet Subcommittee on Road Safety has established a group of educators and other persons who are developing an education program with respect to road safety, and this is obviously an appropriate matter for consideration by that group and by the Cabinet subcommittee.

I understand that the Safe Playing Club, which has been established in New Zealand, is a road safety program which is aimed at teaching those young preschoolers how to act safely near traffic, that is, the three-year-old to five-year-old age group, which is a very vulnerable group indeed, as these children are entering the community in preschool programs, and the like. Programs in New Zealand and similar programs in the United States have shown that they reduce the risk of accidents by up to 90 per cent. The program is based on modelling safe behaviour and positive reinforcement (praise and reward for acceptable behaviour rather than chastisement and punishment for incorrect behaviour). Part of the program involves the use of a series of story books with a bear-like character as the dominant figure.

I understand that the child's own name is incorporated, for example, in the text and that this boosts the child's interest level and attention span. Other reinforcements are stickers, T-shirts, promotions involving colouring books, prizes, and the like. It is also interesting to note that in New Zealand there is very substantial private sector support for this program. I understand that in that country an amount of up to \$350 000 has been provided by the non-government sector for the establishment of the program, together with funding from the Ministry of Transport. This is a most interesting and appropriate matter for further consideration in the South Australian context.

### ELECTRICITY TRUST

**Mr BECKER:** Why did the Premier tell the House on 25 August that the Electricity Trust's leasing arrangements are

saving power consumers 'many millions of dollars' when the Auditor-General's Report (page 270) reveals that the \$5.4 million the trust earned from these arrangements last financial year was paid to the Government and simply went into general revenue to fund departmental spending rather than to keep a lid on electricity tariffs?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is not true.

**Mr Becker:** It's in the report.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I can assure members that the benefits of these transactions are many millions of dollars and that they accrue overall to the operations of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. That is the fact.

### ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION CONCOURSE

**Mr DUIGAN:** Can the Minister of Transport advise the House when the concourse in the Adelaide Railway Station mall will be completed and whether the lesser number of railway platforms that are now available at Adelaide Railway Station are more efficiently meeting the needs of Adelaide rail commuters?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Gunn:** And he just happened to have an answer!

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I welcome the considerable interest that members opposite are showing in some of the questions that my colleagues are directing to the front bench. All current work including the ramp upgrading and stage 2 cleaning in the public concourse is expected to be completed by May 1988. The remaining work to complete the upgrading of the public facilities in the Adelaide railway station will be the paving and signage of the public concourse, which is expected to be completed by the end of 1988. Most of the work in the concourse redevelopment project has been geared to the ASER project. Consequently, meeting specific dates for the concourse redevelopment project is contingent upon the staged completion of the ASER project.

Once all work in the public concourse is completed, new opportunities will become available for adjacent commercial developments. The income from these developments will provide an additional source of revenue, and these developments will enhance the facilities available to the public and generally add vitality to the area. The recent completion and hand-over of the last two platforms in early August 1987 has been met with a good response and acceptance by Adelaide rail commuters. The transition of stepping from railcars to platforms at relatively the same level has increased commuter accessibility, and there has been a marked improvement in the lighting levels and finishes throughout the platforms and paid concourse areas. The reduced numbers of tracks and platforms will contribute to reductions in future maintenance costs.

The concentration of users entering the platforms *via* a central barrier facility has allowed resource efficiencies and provides greater control over the movement of the public, also allowing better supervision of tickets. The current paid concourse arrangement also allows the transfer of passengers from platform to platform without having to re-enter the barrier checkpoints. The full extent of efficiency improvements throughout the area will not be apparent until the passenger information display system is completed, expected by the end of 1988. In welcoming the honourable member's question I assure him, all commuters and all other interested people that upon completion of the redevelopment program we will certainly have something of which the citizens of Adelaide can be proud.

### TAFE COLLEGE SECURITY

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Can the Minister of Housing and Construction, in his capacity as Minister responsible for Government buildings, say what further action the Government intends to take to improve security at TAFE colleges? The Auditor-General's Report reveals that last financial year the incidence of theft from TAFE colleges more than doubled, with losses amounting to \$103 000. In one instance alone \$36 000 worth of photographic equipment was stolen from the Elizabeth college because of a security weakness which had been identified two months previously, but not acted upon. The Auditor-General makes the point that a security review of TAFE colleges had been completed almost two years ago but, as yet, there has been little positive action in response to its recommendations.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Theft, whether it be from a TAFE college or any other Government building, is obviously of concern to this Government and I hope to this Parliament. The honourable member referred to a review of security in TAFE colleges, but I am not sure whether that comes under my responsibility or that of my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education. However, I undertake to look at the whole question of security in TAFE colleges and bring down a report for the honourable member.

### ETHNIC INFORMATION PROJECT

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Following the apparent success of Salisbury council's local ethnic information project, will the Minister consider promoting the idea among other councils in South Australia with a view to enhancing the participation of members of ethnic communities in the activities of local government, enabling them to take full advantage of the services provided by local government?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for raising this important issue in the House. I will be quite happy to relay the question to the Minister of Local Government. All members would agree that it is necessary not only to convince all sectors of the community that local government is relevant to them but to convince all sectors of the community that they need to be involved in local government, and certainly members of the ethnic community can and do make a significant contribution.

The development at Salisbury has, as the honourable member mentioned, been a tremendous success. It is a lead that other local government authorities throughout South Australia could well follow. The Salisbury council is noted for the number of developments in which it has been leader in the area of local government, and this is just one of those. I will be happy to take the matter up with my colleague the Minister of Local Government so that she can give the question greater consideration.

### JUBILEE POINT

**Mr OSWALD:** My question is directed to the Premier. Has a committee been set up, or is a committee about to be set up, under the chairmanship of Mr Keith Lewis, the former Director-General of the E&WS Department, in respect to the future of Jubilee Point? What is the purpose of the committee, what is its composition, and when will it report?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I cannot add anything to the public statement I have already made following a Cabinet meeting on Monday, which is that Cabinet has authorised me and the Deputy Premier to take up certain suggestions that have been made, to get them into some sort of shape, and to determine ultimately whether we announce that there is no point in further progressing the project, which the honourable member now is so strongly against, or whether in fact there is some way ahead. A number of options are available. At the moment we have not got in place the arrangements to look at those options and I or my deputy will make an announcement at the appropriate time. I hope that that will be before the end of this week.

### PRIVATE NURSING HOMES

**Mr DUIGAN:** My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health. Are any approaches being made by the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth Government to limit the charges payable by patients in private nursing homes to an amount not in excess of the total of the full pension that those people receive? I have been approached by a constituent whose invalid wife is a patient in a nursing home. This is the second nursing home in which she has been a patient over the past five years. She had to move out of the first nursing home because the charges that were being levied against her stay began to exceed the amount that my constituent was able to pay on his wife's behalf as a result of her receiving a pension. My constituent has now run into the same problem with the nursing home that his wife is currently in.

The fees for private nursing homes are set by the Federal Department of Health and Department of Community Services. My constituent was able to ensure that his wife could stay in this nursing home while he was paying some \$460 to \$470 a month, and this amount he has been paying for the past year or so. However, the fees have considerably increased so that they are now far in excess of the amount that his wife receives by way of pension and he has no way of making up the difference or, at this stage, being able to get his wife into a deficit funded nursing home where the difference would be made up by Government subsidy.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for bringing this important matter to the House, and I will refer it to my colleague the Minister of Health in another place. While realising that my colleague will give a more detailed response, I understand that there can be certain difficulties in ensuring that nursing homes provide the same level of health care and that their financial administration is similar, and those are obviously the problems the honourable member is drawing to the attention of the House. I will ask the Minister of Health whether he can take up this matter, if he has not done so already, with his colleagues the Ministers from other States and the Federal Government, to see whether or not these anomalies can be addressed.

### AUSTRALIA CARD

**Mr MEIER:** Will the Premier join the Premier of New South Wales in urging the Prime Minister to re-think the introduction of the Australia Card and, if Mr Hawke refuses to do so, will the Premier give a commitment to the people of South Australia that the South Australian Government will not cooperate in its introduction?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have already answered this question and do not see any reason to alter the answer that I have already given to the House. In relation to the statement by the Premier of New South Wales, it follows from what I said previously to the House that I do not intend to join him, no.

### FLAGSTAFF ROAD

**Mr TYLER:** Will the Minister of Transport tell the House the State Government's position concerning the future of Flagstaff Road? Flagstaff Road is currently classified as a local road and is in the care and control of the Happy Valley council. However, this road carries an increasingly large volume of traffic as a result of the population explosion around Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley. Many constituents have approached me expressing concern that, when Reservoir Drive is open to traffic, Flagstaff Road will see more traffic than is currently the case.

My constituents believe that Flagstaff Road in its current condition will not have the capacity to accommodate any more traffic. I am told by my constituents that currently in the morning peak period this road can have a queue up to 2 km long, despite the widening of Flagstaff Road over the culvert near the Darlington intersection.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is true that, for some time now, Flagstaff Road has been creating some problems for its users, although the widening of the bridge at the intersection of Flagstaff Road and Main South Road has somewhat freed up the traffic. Of course, more cars than before are now using Flagstaff Road. Previously, many used the Black Road-South Road intersection. Flagstaff Road is under the care and control of the Happy Valley council and at this stage the Highways Department has no policy in relation to taking over its control.

It is true, as the honourable member pointed out, that with the completion of Reservoir Drive there will be an increase in the use of Flagstaff Road. It is also true to say that the Highways Department is very closely monitoring this development and this increase in traffic, and it may well be that, in the foreseeable future, the Highways Department or the Government will have to take over the care and control as it is developing into a major urban arterial road.

In the meantime, if work needs to be undertaken on Flagstaff Road it is the responsibility of the Happy Valley council and I, as Minister, would be pleased to see some work undertaken. However, I think that it is fair to say that the long-term future of Flagstaff Road will be as a major urban arterial road. Inevitably, if that is the case, it will be taken over by the Highways Department and future development or reconstruction work will be undertaken by that department. That decision has not yet been made, so the care and responsibility still rests with the Happy Valley council.

### SALE OF LAND

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** As the Minister for Environment and Planning was unable to answer my previous question and suggested that the \$50 000 compensation may not have been paid to the council, the Government having purchased a piece of land already owned by the Government, will the Minister now provide a full explanation, bearing in mind that the cheque was banked by the council on 23 February this year and the receipt number was 138430?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I draw the honourable member's attention to page 69 of the report, which talks about 'a Minister'. That is not me; that is the Minister of State Development and Technology. I know that the Minister is not here today and it is difficult for the honourable member to ask a question of a Minister who is not here, but that Minister had the carriage of this matter, and now that that has been clarified for the House I am prepared to give a further undertaking—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Thank you, Sir. Now that it has been clarified, I am happy to take the matter up with my colleague to find out exactly what has happened.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is his responsibility.

### WHOLE TREE FORESTRY

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of recent reports from the United States that the practice of whole tree forestry increases the release of nitrous oxide into the atmosphere? Is the Minister further aware that nitrous oxide emissions are reputed to be partially responsible for the depletion of the earth's ozone layer, with an attendant increase in the level of ultra violet radiation reaching the earth's surface?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am advised that whole tree forestry is practised in Scandinavia and Poland. Where soil conditions permit, it involves the removal of the whole of the tree including the root system. I am further advised that there is no reason that my officers can ascertain why whole tree forestry itself, in the way that I have described it, should increase nitrous oxide levels in the atmosphere. However, the incineration of timber remains, as a result of whole tree forestry itself, may contribute to nitrous oxide build-up in the atmosphere. It is suggested that nitrous oxide build-up in the atmosphere is proceeding at something like 3 per cent per annum. Nitrous oxide is one of those chemical agents that have been identified as depleting ozone in the atmosphere. I will endeavour to obtain more information for the honourable member if I can, but the suggestion is that it is the burning of vegetable material rather than whole tree forestry in its pure form as understood that is more likely to be at the root of this problem, if I can attempt a pun.

### RURAL COUNSELLING SERVICES

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the State Government accepts that it is socially just and economically equitable—in short, a fair go—that Federal Labor Governments should pay only half the cost of providing rural counselling services to country communities and require those depressed rural communities, many of whose members are in desperate need of such services, to find the other half of the cost, notwithstanding the fact that the Government has given a commitment to fully fund four health and social welfare councils in Adelaide and the Iron Triangle? The House will be aware that the State Government has given a commitment with the Commonwealth to totally fund 17 new child-care centres, not preschool facilities, and the Minister's own department has made a commitment to build a ball park at Gepps Cross. My people no longer have the means to help themselves survive and, as senior economist Walsh has said, the circumstances in which



rural exporters find themselves is largely due to excessive Commonwealth and State Government borrowings needed to finance their expenditures, thereby forcing up everyone's interest rates, as well as farmers' total costs.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I think that the honourable member has used fair licence and it may have been better for him to debate the issue in the debate on the Appropriation Bill because he has ranged far and wide from his original question about farm counselling facilities and services. I believe that the position in certain rural areas warrants as much support as we can offer, but that must be balanced. The National Farmers Federation in its documents submitted to the Federal Government (and we are addressing this issue to the Federal Government) suggested strongly that there ought to be virtually a nil deficit. If the Federal Government is to entertain the reduction of the deficit to that level, services must obviously be cut, and this cannot be discriminatory. It must be undertaken in a sense of priorities. If one considers the priorities set by the Federal Government, it is obviously still committed to giving as much support as it can, as it sees the priorities, to the rural community, and I would certainly enjoy greater support and put arguments to the Federal Minister for greater rural assistance and assistance in other areas.

This is one direct area that affects rural assistance, but I am aware as much as the NFF, which made those statements, and the other organisations and members of the community that we are looking at a situation where the deficit has been determined not only by the Federal Government but also by industry forces that there should be a reduction in the national deficit. In order to achieve that reduction, however, reduced services will be provided. Unfortunately, in areas of priority one cannot always have one's cake and eat it as well, and we must consider these priorities carefully.

If the honourable member reflects on our provision of services in the sports area, I suggest that that argument should be strongly put to the various rural communities. For instance, the member for Flinders knows that the Port Lincoln Netball Association has argued strongly for the provision of a large sum in order to restore its netball courts. Does the member for Murray-Mallee suggest that I do not consider that as an issue and that I devote the funds across purely to the rural assistance area and not devote any funds to recreation and sport in our community, even though the provision of such funds to sport in our community would improve the rural environment? These priorities must be considered.

The honourable member is all too quick to jump to his feet and demand that the Government provide services here and there and to criticise the fund raising avenues that the Government seeks through taxation and other means such as user-pays revenue raising. The honourable member should sit back and answer his own conscience as to how these priorities are being set. I believe that the Government has set a reasonable basis for its priorities. I hope that I can address the request from the member for Flinders for funds for his netball association so that a recreation facility can be provided in the Port Lincoln area in order to foster an important and valuable outlet for many people in that part of the State. The member for Murray-Mallee should reassess his own request and talk to his colleagues in the rural communities about their priorities, especially those of the NFF, because that organisation has set an agenda that states that we should have no deficit nationally—and that means a reduction in services in South Australia, not only in the metropolitan area but also in the rural community.

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That the Sessional Orders for the establishment of the Estimates Committees be adopted.

With the permission of the House, I shall not read the Sessional Orders, as they are attached to the daily program supplied to members.

Motion carried.

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall) and the Minister of Tourism (Hon. B.J. Wiese), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

## REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education):** 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

It amends the Real Property Act by providing for the incorporation of standard terms and conditions in leases. At present all terms and conditions of leases which are to be registered in the Lands Titles Office must appear in the document itself. In 1981 the Law Society of South Australia recommended that consideration be given to introducing a system whereby mortgages and leases could be prepared as relatively short documents which would incorporate by reference the terms and conditions contained in an instrument lodged with the Registrar-General.

The advantages of such a proposal were seen to be the easier and simpler preparation of documents and the production of less bulky documents with consequent savings in space. In 1985 legislation was passed implementing the proposal as regards mortgages but the decision was taken at that time to assess any legal or administrative difficulties arising from the new provisions before including provisions relating to leases. The Law Society has requested that consideration now be given to allowing the deposit of standard terms and conditions in leases.

The Registrar-General has indicated that initial administrative difficulties relating to the deposit of standard terms and conditions of mortgages have been overcome and that the system is operating in a satisfactory manner. This Bill provides for the lodging with the Registrar-General of standard terms and conditions relating to leases. The consumer is not disadvantaged by this proposal as provision has been made requiring that the lessee be provided with a copy of the standard terms and conditions incorporated into the particular lease. The provision will have particular application to leases of shopping centres, buildings and other developments which involve multiple letting.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 inserts a new section 119a in the principal Act. The new provision will allow a person to deposit with the



Registrar-General a document containing terms and conditions for incorporation as standard terms and conditions in leases. A lease will then be able to incorporate all or some of those terms and conditions by reference. A lessee will be entitled to a copy of the standard terms and conditions before he or she executes the lease.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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

This Bill proposes an amendment to section 73 of the Summary Offences Act 1953, to enable a police officer to remove persons, who have behaved in a disorderly manner, from places of public entertainment. Until 1981, section 73 of the Act was used to enable police officers to remove disorderly persons from public entertainment venues and to arrest them if they subsequently returned. However, this avenue is no longer open to police, as in the 1981 case, *Brander v Lovegrove*, the Supreme Court interpreted the words 'disorderly person' in section 73 to mean a person 'known to have the character of behaving in a disorderly manner either generally or in a given set of circumstances'. Following the decision in *Brander v Lovegrove* police have three means of dealing with disorderly persons at places of public entertainment.

First, the police can report an offender. However, this does not usually result in the cessation of the offending behaviour. Secondly, they can arrest the offender. However, even though this has the effect of removing the problem from the place of public entertainment, it also results in a serious depletion of police manpower levels remaining at the event. The third option available to the police is to remove the offender pursuant to regulation 20 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act. However, this regulation does not make it an offence for the person to re-enter the place of public entertainment.

This Bill repeals section 73 and inserts a new provision which empowers a police officer to order a person, who is behaving in a disorderly or offensive manner, from a place of public entertainment. Further, the revised section 73 empowers a police officer to use reasonable force to remove a disorderly person from a place of public entertainment.

The proposed section 73 (2) makes it an offence for a person to remain in a place of public entertainment after having been ordered to leave, or to re-enter, or attempt to re-enter a place of public entertainment within 24 hours of having left or having been removed from such a place. In addition, the Bill removes the power of the police to order any common prostitute or reputed thief to leave a place of public entertainment. The Government considers it untenable that a person can be deprived of the ability to attend at a place of public entertainment merely on the basis of an occupation or of a reputation.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 73 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section. Subsection (1) empowers a mem-

ber of the Police Force to order a person behaving in a disorderly or offensive manner in a place of public entertainment to leave. A member of the Police Force is also empowered to use reasonable force to remove such a person from a place of public entertainment.

Subsection (2) makes it an offence for a person to remain in a place of public entertainment after having been ordered to leave or to re-enter or attempt to re-enter a place of public entertainment within 24 hours of having left or having been removed from such a place. The maximum penalty fixed is a fine of \$2 000 or six months imprisonment.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

### APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September. Page 768.)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Yesterday, I sat in this place and listened intently to the attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to analyse the State budget, his criticism on how it was framed, and his suggestions, albeit not many, as to how the Government is supposed to perform. I found his speech disappointing and I imagine that his supporters found it even more disappointing. In order to explain my disappointment, I shall go into details of the mistakes and inaccuracies in his speech. However, my disappointment related not so much to those points, because that sort of thing was to be expected as we have it pumped at us virtually every day as the Opposition continues to wriggle and cook the books.

The disappointing feature was that, if one referred back to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition on last year's budget in different economic circumstances, one would find that his speech yesterday was virtually a repeat in content matter and even as regards some of the statistics that he used in his speech last year. In 12 months the Leader has not advanced one iota. Gone yesterday was all his talk about the new direction and about the new found bleeding heart of the Liberal Party and its new concern and care for families and individuals in the community that the Party has suddenly discovered. All this was left behind and forgotten. However, I guess that a different wing of the Liberal Party prepared the research material for his speech yesterday from the one that prepared some of his other speeches. The dries were in the ascendancy yesterday in full force, as they were 12 months ago, and the wets were thrown out of the window.

It has been interesting to see this schizophrenic attempt by the Leader and his Party to reconcile the irreconcilable and to pick their way somehow between a group that feels strongly about this totally dry economic assessment that says the public sector activity should be allowed to run down and be destroyed and that group which still has the heart of Menzies beating in it. For those Opposition members who doubt what I say, I invite them to go to the opening of the Leader's speech last year, to study it, and to realise what I say is true. It is the same old, tired rhetoric.

Another of my disappointments in the Leader's speech yesterday was that last year at least we had some lively and compelling rhetoric. Where yesterday was the reference to the flick passing of the buck that would result in my getting repetition strain injury—RSI? That was one of the best phrases of that time and was part of the more colourful language that at least enlivened the Leader's speech last

year. However, it was not there yesterday, although the content of the speech was the same, albeit recycled. It is a pity that so much work went into a document that could be so misleading and based on such a shaky grasp of even the basic economic principles loaded with double speak and hypocrisy—all from someone who claims to be the State's alternative Leader. It was extraordinary. It was certainly a bundle of woe, and full of contradictions and inconsistencies.

It had the trappings of credibility based on a series of charts, diagrams and graphs that were inserted into *Hansard* to make it look as if some credible picture was being put together in support of the conclusions being drawn by the Leader of the Opposition. It had the same biased use of statistics that we have become familiar with that simply do not stand up to examination. The Opposition continues to display a basic lack of knowledge of contemporary public sector finance and its methods. They are somewhere back in the past, in the 1970s.

When I say that the Leader of the Opposition's speech was very similar in content and theme to that of last year, it was probably almost identical, although I have not checked the record, with that made by the then Leader of the Opposition, Hon. David Tonkin, in periods when I sat here in 1977, 1978 and 1979 as Leader of the Opposition. The same thing: nothing has happened even in 10 years as far as the Opposition is concerned. Public finance has changed; the economy has changed; attitudes to the role of the public sector have changed: all of these have changed and there is absolutely no recognition of this by the Leader of the Opposition, as his speech demonstrates.

It is all very well to sit on the Opposition benches sniping at policy, selectively picking out bits and pieces of statistics and distorting them to suit the occasion. That is fine if you really think you will be sitting on the Opposition benches for ever, and I guess that that may well represent the sort of attitude that the current Opposition has, otherwise it would not be so totally irresponsible in its approach to the issues of the day.

It is quite another matter to try to deal realistically with our economic problems and analyse them in detail. To get the sort of response that we did from the Leader of the Opposition is quite staggering. His scenario of doom and gloom, which I will analyse in a minute—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, indeed. It was invented by a previous Opposition.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition does not continually display his ignorance and add to what is already on the *Hansard* record of yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Fortunately, no-one really listens any more. People with any economic training put his comments where they belong—in the wastepaper basket. Unfortunately, there are some people in the community who do care about it and who might be misled by the Leader of the Opposition's remarks and his analysis. As State Treasurer, it is my duty to put on record how off-course and unreliable it was.

Let me begin with the South Australian Government Financing Authority. The Leader of the Opposition questioned how SAFA creates its surplus and how its surplus contributes to the State's budget. As I have said on many occasions, SAFA is one of Australia's leading financial institutions. It has an extremely high credit rating and is respected throughout the financial sector in Australia and overseas.

The main criticism that the Leader levels at SAFA is that it is not getting a suitable return considering its range of investments, the State somehow being short-changed, that we do not have an adequate profit performance from SAFA.

That just displays an amazing ignorance of the whole structure of SAFA. The Leader is well aware that the majority of SAFA's assets are in the form of loans to Government and semi-government authorities. He should also be aware that over \$1 billion of these assets represents loans to the Housing Trust and the State Bank for public housing at a concessional interest rate of 4.5 per cent. How does one get a better than inflation return on that portfolio? He knows this, I would have thought, if he had been listening, because he recently had a full briefing: he and some of his colleagues had a full briefing with the SAFA management and questions were raised following that.

Those officers came away saying that they felt it was a very useful session, that some good questions were asked and that they were able to respond. They believed that the Opposition had a much better understanding of the structure and operations of SAFA. Their feelings will be sadly disappointed when they read yesterday's remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I have just given one clear example. The Leader ought to know some of these things, but apparently he does not. He has forgotten that it was an arrangement established by SAFA which enabled us to use those funds for capital spending programs, funds which otherwise had to come from the State's Loan Council program. For instance, by providing those concessional loan moneys—

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The member who interjects is something of a businessman, I am told. He has probably had some experience in rural concessional loans, and I would like him to tell me how a bank which lends at a concessional rate of 4.5 per cent could get a better than economic return, because that is what the Leader of the Opposition says.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am prepared to exchange interjections with the member on the backbench, who, I think, does understand a little about these financial matters. The Leader of the Opposition does not need to protect him: he is able to protect himself. In fact, he will probably be down there at some stage in the not too distant future. If not down there, at least somewhere along the front bench, as I understand it. That is fine. Good luck to him. Let me go on. The South Australian Government Financing Authority pioneered the nomination of Loan Council moneys to public housing ahead of all other authorities and ahead of all other Governments and the benefits that we have received through that arrangement are in excess of \$300 million—a superb result, particularly for a State of this size. The Leader of the Opposition is attacking SAFA because of its inability to show what he would regard as an adequate return when arrangements like that have been set in train. It is quite extraordinary.

The SAFA surplus is very stable. In large part, it derives from the interest on loans to semi-government authorities. In recognition of possible variations year to year, depending on the particular performance or interest rates of the time, in 1986 a general reserve of \$75 million was created, and a further allocation of \$35 million was made in this year's budget. That \$110 million is now set aside. It is a very adequate buffer to enable SAFA's contribution to the budget to be maintained.

It is highly improbable that SAFA's income should suffer any serious sort of decline. In addition, over the past four years the Government has allowed SAFA to accumulate operating surpluses, which further strengthens its income earning capabilities. At 30 June they totalled \$99 million. If that does not represent sound financial management, just what is it that the Leader of the Opposition suggests SAFA should do to improve its economic strength? He poses all sorts of questions and leaves much innuendo hanging in the air, but he offers no answers.

I guess a further example of the Leader's misunderstanding of SAFA's operations is his remarks concerning some sort of red alert to education institutions to hand over their surplus funds. The House will remember that there was much tut-tutting on his part about that, that SAFA was somehow trying to get into the reserves of those organisations and do something to them. Again, he has got it wrong. It is not a statement of fact. Semi-government authorities such as the South Australian College of Advanced Education, which was specifically referred to by the Leader, deposits its funds with SAFA instead of on the short-term money market and suffer no disadvantage. A commercial interest rate is paid on such funds, and it is calculated on a daily basis.

The Government and SAFA believe that it is obviously important that surplus cash balances in the public sector are dealt with in the most efficient way in order to minimise net interest costs. It is a process that ought to be applauded and not attacked and criticised. It is not to the disadvantage of those authorities.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** In one interjection, he backs away and virtually cancels four or five paragraphs of his speech. Why did he bother to make it? Why did he waste the time of this House dealing with it if he wants to tear up that page? I will tear it up—that page is non-existent. I will delete it from *Hansard*—what nonsense! That is what he said, and it is wrong. The surplus funds SAFA holds have led to savings through a combination of a higher return on funds invested and by delaying borrowings by using invested funds.

If the Leader of the Opposition is serious about the Government's tackling increasing interest costs, surely he has no argument with the very proper and financially sound basis on which SAFA continues to operate. The Leader tried to make political mileage in his budget reply—and he is now backing off at a rate of knots—by somehow suggesting that SAFA is desperate in calling in funds and creaming the market. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was creaming the market, and I ask honourable members to remember those words. What an outrageous suggestion! As I have said, in an interjection the Leader of the Opposition has backed away from that view, and I am pleased to hear it. It is mischievous and utterly wrong to say that.

Let us consider a few miscalculations made by the Leader of the Opposition, who claimed that our policies will cost every South Australian \$740 a year (and I note that he had that figure repeated in a newspaper this morning) per head in taxation. If the Leader wants to be honest in his argument, he should use the right figures. The Leader should realise that he has used a 1986-87 figure and he has not allowed for an increase in population according to those estimates. To make a proper adjustment he should reduce the per capita amount by \$40, but he would say that that is almost nothing. However, it is extremely significant in percentage terms. That is the shonkie way that he made that calculation—which is wrong. I repeat: South Australia

is the fourth lowest State when comparing State taxation levels per head of population. The Leader of the Opposition chose to ignore that point in his misleading and dishonest calculation on those statistics. He gave shonkie statistics, but I am sure that he will repeat them again and again, as he has done on a number of occasions.

The Leader of the Opposition also gave a long list of examples of the terrible economic condition of South Australia, how we are almost finished, we are on our knees and about to fold up. He suggested that the Government's efforts to attract investment through the submarine project, ASER and other things should be forgotten about. In fact, they would be abandoned if he had his way: we should give them away, because there is no point, and South Australia is so badly off that we are all finished.

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is not true. I noticed the selective use of statistics, but what about some that he did not use? The Leader did not mention that job vacancies are increasing, that property transactions are up, that industrial electricity sales (a good forward indicator of activity in this area) are improving. The Leader of the Opposition did not mention that three independent surveys—the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry—all claimed that this State will have the highest increase in private sector investment this financial year. None of that was mentioned.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is not just the highest increase, but it raises our proportion of national investment very considerably indeed, and in support of that I refer the Leader to the budget papers. The Leader cobbled this into his argument about our financial status and, on the one hand, he claimed that we should reduce capital works expenditure and he tut-tutted about the level of expenditure which indeed has been very substantially reduced, anyway. On the other hand, a few sentences later, the Leader deplored the lack of encouragement given to private sector activity by the Government. Which way does the Leader want us to jump? He does not know, because he wants to have it both ways.

Eighty per cent of the State's capital works programs go directly to the private sector. We are aware that any cutback in this area is a discouragement to the private sector, so we want to keep it to a minimum. On the one hand, the Leader of the Opposition would want us to encourage but, on the other hand, he wants to cut and discourage. He wants it both ways, which is his style on just about every issue on which he addresses the public. The Leader of the Opposition's inconsistencies in this respect are manifold and will continue to be pointed out.

On the question of incentives the Leader of the Opposition referred to the payroll tax exemption level. This Government can refer to that with some considerable pride, because we have lifted it in real terms, and have done that consistently budget after budget. We have not imposed a levy or surcharge, as has been done in other States. We have made quite sure that our payroll tax rates remain among the lowest in the country.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I appreciate why the honourable member has to make that interjection, particularly if he wants to get onto the front bench. However, I suggest that the inability of those already there will be of more assistance than his interjection. The honourable member would know that there is a general consensus in many

country areas that that blunt instrument was not helping regional development or country employment.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** That is absolute rubbish!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member can have chapter and verse on that. The way in which we will apply the fund under the restructuring scheme will be far more effective and will create far more jobs, particularly in the South-East, where the honourable member would know that there is already a lot of investment and development. In fact, arising at the time of the Sydney investment seminar that I gave Apcel, said that it would forward commit an investment that was much further down the track.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would have thought that the honourable member would welcome that sort of development, as very definitely does his colleague the member for Mount Gambier. I point out that the payroll tax scheme is not the only incentive that we offer. We have a number of development funds and a number of programs—which are conveniently ignored by the Leader of the Opposition—aimed at directly assisting industry. For instance, I cite the South Australia Development Fund, which is involved in 30 projects at more than \$500 000 each with a total investment value for the State of more than \$64 million. Some of those projects cover expansion of existing facilities and others the establishment of new plants. In a number of cases more than 200 jobs will be created by each of the industries involved. There are many other areas where we are looking at developments and improvements both in metropolitan and regional areas through the incentives and the funds that we offer. The restructuring of the country payroll tax rebate scheme will create a number of those jobs and developments, and the evidence will be shown.

I refer to Technology Park, which now has more than 41 companies with investments totalling \$50 million. What about the \$350 million that Holden's is investing at its Elizabeth plant to establish its entire assembly operation in this State? That is not a bad vote of confidence in a State that the Leader of the Opposition says is bankrupt of ideas and policies and offers no incentive to private industry. What about the Japanese and German companies involved in looking at the National Tooling Centre project and the response to the Centre for Manufacturing from business both within this State and interstate? What about the investment I referred to a moment ago—Kimberly Clark's \$100 million new plant and equipment centre at Millicent? I refer also to BHAS' \$58 million planned upgrading of the Port Pirie smelter; Mitsubishi's new aluminium foundry to export cylinder heads back to Japan; the Santos development of the Moomba to Whyalla pipeline; ICI's plan to spend \$18.5 million on a soda ash plant; and, on a smaller scale in the country, the \$1.7 million to be spent at Murray Bridge by Gerard Industries. And I could go on.

Are these examples of private industry which believes that it is operating in a hostile environment or a bankrupt State which is on its knees? The answer is a resounding 'No'. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition, in order to ensure that his argument is heard, conveniently ignores all of those developments and tries to keep right out of the way of them. I must give him credit in this respect: he did mention the submarine project, but only in the sense that somehow or other we were relying on that project for all of South Australia's development, as a cure-all for our problems.

I have never—and would never—suggest anything of the sort. It is certainly in stark contrast to our predecessors where, to the Tonkin Government, the Roxby Downs project was the answer to the development of South Australia

and it had nothing else to offer. That was going to be it. That project has proceeded and I have paid—and will continue to pay—full credit to that Government for ensuring that the indenture was carried and for the work on the project. I point out that it is proceeding in the way it is only because this Government continued with it and honoured that obligation. If the submarine project was the only project that we could point to—as was the case with Roxby Downs during the time of the Tonkin Government—we should be packing up shop.

The fact is that we are not relying on that; nor are we relying on the submarine project as the cure-all for our economic problems. On the contrary, what we are saying is that it is important and that it is a catalyst for a whole range of developments and diverse investments that spin around it. In itself it is valuable, and \$100 million or so will be spent in the near future on establishment, administration and other facilities at the port of Adelaide. However, it is what it stands for and what it can produce that we are talking about, not that we are suggesting that it is the answer to all of South Australia's ills.

Of course, the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that we turn our back on that as well, because South Australia has no future. Perhaps in the national interest we should be telling New South Wales that all is forgiven and that it may as well pick this project up and take it away. There are many examples of misuse of figures and interpretation—some minor matters. The Leader of the Opposition criticised us about our assumption of an inflation rate of 7.25 per cent, which he says is higher than forecast by the Federal Treasury and independent economic advisers. Well, the Federal Treasurer's May economic statement, at page 18, states that the Federal Government is assuming an inflation rate of 7.25 per cent this financial year—exactly what our budget incorporates.

It may be that the rate will be different. Indeed, I hope it is lower. That is the rate on which our budget had to be framed because that is the rate on which the Commonwealth was working. Then there is this employment area. Again, the Leader of the Opposition recycles erroneous material, as he has been doing for a long time now, on the question of employment levels in the public sector. He claims that total departmental employment levels have increased by 3 000 since June 1982 and in the total public sector have increased by almost 13 000. He draws that information from the Public Service Board report. However, he does not read the report correctly. He gets it wrong. He likes to mix up figures. I recall his responding to the budget by saying that this Government has increased numbers in Public Service departments by 3 000 and that it is only getting rid of 450 jobs in the current budget as a result of the cuts. Of course, he is comparing unlike statistics, trying to compare numbers of persons employed, whether they be full-time, part-time or casual, with full-time equivalents—the only realistic measure by which one can look at employment figures.

If one uses those correct figures in departments the total increase in employment between June 1982 and June 1987 is 1 006 FTEs. In simple language that means a realistic expression of all those employed, as I have said—the full-time, the part-time and the casual—translated into an equivalent full-time number. After all, it is not the persons we are talking about, but the cost of the jobs that are involved. Therefore, it is not 3 000; it is two-thirds fewer than that.

In the total public sector employment the real figure of the increase is 4 330, not 13 000. That just shows the staggering scope of the misleading use of the figures. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition does not take the next

step either, which is to analyse just where that increase is occurring. Yesterday he failed to mention that 92 per cent of the increases in departmental employment—the 1 000 over this five-year period—covers areas associated with law and order such as police, correctional services and the courts.

I understood that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues were braying for more police services, were demanding that more criminals be put in prison and for longer periods, and that the courts process claims more quickly. That is their big demand; and employment has increased in response to those community demands, not from the nonsense that the Opposition talks, and the next moment we are being criticised for an increase in numbers. Let me repeat: 92 per cent of the departmental increase is in police, correctional services and the courts—the law and order area.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Do you want us to reduce the police? Is the honourable member who is interjecting saying that we should have fewer police? I would like him to put it on the record. I would like him to come clean and say that that is exactly what he is doing.

Let us now come to public sector employment generally. The increase also covers our major commercial enterprises—SGIC, ETSA and the State Bank. Is it suggested that we put a bar on employment in those commercial enterprises that can actually generate activity or have needs in the State? Of course not. It is absolute nonsense.

What about the Health Commission? I would be interested in the honourable member's interjection on this. That has certainly been an area where employment has increased. In response to community needs, there are more nurses and others within our hospital system, both metropolitan and country. Have I heard the Opposition complaining about that? On the contrary. In another place the shadow Minister of Health demands, almost daily, more resources here, extra staff there, and extra spending somewhere else. Then in this place, because apparently they have not checked their notes (and one is not surprised about that, considering the desperate contributions made by all members of the Opposition), the Leader of the Opposition is criticising us for the increases in those areas. Let us have a bit of honesty in terms of public sector employment. Let us look at the way in which we have contained it but attempted to address priorities in the process.

I turn to another section of the Leader's speech—his concern about the amount of interest on borrowings to be paid by the State in this financial year. Perhaps it would be useful to remind him that the State's interest bill depends on three factors: prevailing interest rates; the levels of past borrowings; and the levels of current borrowings. My Government has no control over interest rates which operate Australia-wide and overseas.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** And that is a very good thing. If indeed they are coming down that will benefit us. However, we have no control over that. The honourable member's interjection ought also to take account of that second factor; that past borrowings, many of them undertaken at historically low rates of interest, have to be rolled over or refinanced at higher rates of interest. Even if the general level of interest rates is decreasing there still may be an increase in the actual interest rate burden of Government. This Government cannot be held responsible for the borrowing programs undertaken by previous Governments. So, there are two factors where that criticism is totally inappropriate and misleading.

Finally, there is the one we have some control over, and that is our own new borrowings. We have taken an extremely responsible approach in this area. As my Financial Statement at page 62 discloses:

In real terms per capita net indebtedness in South Australia has declined as a proportion of State gross domestic product in every year that my Government has been in office.

Compared to the previous Administration, represented by those on the Opposition benches, that is an outstanding record and one that indicates that the area over which we do have control we are attending to, and we are attending to it responsibly and properly. The Leader made a number of other remarks, such as:

The South Australian economy is going downhill. The State is being outperformed by the rest of Australia.

Later, he said:

This is a budget of risk, not restraint. We are mortgaging the future of our kids. The taxpayers can no longer afford to sustain the increased level of Government spending and borrowing.

Mr Speaker, that is simply a recycling, as I said at the beginning, of what we have heard often, interestingly enough, in exactly the same equivalent speech in last year's budget.

As I said, we missed some of the great rhetoric, but there it was—all the familiar talk. I am sure that members have not picked up the fact that those quotes did not come from what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, although I am sure that members thought they had remembered them. They are direct quotes from the 1986 speech, and they could have been transposed into yesterday's speech and no-one would have noticed because the theme and the remarks were exactly the same. Next year we are probably going to have more of the same if the Leader of the Opposition is still sitting in his current seat and making the budget reply at that time.

The Leader of the Opposition claims that our Government is one of stunts and symbols. In fact, this is a Government which has had to face a huge reduction in Commonwealth funding to cope with the general downturn in economic activities. In doing so it has had to provide competent financial management and address serious issues of social justice.

We have much important work to do. I am very happy to receive, and indeed I welcome informed, responsible and constructive criticism and advice on how we can improve that performance. I certainly have more to do than be preoccupied with the games the Leader of the Opposition wants to play, and with his carping and negative reaction to everything that happens in this State.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture):** I move: That the House note grievances.  
I seek leave to continue my remarks later.  
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### **FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL**

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Fisheries)** brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move: That the report be noted.

**Ms LENEHAN (Mawson):** I rise as a member of the select committee appointed by the House to examine this Bill. It was the specific brief of the select committee to

address factors relating to the economic viability of the southern rock lobster fishery. This was done against the background that the South Australian rock lobster fishery is currently fully exploited with greater fishing capacity than is required to take the available catch.

With the continual introduction of new technology and new fishing techniques, further increases in this effort have resulted. The committee acknowledged that the complexity of management issues, which included such issues as biological and sociological factors, as well as economic considerations, had to be examined. Thus, considerable evidence was presented to the committee covering matters such as aquaculture techniques and the present status and future viability of research into seeding techniques. We heard conflicting evidence from a number of witnesses on the whole question of the economic viability of such aquaculture techniques.

The effects of extended closure as a means of protecting the spawning female was also a matter raised by a number of witnesses who came before the committee. The Bill provides for the rationalisation of the number of rock lobster licence holders in the southern zone fishing area; the establishment of a primarily industry based rationalisation authority to oversee the rationalisation; the payment of compensation to those licensees who voluntarily leave the industry; and the repayment of compensation moneys by the remaining licensees. There were a number of questions and submissions on the proposed rationalisation scheme, and the divergent views presented to the committee are documented in the report which the Minister has just tabled.

Evidence was also presented relating to the level and method of setting the surcharge, pot values, and the question of dual licences. I would like specifically to refer to two matters which were raised by a number of witnesses and included in a number of submissions. In so doing, I would like to quote from the evidence presented to the committee by Mr Brian Jeffriess, the Executive Officer of the South Australian Fisheries Industry Council. In his submission he states:

The second point in opposition to the Bill has been outlined before, and it concerns the clause that requires an incoming licence holder to pay out the total balance owing to the buy-back scheme. This is contrary to all normal commercial practice. It also makes transferring sharply more difficult and impedes further restructuring through the market. Most important, it is an unfair and unnecessary major taxation loss that no other group in the community has to bear.

The committee took this point seriously and discussed it, and I refer the members to appendix C of the report wherein an amendment has been proposed by the committee (and, indeed, moved in the committee by the member for Chaffey), with a view to ensuring that all people who are transferring licences or having licences transferred to them are treated equally in this regard; that, in fact, one only has to be responsible for ensuring that any accrued liability has been paid, and that there is no future surcharge liability. I believe that that is an important aspect.

Another aspect raised by witnesses and by a number of people making submissions was that the South Australian Fishing Industry Council strongly promoted the use of licences as collateral. This was another matter which the committee discussed in some detail and, I believe, discussed very openly and frankly. I refer members to the final page, under 'Recommendations', which states:

The committee further recommends that urgent consideration be given to the provision of the use of licences as collateral for loans.

I do not want to take up any more time of the House. I am sure that my colleagues who were on the select committee will wish to pick up other aspects of the committee's

report. However, as a member of that committee, I want to congratulate the Minister on the way in which the business was conducted, and also to congratulate other members of the committee for the frank, open and cordial way in which discussions were held and recommendations arrived at. This was the first select committee to which I have had the honour of being appointed, and it was a most enjoyable but, more importantly, an extremely informative experience, and I therefore support the recommendations embodied in the report tabled before the Parliament.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I am pleased to have the opportunity of speaking to the motion noting the report. In so doing, I want to make a few comments, particularly in relation to the fact that this proposal was first brought to my attention by industry leaders in the southern rock lobster zone. Although I appreciate that 51.5 per cent of those involved in the industry voted in support of the proposed buy-back, I recognise that 48.5 per cent of those involved in the industry were not in favour of that proposal.

While having discussions with both groups, I gave an assurance that I would do everything in my power to see that the views of both sides—particularly the counter views of the proposal before the House—were given every opportunity to be properly canvassed. Certainly, the select committee has done exactly that. I believe that there is an immense wealth of knowledge now contained in that document. Undoubtedly, the information had been available before, but many of the witnesses who came before the committee were unaware of certain aspects, arguments and evidence. It had the effect of putting it all together, and I certainly recommend that every fisherman in the southern rock lobster zone, before taking any decision on where he stands in this issue, ought to avail himself of the complete file, with all the minutes and the evidence given before the select committee, and go through it from beginning to end.

The Bill does not compel a fisherman to offer his licence and equipment to the authority, but by the same token it does provide a compulsion in that those fishermen remaining in the industry have to finance it. That aspect was of great concern to the committee and has been addressed under the heading 'Surcharge'. At the end of that section the report states:

However, the authority should take into account possible economic effects of the application of the surcharge.

In other words, if there is economic hardship to any individual fisherman, the authority ought to take that into account and do what it can to alleviate that effect. The report continues:

The committee further recommends that urgent consideration be given to the provision of the use of licences as collateral for loans.

Had that provision been available in years gone by, I believe there would be little need for this Bill, because the industry would have had the capacity to be self-regulating and able virtually to buy vessels out of the industry, those people wishing to remain in the industry having the capacity to go to the bank and borrow in order to do just that and buy other fishermen out, bringing their pot numbers up to 80, and so forth. That issue must now be strongly pursued by SAFIC with the Government and the Minister in an endeavour to have that proposal put into effect. That principle applies in many other areas, certainly in relation to irrigation licences, etc. It is a valuable item of collateral, and the argument against using it as collateral could equally apply to other sections of the community and to other industries.

The committee recommends to the House that the existing requirement in the Bill in relation to any encumbrance attached to the licence should remain: that is any person



wishing to purchase a licence from an existing fisherman should be treated in no other way. In other words, the person coming in would not have to put up \$50 000 or \$80 000, depending on the period involved: the purchaser would inherit the remainder of the encumbrance attached to that licence in the same way as would any direct member of the family. This will have a beneficial effect.

I believe that the committee has fulfilled a very worthwhile exercise. I appreciate that certain people in the industry would prefer to see the legislation defeated, but that is not possible. Many members of both Houses support views differing from those involved in the industry. There are not enough members in either House to defeat the legislation, and I do not think that in the long term that would be desirable anyway. Whether or not this legislation will effectively remove any boats is yet to be seen. I believe that, if the licence is able to be used as collateral, in the long term it will have enormous benefits for the industry, enabling it to work out its own problems and remedy many of its difficulties.

It is interesting to note, in relation to the extension of closures—and a lot of very good evidence was given about this—that the biological expertise that was received, whether it be from South Australia or Victoria, indicated that the extended closures would be of little benefit in protecting the resource. Evidence was given that it is virtually impossible from a biological point of view to destroy the resource. It can be reduced to the extent that it is not a viable commercial operation, but it would be very difficult to destroy the resource. By the same token, it was interesting to note that the Victorian fishermen, of their own volition, went ahead and closed October to operations. That is a matter that perhaps the southern rock lobster zone industry should seriously consider, and we have commented to that effect in the report. I believe that the commercial aspects of a decision in relation to closure must be made by the industry itself. I support the findings of the select committee, and I trust that they will be of some benefit to the industry as a whole.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I wish to support the report of the committee and the amendments suggested to the Bill. I want to thank the people who gave such wide and varied evidence to the committee. Most witnesses were very definite in their views, and I think it is true to say regarding any farming community—and these people farm the sea—that strong views are held by these people that are sometimes without foundation and a little misguided.

A number of points were made to the committee. Nobody disagreed with the fact that the fishery was being fully exploited. Evidence was given by the department that showed that the fishery itself had reached the stage where fish being caught were close to legal minimum size and slightly over. That at least indicates that the fish being harvested over the catching period were of legal size. Evidence was given that a lot of immature fish were thrown back, and that this problem could be overcome in a number of ways. One suggestion involved seeding, whereby spawn of the crayfish would have to be collected and artificially reared, a process taking almost 12 months, during which the crayfish would go through between nine and 14 stages of pupae. To date that process has not been successful elsewhere in the world, and evidence was given to the committee to that effect. Suggestions been made about a particular effort in a certain area, but this was later refuted in a letter to the committee by the Director of the CSIRO.

We were looking at a method of overcoming a problem involving an activity which was economically doubtful, costly

and possibly unworkable. I am sufficiently optimistic to believe that, if we could perfect aquaculture to such an extent that we could rear rock lobster to 12 months, we should have a go at it with a view to extending it to four years and, with the legal minimum size, we would be selling them on the market and not just letting them loose into the sea in their millions in the hope that we might catch a few thousand back.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What did you establish in relation to the—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot allow interjections. I ask the member for Florey to address the Chair.

**Mr GREGORY:** Evidence was given to the committee by a biologist that the resource held so many fish and it would not matter how much was tipped in by way of a seeding program: there is only so much shelter and so much food. I am sure that the member for Alexandra, who is interjecting, understands that, if he has a number of paddocks with a certain quantity of grass, he cannot fill those paddocks with sheep and expect them still to be alive at the end of 12 months. A paddock can carry only so many sheep for a certain period and the same principle applies in the rock lobster industry.

Evidence given to the select committee clarified a few of the questions in my mind. Part of the evidence indicated that seeding programs have been carried out with no effort to ascertain the cost of such programs. No cost-benefit study was done. The estimated cost of a research program varied from \$150 000 to \$400 000, without any guarantee of success. Evidence was also given that, because of its nature, a fishery could be destroyed economically although not biologically. Because of pressures on the fishery, the existing fishermen could find themselves on the edge of bankruptcy and be left wondering whether or not it would pay them to work. The only way that the fishery can be worked more economically is by a reduction of effort, which means the removal of boats and fishermen from the industry. Other measures such as the closure of the season and the reduction of available time were discussed.

It was suggested that the fishery be closed in October and possibly for two weeks in November. The Victorian department is following that practice, apparently at the request of the fishermen themselves. A biologist gave evidence that there was no biological reason for doing that. He said that the females would spawn and, provided that they were returned promptly to the water, this would have no adverse effect. The committee was told of the practice of scrubbing the female fish. No-one could say who adopted that practice. Indeed, I was reminded of the reply received when one asked, after the recent Federal election, who voted Liberal and everyone seemed to have voted for the Labor Party. It seemed that no-one engaged in scrubbing the females.

Although I am in two minds on the question, I believe that, if the fishermen ever wanted an extended closure, it could be provided. The fishermen also wanted to continue the 15 per cent reduction that was introduced some years ago to see whether it would work. I believed from the evidence of departmental officers that, although that was partly effort reduction and was partly working, it was not enough. The fishermen held a meeting at Millicent and considered certain measures to reduce effort in the fishery. They unanimously decided that the only thing that would work would be a buy-back scheme. A certain number of the fishermen were opposed to the buy-back scheme for economic as well as philosophic reasons. The percentage of fishermen wanting the buy-back scheme was 51.5 per cent, and on that basis the department and the Government went ahead.



It was suggested that a different result might be obtained if the ballot were held again, but I was reminded that whoever loses the grand final in a couple of weeks time will want to replay it. Indeed, the losing team may wish to replay the grand final over a number of weeks. So, once the ballot has been held the result must be considered as final. I found it disappointing that certain people in the industry could not accept the majority decision. The buy-back scheme will help those fishermen wanting to get out of the industry, especially those wishing to get out for economic reasons. As the fishermen will benefit from the buy-back scheme, I support the Bill.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I, too, pay a tribute to the way in which the Minister conducted the proceedings of the select committee. It was difficult at short notice not only for the witnesses (and over 20 submissions were received by the committee) but also for committee members to have to sit at short notice and at odd times. However, all parties cooperated as well as they could and it was a worthwhile exercise. I was impressed by the evidence given by the fishermen. Some of the most experienced men in the industry took time to attend and put their views before the committee. Without exception, each of them expressed concern for the long-term future of the fishery and requested that the fishery be left in as good order as it could be and in an economically viable state for succeeding generations.

I thank those fishermen who appeared before the committee for their time. Their attendance showed the concern of South-Eastern fishermen for the industry that gives them a living. Committee members accepted the fact that the fishery is a State resource and that the State has an interest in ensuring that the industry is viable in the long term. The State also has an interest in seeing that, biologically, the fishery is maintained for the use not only of professional fishermen but also of recreational fishermen. Further, the fishery produces income from fishing licence fees which no doubt may be increased in future.

I thought that perhaps the evidence from the Fisheries Department showed there has been too much preoccupation in the past with effort reduction, which involves the economic side of the fishery and which should be left more to professional fishermen whose livelihood depends on it. Tremendous divisions have been caused by the whole issue of buy-back. It is noticeable and perhaps understandable that the department may have seen its role as something more than just ensuring the biological preservation of the fishery and has extended not only that sort of advice but also firm directions as to where effort reduction may come from and where the fishery is heading.

It is important that in future SAFIC take a much greater role with the Fisheries Department in ensuring that there is a long-term plan for the fishery. It is most unfortunate that the divisions among fishermen themselves have arrived at the stage at which they have. The southern ports seem to take a contrary view to that taken by the northern ports. It should also be realised (and it was expressed in one submission) that there is free movement of fishing boats throughout the South-Eastern rock lobster zone.

If people in one port think that they are hardly done by, it is a free industry if you have a licence and you can shift and operate your business, just as in any other business, from another location. That point should be made, as it may go some way in the longer term towards resolving the feeling in one section of the industry that it is disadvantaged.

The point cannot be stressed too greatly that the fishermen themselves must become united, because that is the

only way that I can see the long-term viability of the fishery being taken into account and not short-term actions which in many cases are not in the best interests of the fishery. In discussing the biological state of the fishery, it has been noted by other members of the committee that we received conflicting evidence. Almost without exception the fishermen were concerned about their ability to take rock lobster from the fishery in October, because at that time female rock lobster are still spawning.

In fact, many of the submissions put to us suggested that the fishery should be closed in October. However, some of the fishing and biological experts who gave evidence believed that the long-term interests of the fishery could be protected by determining the size of the crayfish taken, which would determine the number of times a female would have spawned before she was taken from the resource. The committee came down with this recommendation:

The committee is of the view that the industry must address the issue of extending closures.

The committee believed unanimously that SAFIC and the industry itself must take up this matter in the future.

As to the economic state of the fishery, it was accepted, and the evidence given supported the view, that most fishermen are receiving a reasonable income. It was accepted by the committee that there was a need for a reduced effort in the fishery. Of course, there were different views as to how that effort reduction should take place. It was accepted by everyone that the price per kilogram received for the catch has maintained the increased viability of the industry and that, if something should happen to the price per kilogram of the catch, the industry in the future could be in serious trouble.

Those of us who have rural backgrounds understand only too well the effect of drought on the rural population and its income. In many cases the State has to step in and provide short-term low interest loans in order to help those farmers over that period. The committee did see that there was a need for rationalisation, and that is why the recommendation came down in support of the buy-back scheme. It must be very carefully noted, however, that the scheme is voluntary—there is no compulsion. There is no guarantee of how many boats will be taken out of the industry in the next two years; in fact, there is no guarantee that any boats will be taken out. That is for the fishermen to decide.

I believe it is quite correct that the fishermen should decide. However, we believe strongly that the per pot surcharge placed on the fishery, should impose the minimum burden on those who can least afford to pay it. In other words, the committee had the view that the buy-back authority should impose a surcharge only as boats were taken out of the industry. We all recognised that there are people in the fishery who see it as a way of life. Many of them are experienced fishermen who have much to contribute to the industry.

Also, there are people who have recently come into the industry and who have severe financial commitments, so that an increased pot surcharge of the magnitude contemplated could make it quite difficult for them financially. We accepted that we should express our opinion that the levy should be introduced in such a way as to protect the needy. Our recommendation that the Minister give urgent consideration to the use of licences as collateral, as the shadow Minister explained, probably will have the greatest effect on the long-term benefits to the industry. Indeed, we will be monitoring the speed at which the Minister can introduce this scheme. If fishermen can borrow against the security of their licences, it will take away much of the burden of future rationalisation. In fact, if this scheme had

been in place 10 years ago we might not be faced with some of the problems that we have at present.

In conclusion, it is fair to say that we all agree with the need for ongoing rationalisation to take place in the industry, not only for the benefit of the fishery but for those people who make their living from it. We thought that there was a desperate need for some long-term planning.

I believe that SAFIC and the fishermen have to come up with some long-term plans, not like the 15 per cent reduction which came in very quickly, as many fishermen thought, and disadvantaged some of them. I am sure that if SAFIC and the fishermen can get together and produce those long-term plans in consultation with the department, it will help unite an industry that is vital to the State.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** As the Minister will be aware, I have supported the Port MacDonnell fishermen for a considerable time in helping them to put their point of view to him. In fact, having lived in the South-East for over 30 years, I have watched the industry grow and develop. I note with some regret that the committee has approved the buy-back scheme with relatively few amendments, and those hardly accede to the requests made by the Port MacDonnell Fishermen's Association. I do note, however, that a recommendation was made which is not included in the legislation and which possibly cannot be included. That is the recommendation for licences to be recognised as collateral for loans, a measure already in place in Victoria. I hope that this matter will be put by the Minister to the Crown Law Department so that any legal hitches can be cleared up quickly. It could facilitate considerably improved livelihoods for fishermen. I believe that, if that measure had been in place over the last decade or so, it would have helped fishermen throughout South Australia purchase additional pots. It would have helped many of them consolidate their holdings. In fact, the buy-back scheme might not even have been necessary.

With respect to my parliamentary colleagues, I have to say that I believe that the comments of the committee members were to some extent platitudinous. I have already expressed my disappointment that they are approving the progress of the buy-back scheme. Comments have been made that the scheme is voluntary. To some extent that is true, but it is only partly true. It is voluntary for a fisherman to withdraw from the scheme, but it is compulsory for every fisherman remaining to pay into the scheme. A request made for some ports, for example, to stay out of the buy-back scheme completely was discounted by the committee on the ground that it would create a great number of problems. Perhaps that is so. I would point out that with reference to South Australian, Victorian and Commonwealth dual licence-holders, even firmer measures are being legislated for here in this recommendation in order to prevent those original dual licence holders from splitting licences. I believe some of them have held dual licences since 1967.

They were granted their dual licences, rather than purchasing them, and are prevented from splitting them if they sell their South Australian holdings. It is regrettable that there is no recognition that those fishermen have been paying all licence fees and other expenses relevant to both licences over two decades while they have been able to fish at only one place at any one time—either in South Australia or in Victoria. Therefore, to some extent they can be credited with having reduced effort in South Australia over the past two decades. Their representations to the committee have been ignored. However, if some of them were able to retain a Victorian licence while still fishing out of a South Australian port (such as Port MacDonnell), their effort would

be interstate and the financial returns would come back to South Australia (to their home port of Port MacDonnell in this instance).

This legislation, as I said before when this matter was first referred to a select committee, will not really lead to a reduction in effort. I have always been under the impression that that is what the Minister and his directors were really about. There is evidence that fishermen will work harder to meet the cost of the buy-back scheme, particularly those fishermen who are less able to meet the cost. They will be limited only by their physical capabilities or by the vagaries of the weather—and we know what they are like in the extreme South-East where there are fewer fishing days. Therefore, there is every chance that these fishermen will be forced to take risks by fishing in bad weather in order to make money to meet their costs. That point was discounted by the committee.

It disappoints me, too, that there is no mention in the appendices of expert advice from people such as Mr Campbell (who is now with the Commonwealth Fisheries Department in Canberra). Mr Campbell came to my office some years ago as a representative of a team from the Flinders University. I know that he was willing to come to South Australia but could do so only on the invitation of the Minister. Perhaps that invitation was not extended and, if not, I simply say that the committee would have been able to take heed of at least some comments from a person who has studied the problem not only for the fishing industry but also as it relates to the large number of socio-economic problems confronting ports in the South-East in the event of a large number of vessels dropping out of the industry. No doubt fishing officers and others have been aware of that for some time. The Copes report, which all of us have studied, also mentions this.

It occurs to me in passing that the Newfoundland fishing industry is not noted for its wealth, despite the impact of the Copes report in that area over many years. In fact, that area is cited as being one of the most impoverished sections of the United States and Canadian economies. The short time allowed for evidence to be received, for reports to be made and for the Bill to be debated has also prevented at least one other expert from attending because he is on a fishing vessel in the Abrolhos Islands. He would have given evidence about the possibility of engaging in the culture of lobster eggs—another fact which has been quite heavily discounted by South Australian fishery officers who say that, because of problems from the egg through to larva and other stages in the first 10 months, it is simply not possible to raise *Jolsus novachollandiae* (or the Southern rock lobster). Only this week a television program dealt with a professor in New York State who was breeding rock lobster from the larva stage to not simply 10 months but to the commercial stage. That program is well advanced.

I predict here and now that within South Australia efforts will be made within the very near future to engage in a substantial rock lobster breeding program. If it is difficult to breed the southern rock lobster, perhaps we can look at international experiences with cross breeds, such as the main lobster variations which may prove to be easier, because in the New York State experiment it was found that they breed very much better in captivity and increase in body weight at twice the rate of lobsters in the wild. The professor in the television program (and it was remarkably interesting) said that the wild eggs were surviving at the rate of only 0.01 per cent, which really gives just a handful of lobsters. The fishery officers in South Australia have told us repeatedly that there is a very low survival rate in the wild as against a much higher rate when they are raised under

artificial circumstances. The professor also said that the rock lobsters themselves are responsible for their high mortality rate because they are extremely territorial and will fight one another to the death in order to gain territorial rights. Who knows what is going on off the southern coast?

To discount and dispel any possibility of rock lobster culture, and for us to simply assume that there is only one expert in the world with any experience with rock lobster breeding, is folly. I hope that the department in its \$700 000 program, which was announced in the *Border Watch* only yesterday, will include some investigation into rock lobster culture and not simply examine what is going on on the ocean floor. That has occurred over the past 20 years, and I know that officers of the department have been actively engaged in those studies. Lord knows how much more study will be carried out. It is time that we put something back into the ocean rather than just taking it out.

There are many other fish cultures where we are already experimenting not on a failure basis but on a success basis, and I believe that we should follow that line of attack. I also remind the Minister that the buy-back vote won by a majority of only seven votes. That figure is repeated almost *ad nauseam* in the debate and it really means that only a narrow margin favours buy-back. I believe that representations made to me by fishermen from the port of Southend—and colleagues have discussed this issue with fishermen from that port and from Port MacDonnell—would have indicated to members of the committee that a change of heart within the industry probably would have overturned that vote had another vote been taken. It is like having a Federal election and then saying a week later that the Party that was victorious would have lost. However, we cannot keep taking votes. I simply point out that the margin in favour was narrow. Fishermen may have voted for the wrong reasons. The emphasis placed on the vote is disproportionate to the information handed out to the fishermen prior to their voting.

However, I believe that it is common knowledge within the lobster industry throughout South Australia that the Government has been single-minded in its pursuit of a buy-back scheme over the past two or three years, irrespective of the outcome of the vote. In support of that comment I refer to a Western Australian brochure published by a ship and yacht broker. Our South Australian Director is reported in that publication as saying, rightly or wrongly, that the Government would have gone ahead even if the vote had gone against the scheme. Our Minister is on record—and a taped transcript of what he said on radio in the South-East is available—as confirming that fact.

I only hope that this legislation, if it passes both Houses, will be the last for the time being and that no further serious measures will be taken within the term of the scheme, so that fishermen will have time to stabilise. Fishermen desperately need to know that what they are engaged in now and their financial commitments will not be altered within the next four years. To do otherwise would throw their livelihood into chaos. I sympathise deeply with the plight of some fishermen in ports in the South-East. Many of them are happy to fish and make what they regard as an adequate wage (although not a grand living) and would wish to remain within the industry even under present conditions.

I hope that these men, who know and enjoy no other livelihood, will not be forced out of the fishing industry simply because of the buy-back scheme. I know that representations were made to the committee by a number of young people keen to remain in the industry but who have financial commitments—recently married, buying houses,

raising families. They highlighted the relatively small amount of spare cash that they can put towards the buy-back scheme and, of course, they are still not aware of the interest rates and the availability of finance, which are issues on which fishermen need reassurance.

I am informed that there is an issue which certainly needs to be clarified with regard to procedural matters in select committees generally and with regard to the availability of evidence between submitting parties. I do not know whether it would have made any difference to the findings of the committee in this case, but we must have clarification of the constraints placed on witnesses and in relation to the Chairman of the select committee quoting the relevant Standing Orders. I will take up that matter in writing with the relevant House committee to ensure that in future no group believes that it may have been disadvantaged.

As colleagues of mine have said, there is inconsistency between the States. Victoria has only recently decided not to fish in October and early November—an issue that was canvassed before the committee, and I know this from notes made in the report. Incidentally, that decision was taken by the industry itself and was not the outcome of Government pressure. South Australia has already reduced its pot entitlement by 15 per cent. As I said previously, many lower South-East fishermen do not believe that that initiative has been given time to work its way through because it takes at least five years for young lobster to mature to catch size, and five years have not elapsed since that entitlement reduction was implemented. Therefore we assume that somewhere off the south coast many more young lobsters may be maturing and that in two or three years time perhaps the catch rate would have increased even without the buy-back scheme.

I believe that the Minister's own fishery officers have pointed out on repeated occasions that we need a five or six year time span and that, if a large number of larvae are found on the reefs in any one year, one can anticipate that it will be five or six years down the track before a heavy catch is experienced. That is the indicator.

The committee is in no way to be blamed (although I did say that I thought its comments were platitudinous), because the time allowed to obtain all the evidence, including expert evidence from across the world, was insufficient. Under the circumstances, in the brief period that I have had to peruse some 15 pages of the report and come up with relevant comment, I feel that justice has not been done to the Bill by the Lower House here today. However, that decision was made by the Minister and it was agreed that we would cooperate to get this legislation in place, with amendments I had hoped. The amendments certainly are not helping the Port MacDonnell fishermen, as I see it. However, we did agree with the Minister that we would collaborate to get this legislation in place in time for the commencement of the coming season.

I repeat that it is with considerable sympathy for the Port MacDonnell fishermen and the Southend fishermen, who have made strong representation to me over the past 12 to 18 months, and with some disappointment at the nature of the amendments made to the legislation, that I conclude my remarks.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Fisheries):** I thank members of the committee for their cooperation and members of the parliamentary staff for their support, given the circumstances of the hearings and the times that we were required to meet. I also acknowledge the cooperation of members of the committee in preparing the report. We have sat over the past four days extensively and a good deal of

members' time has been devoted to preparing this comprehensive report for members of Parliament.

I am pleased with the recommendations, and with the amendments with which we will deal when we go into Committee. I thank the people who gave evidence: I believe that they presented their arguments clearly and articulately. I am pleased that diversity of view was expressed and that there was adequate opportunity for all points of view to be presented before the committee. I thank parliamentary staff for their support in organising all the hearings and for providing a well organised venue for the witnesses to present evidence to the committee.

I place on record my thanks to staff for their support in preparing the final documentation and the report for presentation today, given the limited time period. The member for Mawson acknowledged the cooperation between members of the committee, and I support those comments. Having been on several other select committees, I can say that this one was productive, useful and fruitful, from the point of view of evidence and information presented.

I am pleased to be able to table this report and to be able to speak to it. In particular, I am pleased for the rock lobster industry in South Australia because I believe that what we are endeavouring to do with this Bill, albeit a voluntary scheme, will be of benefit to the economic resource of the fishery and to the fishermen as a whole who work that fishery. I think that in the long term that will be of great benefit to the community of South Australia.

Various members have made statements today regarding the long-term planning. I am sure that the fishermen and the department are fully aware of the need to look down the track and predict the market, and the biological and economic situations of the fishery as a whole. I am sure that the department will take this on board, and that it is already well down the path of planning for the future of this particular fishery. I refer to a couple of points made by the member for Mount Gambier in what I will describe as a 'loser's speech'. It is important to note that this issue has been in the community now for well on 10 years. I suppose that it has been consulted to death with the fishery because all the ports have been involved and all interested parties have had an opportunity to either attend or be part of discussions over those years.

It is certainly not something new and should spring no surprise on members of Parliament or the industry, given the proposal that is before us in the Bill. It certainly comes as no surprise to members of Parliament who have a knowledge of the industry and who are aware of the issues facing the industry in the southern part of the State. I would have to test the argument that there is some surprise in this proposal and that the community has not had a proper opportunity to debate it. In relation to the evidence placed before us with regard to collateral, I am advised that as yet Victoria does not have a scheme to provide collateral on a licence, but that is being considered. We have received communication from the Victorian fisheries department which indicates that it is not presently in place. However, that does not detract from the recommendation of the committee which requires us to urgently consider collateral being made available to fishermen who are granted licences within this fishery.

The other point I wish to raise is in relation to the aquaculture question and the seeding proposal. As a committee, we had evidence placed before us from the Principal Research Scientist from the CSIRO, which evidence is available to members of Parliament. The summation of that letter from Dr S.F. Rayner to the Director of Research, Department of Fisheries which was tabled for the infor-

mation of the committee, indicates quite clearly that commercial scale culture and mariculture are very expensive, distant alternatives and, certainly, not something on which the CSIRO is likely to embark at this stage.

In fact, much of the discussion held and information supplied to the community is questionable, because it is apparent that there has not been any great success in this area, and there are significant gaps from the level of breeding through to the placement of the animal in the wild. One would have to say that it is questionable to have presented various newspaper documents which endeavour to argue very strongly that there is an alternative available for the industry as a whole, based on the information which has been provided to us by expert evidence.

I think that has been questioned thoroughly by the committee, and the committee's conclusion, which is contained in the report, heavily discounts that aspect as an alternative. Quite clearly, it comes down to the view that a voluntary buy-back scheme is the most obvious alternative available to the fishery at this time, and that we should proceed urgently on that path in order to see the recovery of the fishery. I think the evidence is quite overwhelming from both the industry sources and the experts that now is the time to move in terms of the economics of the industry. We do not want to wait until there is an economic collapse; we ought to get on with the process and whilst we can address the issues with a reasonable degree of freedom we should do so, and not wait until we are faced with a crisis where we have to overreact or react in a very bad situation.

I would like to indicate my pleasure in having the opportunity to table this report and, hopefully, seeing our proposals go towards assisting our fisheries industry, particularly the southern zone rock lobster fishery. I hope that it will encourage the economic well-being of that community, in particular, and I see it as setting some guidelines and giving some examples for future industry management which will allow us to have a better knowledge and data bank for this whole issue of fisheries management. With that comment I finalise my remarks and again thank members of the committee and the staff of the Parliament for their cooperation.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Clause 8 (4) provides:

This section does not prevent a licensee from transferring the licence to a member of his or her family.

I can see no definition of the word 'family' and it appears to be left open. Is it possible to define 'family', or does the Minister think that it should be defined?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** In the scheme of management it is clearly defined. It has been well exposed in other areas. It involves the broadest possible definition of 'family' and I would be more than happy to provide the honourable member with a copy of that. I do not have one at the moment, but I can assure him that it canvasses the whole aspect of the family.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Transfer of licences.'

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

Page 3, lines 37 to 41 and page 4, lines 1 to 5—leave out subclause (3) and insert the following subclause:

(3) Subject to subsection (4), a licensee cannot transfer his or her licence to another person after the end of the prescribed period unless the licensee has paid to the Minister any accrued liability for surcharge.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—'Surrender of licences.'

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

Page 4, line 8—leave out 'the prescribed form' and insert 'a form approved by the Minister'.

Amendment carried.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

Page 4, lines 15 to 23—Leave out subclause (3) and insert the following subclauses:

(3) A person who holds a South Australian licence and who also holds a Commonwealth licence issued in conjunction with the South Australian licence cannot surrender the South Australian licence under this Act whilst continuing to hold the Commonwealth licence.

(3a) A person who—

(a) is entitled, by virtue of a South Australian licence and a Victorian rock lobster authority to fish for rock lobster in the waters of the Southern Zone and in Victorian waters adjacent to the Southern Zone;

but

(b) is restricted to the use of one boat and one pot allocation in those waters by virtue of the terms of the licence and the authority,

cannot surrender the South Australian licence under this Act whilst continuing to hold the Victorian rock lobster authority.

Amendment carried.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

Page 4, after line 27—insert the following subclause:

(6) In this section—

'Commonwealth licence' means a fishing boat licence under the Fisheries Act 1952 of the Commonwealth;

'South Australian licence' means a fishery licence in respect of the Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery;

'Victorian rock lobster authority' means an authority issued pursuant to the law of Victoria entitling the holder to use a boat and pots for rock lobster fishing in Victorian waters adjacent to the Southern Zone.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Money expended for the purposes of this Act to be recouped from remaining licensees.'

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Clause 11 (1) (a) provides:

... impose a surcharge on the licence fees payable in respect of licences;

The buy-back proposal that was voted on was that the surcharge be a levy on pots—a pot surcharge. Can the Minister read into *Hansard* that that is the intention of the surcharge?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for bringing this to my attention. It is important to record how it is intended. The select committee explored every possible avenue regarding the equity. It was fair to say that the committee concluded that the most practical way, if not the most equitable way, was by pot. That can be clarified by looking at the definition of 'surcharge' which is on page 2, line 10 of the Bill. It is intended to apply per pot.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## APPROPRIATION BILL

Debate on motion to note grievances (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 832.)

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Yesterday, the House was presented with the Auditor-General's Report, which contained the strongest and most significant questioning of a South Australian Government for at least a decade. It was critical of this Government's increasingly frequent use of claims of commercial confidentiality to refuse answers to legitimate questions about the use of taxpayers' money. It revealed that beneath this umbrella of secrecy which the Premier in particular has erected lurks a

flood of examples of Government financial incompetence and mismanagement.

In my speech in the Supply debate last month, I made the point that there may well be occasions when information must remain confidential for commercial reasons, but I added that, if this was necessary in cases like the ASER project, the ETSA leasing deals and the timber corporation's New Zealand fiasco, the Premier had yet to justify the Government's refusal to answer legitimate questions. I suggest that the ASER project was probably one issue in particular raised by the Auditor-General. His report is heavy with the implication that the Government has not had a sufficient handle on the reasons for escalating costs, given its financial obligations involved in the project.

There is little doubt that the Premier's press conference last Friday was an attempt to pre-empt the Auditor-General's Report. The first page contained the good news about the response to the opening of the Convention Centre. The second page contained some of the facts the Opposition has been seeking for some time about the cost of the project and how much this will involve taxpayers' funds in meeting lease commitments. These cannot be matters of commercial confidentiality by any stretch of the imagination.

We now have some of the story. But, even as the Auditor-General's Report was being tabled yesterday, the Premier was still refusing to answer my question about the estimated completion cost of the total project. Figures in the Auditor-General's Report suggest it is now at least \$254 million. Why will the Premier not admit that?

We also had the spectacle yesterday of the Minister of Forests again claiming commercial confidentiality to refuse answers to questions about the bungle—his word—over the investment of the Government in a New Zealand Timber Company. At the time he was doing this, members reading the Auditor-General's Report were obtaining compelling reasons why the Government's secrecy, its lazy, lax approach to financial management and accountability, is fraught with risk for South Australian taxpayers. The report reveals for the first time that the independent chartered accountant's report upon which the Government based its initial decision to make this investment, was even qualified. Of course, the Minister did not reveal this at the time he made his big announcement about this investment.

He did not reveal it in answer to questions at his Estimates Committee last year and he did not reveal it in answer to the Opposition's questions on this matter last month. I put the Minister on notice that the Opposition will continue to pursue this matter during the Estimates Committees in a fortnight's time. I hope that he will not go on defying the very clear warnings of the Auditor-General. I hope the Premier, as well, will accept the warnings in this report and be more forthcoming with answers about what the Government is doing with taxpayer's money. The need to do so—to ensure that the Parliament can effectively bring the Government to account—is highlighted in some of the Auditor's revelations about particular items of spending. I propose to deal with just some of them this afternoon.

In particular, I refer to the Government's lack of response to previous audit findings which identified potential for considerable savings of taxpayer's money. For example, in the area of school transport costs, as long ago as May 1983 a steering committee was appointed to look into this matter. It reported in April 1985. It cost \$12 000, not including the salaries of the departmental officers involved, and recommended a rationalisation of services, with more opportunity for the involvement of private sector operators, which could save \$1.5 million a year. But what did the Government do? More than a year later, in July 1986, a working group was

established to consider the report and, after yet another 12 months delay, we find revealed in the latest report of the Auditor-General that the review of the review has only just been completed.

The need to consider more outside involvement in services like these to protect the taxpayer is highlighted by the Auditor-General's observations about the cost of school cleaning services. He has reported that the use of industrial contractors is clearly the most effective method of cleaning departmental property. The average cost per square metre of an industrial contractor is \$7.89, compared with \$12.86 for weekly paid Government employed, union controlled cleaners.

There are a number of other examples identified in the Auditor-General's Report where the Government has been slow to respond to previous audit findings, such as in housing for Government employees, rationalisation of Government office accommodation, and the determination of who exactly is liable for \$127 million of superannuation and long service leave payments to employees in the tertiary education sector.

A further example relates to the Aquatic Centre. Members will recall that the capital cost of this project doubled because of Government mismanagement. We even find, from the Auditor-General's Report, that a further \$319 000 was spent last financial year, bringing the total to \$8.4 million. That is the capital cost, but it is also possible that there will be a significant recurrent obligation. The Auditor-General has been warning since 1984—for three years—of the need to reach agreement with the Adelaide City Council on making up any shortfall in the operating costs. Because of continuing Government inaction, the Auditor-General has been forced to observe again this year:

Despite the fact that the centre has been in operation for two years the council and the department still have not reached agreement on the amount to be provided by the Government.

His report raises important questions about another recreation and sport project. It reveals that, in total, \$265 000 has been paid to a company for the cancellation of a contract to resurface the running track at Olympic Sports Field.

The Government's failure to quantify potential operating deficits for projects it embarks upon also now applies to the new Kangaroo Island ferry. This project was not put out to tender. In March 1986, just 18 months ago, its completion cost was put at \$15.6 million. This has now escalated to \$19.4 million—a 24 per cent blow-out. One reason was a payment of \$450 000 due, according to the Auditor-General, 'to reimbursement of costs incurred by company due to late receipt of drawings.'

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It will be interesting to see the final capital cost in the Auditor-General's Report next year. I am sure that the final bill will not be small. The Government will not come clean and tell us about it. We will have to prise it out of the Government through the Auditor-General's Report. It seems that the Government's reluctance to be open with this Parliament is continuing. In addition, the Auditor-General's Report reveals there has been no determination yet of the full extent of the subsidy which will be necessary to meet the operating shortfall of the service. This is an extraordinary failure of basic principles of financial management. This cost should have been quantified at the time the decision was taken to construct the vessel.

The Government exhibits ability to spend money on having a good time. The Auditor-General's Report reveals that the gala opening of the convention centre cost \$210 000. If 1 000 people attended, that represented a cost of \$200 a head. The America's Cup challenge cost taxpayers a net \$1.8 million and the Three Day Event \$2.2 million, including

\$26 000 in bills still owing to the Government. However, the Government has shown no determination to come to grips with escalating costs in a number of key areas of expenditure. For example, net workers compensation claims to be paid this financial year are estimated at \$46.5 million—a 45 per cent rise. In the Education Department alone, premiums for this financial year are estimated at \$12 million—a 26 per cent rise in just 12 months. The cost of meeting departmental workers compensation claims last financial year was \$29.7 million—approaching three times the cost only four years ago.

There is increasing concern that the escalating cost of Government concessions and other forms of financial assistance may be due at least in part to taxpayers' money going to people who may not be eligible for it. Yet there appears to have been some reluctance within the Government to crack down on any potential rorts. For example, the Auditor-General reveals that in December 1986 he expressed concern at the length of timeframe the Department of Community Welfare was proposing to check the eligibility of recipients of electricity concessions. The Auditor-General's Report reveals concern about eligibility criteria being applied to payments of concessions for water rates, emergency housing, Housing Trust rental rebates, and motor vehicle registration and drivers' licence fees, as well as electricity concessions.

In total, Government concessions like these were worth \$120 million last financial year. More strict application of eligibility criteria can benefit those in real need. In our prisons, there is a further significant rise in the cost of protecting society from offenders. Last financial year, the average annual net cost per prisoner was \$44 000—a 22 per cent rise in just 12 months. It is also costing taxpayers much more to subsidise public transport. The Auditor-General reveals that last financial year taxpayers subsidised every trip on STA buses, trams and trains to the tune of \$1.85—a 40 per cent rise since 1984. This is the cost of meeting the STA's operating deficit and is in addition to fares paid. Last financial year, the figure blew out because of the significant decline in the number of journeys on STA services. They were down by 6.2 million passenger journeys over the year. Commuters are showing what they think of the unreliable services and escalating fares which are the hallmarks of this Government's performance in public transport.

Turning to commercial activities examined by the Auditor-General, I point out that the Government's investment in the New Zealand timber venture is not the only matter for concern. We find that there is a proposed investment of \$1.2 million in Armstrong's Tavern associated with the Adelaide College of TAFE. The Auditor-General has reported that the advice the Government accepted in making this investment decision took no account of debt servicing costs—a responsibility the Cabinet must accept because it gave the final go-ahead for this venture.

A further significant loss by the Government owned radio station, 5AA, is also revealed. The deficit of \$2.1 million in 1986-87 produced an accumulated loss of \$3.1 million. Yet the Auditor-General also reveals that the Government invested a further \$2 million of equity last financial year with a further \$1 million proposed in 1987-88.

There are many other matters in the Auditor-General's Report which must be pursued. Why, for example, did consultants' fees for the entertainment centre cost us almost \$1.2 million for a centre which is not to proceed? Why is there lack of information for audit on the Wakefield Press? Why is the Woods and Forests Department declining to follow accepted accounting procedures, with the result that the Auditor-General has made a qualified report? Why did



the Festival Centre Trust spend \$67 000 on a production which was not presented? Why did the Minister of Employment and Further Education agree to buy a block of land from a local government council when the land was already owned by the Government; and why, as a result of this bungle, did the Government end up having to compensate the council to the tune of \$50 000?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It was interesting that today in the House the Minister tried to suggest that the \$50 000 had not been paid. When he got caught on that with the cheque number (the cheque was actually banked by the council), he decided to flick-pass the buck down the line to someone who was not here. Talk about accountability and responsibility for actions! At the opening page of his report, the Auditor-General makes an important point about the image of the public sector. He states that most areas of the public sector are staffed by competent, hardworking people, and I agree. The responsibility for the major failures in performance and management which he has identified this year does not lie with public servants. The buck stops with the Premier and his Ministers. It is their reluctance to provide information and their unwillingness to be accountable which are at issue.

We see, right through this report, failures of Ministers to follow up on previous expressions of concern by audit. We see opportunities to provide the public with a more efficient service, at less cost, being ignored. We see, in summary, all the signs of an arrogant, evasive, lazy, incompetent Government.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** That whole front page ought to be printed somewhere.

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I want to draw the attention of the House to a grievance that will emerge during the course of my remarks. In the first instance, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that a fellow called Gutenberg developed a process called 'printing' in about the middle of the fifteenth century, somewhere around 1439 or 1440, the exact date not having been recorded by historians. No note was made of it in any document that has survived to this time. Subsequently, a fellow called Caxton, who had learned something of this technique, brought it to England and first used an advanced form in about 1473, as far as I am aware. Again, the record is not precise, and the reason for that is that there was no means by which it could be reproduced *en masse* for the sake of reference made to the fact by future generations.

Anyway, thereby hangs the tale: we now have printing, and we have had that technology for some 500 years. As a consequence, along the way society has benefited because it has been possible for a document, treatise or tome to be reproduced many times over, quite efficiently and in a way that has made it possible for large numbers of people to read that information, be stimulated by the argument and/or the factual substance of it and thereby adjust their own perceptions of the nature of any particular subject. That has meant that men have been capable of exchanging views with one another across time and geographical space, and have become, through this means, more civilised as a consequence.

We all enjoy the benefits of that. Indeed, in this Parliament we have enjoyed the benefits of a permanent record of the proceedings of the Parliament for longer than any other Parliament in the British Commonwealth, so far as my research is able to determine. We first had direct reporting of our speeches in the first person in the written record

of the South Australian Parliament in 1914, but there was a third person record since the day Parliament began in 1859. That predates even the record of the Commons.

In the House of Commons a fellow called Cobbet took it upon himself to make notes of the debates in 1903, which is almost 50 years after we had begun doing that here in South Australia. Subsequently, Cobbet sold his interest in the Commons undertaking to a fellow called T.C. Hansard, whose name is still associated with the record of all parliamentary debate that takes place in Parliaments within our Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. In any case, these days we in this State quite justifiably pride ourselves on the way in which we have shown the rest of the world how to develop democracy, and record the way in which it comes to its decisions and proceeds to address the great social issues and problems of the day.

Of course, we did that by first passing legislation to give women the vote here in this Parliament in this country, and the rest of the world followed that example. We have done it in other ways, by first electing a woman—not that that necessarily means anything special, other than demonstrating that all people are equal, and that this Parliament has recognised that fact. Now, I want to focus particularly on our record of proceedings, on the way in which we have kept that record and in which we now project ourselves to the rest of the world as being a centre of excellence in that regard, and on the way in which we have embraced new technology.

The technology to which I am referring is the use of the silicone chip in the computer era, including word processing, and in what these days is called desk top publishing. We now have in this place the means by which it will be possible for us to desk top publish our daily record of parliamentary proceedings without the necessity for it to be taken away to a building somewhere else in this capital, whether manually or electronically. We can do that here in this place. The other thing that this technology, of which we are so proud, enables us to do is that we can diversify that record to make it more precise, more clearly illustrated, more accurate and more simply understood by more citizens (indeed, by more members).

For a long time we have used the practice of not just having a written record of our proceedings but having it illustrated by statistical tables which, using technology as relevant and up to date as it was in the mid 1960s, required typesetting. Since it became technologically possible for us to use them, statistical tables have been a part of the way in which we illustrate our argument and our understanding of the world about us, and of the way in which we should proceed to make decisions relevant to that world.

At this time we can take a further step, as indeed we did under Speaker Eastick in the early 1980s. Funnily enough, that step resulted in our showing the way to other Parliaments. We incorporated graphs, histograms and pie charts in our record. The difficulties associated with including that in the printed output at the time were not considered to be too great to enable it to happen. I understand that recent complaints from the Government Printing Office have resulted in a reversal of that decision. Even though a precedent was set to allow those devices—which more concisely, accurately, simply and comprehensively explain an argument—to be included in the record, we find that we are now denied the right to use them.

No explicit direction was ever given to this Chamber by a Speaker or a Chairman of Committees that the practice of incorporating graphs, pie charts or histograms into *Hansard* would cease forthwith. That is in spite of the fact that I have found, to my dismay, that when I sought to have incorporated in the record a valid statistical representation



of information in the form of any one of those three devices, leave was given conditional on consent being granted. I do not understand, in this day and age, when we have those devices at our disposal, how we can refuse to use them, unless we are bowing down to the pressure of printing unions or something like that in the Government Printing Office. I will not reflect on any member opposite as to why that may be so.

I point out to the House, however, that on no fewer than 46 occasions the incorporation into the record of some 57 separate instruments of explanation of this kind of material has been permitted. Not only pie charts, histograms and graphs but also diagrams, maps, and so on, are included in the record, and I will briefly describe what they are. My grievance is that, even though we have the technology to incorporate this information into the record in a trice, we do not use it and we refuse to allow members to use it to illustrate the points that they are making.

The House first permitted incorporation of material in this form on 30 March 1982 by none other than the Hon. Peter Duncan on pages 3707 and 3708 of *Hansard*. On 27 July Dr Billard incorporated two items during a speech. On 10 August the Hon. Peter Duncan again incorporated three items during a speech, and so did the member for Peake (Mr Keith Plunkett). On 11 August 1982 Mr Evans (the then member for Fisher) also incorporated information. On 12 August the member for Heysen (as he is now known) incorporated a quarterly net migration gain to South Australia in chart form. On 15 September the member for Ramsay and the Hon. David Tonkin—

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

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I wish to raise a matter of considerable grievance to the District Council of Eudunda, and it relates to the State Transport Authority as it thrashes around in its attempt to raise revenue. To summarise this source of grievance I refer to an agreement reached back in 1937.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, a date of some significance to this Parliament, as the member for Coles first saw the light of day in that very year. Agreement was reached that land surplus to the railways needs was to be taken over by the council and developed as a playground and garden at peppercorn rental (one pound per year) for the period of tenancy. I have read the agreement, which refers to the demised land—that is, land surplus to the requirements of the railways—and it appears that the council did the railways a service by beautifying what was quite an ugly spot in the middle of Eudunda.

A subsequent agreement in 1948 added a little more land to the reserve area with no change to the conditions. So the council, in good faith, developed these memorial gardens and have looked after them and paid all the rates and taxes as part of the original agreement. As I have said, it has met all the conditions requested at that time. In fact, it seems to me that the council in the initial years of the agreement did the then South Australian Railways a service. However, the STA, in its lack of wisdom, has now decided to demand that the council either pays rental commensurate with the subdivisional value of the land or it buys the land. The council wrote to the Property Manager of the State Transport Authority protesting at this change in the lease conditions, and suggesting that it breaches the spirit of the original agreement—and I agree with that proposition. Nonetheless, the STA intends to proceed with its demand and has slugged the Eudunda council rent for what it considers to be the

market value of that property (as though the property was to be chopped up for housing blocks).

I sympathise with the STA and its financial problems, but what has happened to it happens to most socialised enterprises and industries—they lose money. As soon as the STA started gobbling up private enterprise bus services which were making money in the outer suburbs, you could bet your bottom dollar that it would not be long before they began losing money—and that is what has transpired, just as surely as the sun rises each morning. In sympathising with the STA over its difficulties I cannot condone its actions throughout South Australia, particularly at Eudunda, where it seeks to raise revenue by breaching the spirit of a very long-standing agreement to beautify surplus land.

I refer now to a letter I received (and I think all members received a similar letter) from the Electronics Association of South Australia Incorporated which indicates that the Government is being particularly shortsighted in the allocation of funds for the training of electronic, electrical and mechanical engineering technical officers or people who seek to become technical officers in that discipline. The association rightly points out that, if we are going to cash in on this much vaunted bonanza of the submarine project (much vaunted by the Government), we will need a number of technical officers in these skilled areas. In part, the letter states:

It appears however that the areas of electronic, electrical and mechanical engineering at technical officer level are receiving the same budget treatment as other areas. We feel that this is potentially disastrous since indications are that we will require a substantial increase in these types of personnel within the next two years. Figures of 200 to 300 are being quoted.

If we do not train them in South Australia the alternative will be to import them from interstate or overseas which would defeat at least two of the declared purposes of the project.

My remarks in this grievance debate may be of a disparate nature, but they are not disjointed. I quote now from a letter that the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy Incorporated sent to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins) after it received a copy of comments made by the Minister to a biannual meeting of the Public Service Association. The letter states:

Dear Minister,

The chamber has had the opportunity to study the full text of your address given to the Public Service Association of South Australia on 26 July 1987 and on its behalf I must express our serious concern about its implications.

The chamber takes strong issue with some specific statements made as set out below:

1. Your quote 'After discovering what in some cases have been major sources of energy, governments have virtually handed them over to private enterprise with very little State control.' This is a disturbing statement, both as to factual content and the inference that the State does not benefit from discovery and development of the State's resources by private enterprise. The chamber is not aware of any major discoveries as such being made by the State. South Australian Department of Mines and Energy (SADME) has acted upon reports of coal occurrences in the State and has carried out the necessary programs to prove up these deposits notably Leigh Creek, Bowmans and Moorlands. Leigh Creek has of course been developed by and is owned by ETSA. The department is well recognised as performing a highly professional role as an effective regulatory authority and in carrying out reviews, surveys and documenting their work in publications and maps... However, the work carried out by SADME does not pretend to be capable in itself of 'making discoveries'—discoveries are the result of the expenditure of large amounts of risk money by mining and petroleum companies, primarily by way of minerals and petroleum exploration drilling.

And so the letter continues. It is too long to quote, but later it states:

2. Your quote: '... in order for the entire State to benefit from these major assets, the public sector could or arguably should have been the owner and developer of these resources.' [Presumably this implies equity investment in the resources, because as

pointed out above, legal ownership of the resources is already vested in the State.]

Public sector ownership can be brought about by one of two methods. Firstly, the State could have outlaid the \$1 billion of high risk exploration expenditure over the last 10 years in order to discover the resources itself. The chamber believes that there is ample evidence to demonstrate that public sector expenditure in such areas is not as effective as private sector expenditure. Alternatively, having granted exploration licences to the private sector the State could have waited until the private sector outlaid the risk money and then acquired from the private sector the resources that have been established as a result of the exploration expenditures by that private sector. Clearly, if the State was to pay market values for established resources such as Cooper Basin oil and gas reserves or Roxby gold/copper/uranium reserves the State outlays would be many billions of dollars—beyond the capacity of the State finances, even if it were an appropriate step to take in principle. If the State was to pay anything less than market values, this would amount to expropriation and the consequences for future investment in South Australia would of course be tragic.

The letter continues in this vein and again quotes the Minister. Copies were sent to the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I managed to obtain a copy, too. I have read some of this letter into the record because the Premier's minders may not have passed it on to him in his reportedly busy schedule. I would like the Parliament to know that the Chamber of Mines and Energy did not let go unnoticed those outrageous sentiments of the Minister of Labour, who, despite his left wing socialism, was making quite preposterous suggestions to the Public Service Association.

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

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I will briefly address a number of matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report which happen to lie within the province of the two portfolio areas I cover, namely, employment and technology, and labour. It is interesting to note that the items highlighted under 'Audit Issues' at the beginning of the Auditor-General's Report concerned, first, the Timber Corporation—and this Parliament has certainly been subjected to a very strong debate on that topic. The next item related to technical and further education and concerned the buying of the hotel. I think that the Auditor pointed to the fact that the Government had not been telling the truth as far as its profitability was concerned. Indeed, the Premier and the Minister told this House that it was going to be a profit-making venture.

To his credit the Auditor-General highlighted the fact that that profit was being calculated not on the full cost but on some estimate which excluded the necessary capital input, that is, the money that was necessary to set up the venture. Under no accounting terms could that be classed as profit unless the basic costs or the costs of the repayment of capital were included.

The other item was the infamous yabbie farm, which was developed in the Riverland costing the Community Employment Program in excess of \$700 000. It was pointed out that that was a very poorly managed exercise. To keep the matter in context, it is worth noting that the areas highlighted in the report, particularly relating to my portfolio areas, are matters that have been raised previously and about which nothing has been done.

For example, we heard earlier that a report was produced on the management of the school bus system. The Auditor has since indicated in his report that no action was taken by the then Minister of Education and the now Minister of State Development and Technology on this matter, with the result that losses of more than \$2 million were sustained. I make the point that there are occasions when Governments can be expected to make mistakes. What this Parliament

and the people of South Australia cannot condone is the fact that, when the information is made available, the problems are highlighted and nothing is done. We saw that with the school bus system.

I now take up the issue of management of Community Employment Programs. According to my estimation, more than \$100 million has been spent in this State on CEPs. To me, that has been a tragic waste of money through poor management, and the poor management has been evident right from the beginning. It has been the Opposition's contention from the start, when the Bannon Government came to power in this State, that if it was going to spend this money on its little dream child then it should be spent wisely. The Auditor-General has pointed to deficiencies in the management of these schemes ever since their inception. However, we continually see, in report after report and from other areas, criticisms of the way in which the schemes are managed.

I refer members to page 73 of the Auditor-General's Report which talks about the yabbie farm. How could the debacle of the yabbie farm have occurred if the rules had been followed and the department had taken the time to manage the project properly? It is not good enough for Ministers to duck their responsibilities. It is not good enough for Ministers to say that they will look at it in a year's time. The deficiencies of management have been highlighted now for some four years, yet the Ministers of this Government have chosen to ignore them. Why they have chosen to ignore them is beyond me, because the taxpayers are paying a very high price for some of these little enterprises. Members can read, in their own time, the audit investigation of the yabbie farm.

The underlying message is that it was a tragic waste of money. Who is responsible? I suggest that the Minister of Labour in this House shares some responsibility for that debacle. It is now under the responsibility of the Minister of Employment and Further Education. We are given to understand by the Auditor-General that CEPs are still not being managed properly. He said that there has been a review, which disclosed that the same problems exist now as existed in the beginning. Of course, he comments that the Community Employment Program is being wound down and that by the end of this financial year all funds will be expended.

That is no excuse for wasting what is there. There are a number of projects in my area, if we were going to use the Community Employment Program, which could have received some funding. Knowing the people concerned, I believe they would have been managed correctly. The sum of \$12 million including major sponsors was allocated in 1986-87 for projects funded by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth Employment Program. I understand that this year, the ultimate wind-down, there will be some \$10 million made available.

The money has to be accounted for. We cannot just throw it away, which seems to be what the Government is doing and has done it in so many areas. I hope that, if Government members have any pretensions to being Ministers, they will read this report, because on page after page there is an indictment of the poor management of this Government. I do not know whether they do not care, or whether they do not have the skills of organisation or management, but they stand indicted for their total lacklustre performance. This State simply cannot afford to throw away the massive amounts of money in all the areas that have been outlined over the past few weeks and expect the people out there who have been hit hard—whether it be on the buses, at the petrol stations, through land tax or through all the

other charges that are being made by the Government—to stand by and see it being wasted in such a way.

The last area I wish to address is again an area of neglect. This is in the workers compensation and occupational safety areas, which are connected. I have raised this matter before—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I certainly have had a look at the Government payout, and it is quite horrific. For the edification of the Parliament, in 1983 net claims paid were \$11.5 million; in 1986-87, \$29.7 million.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Yes, indeed. If we look at the departments that were deficient, we find that the Education Department went from \$1.7 million in 1982-83 to \$8.8 million in 1986-87—a 410 per cent increase. The Police Department suffered a 236 per cent increase over the same period, probably because of the stress and assaults its officers have had to suffer because this Government does not get its law and order policies right. In the area of correctional services, in 1982-83 it was costing the Government \$339 000, which rose to \$1.8 million in 1986-87—a 423 per cent increase.

I have alluded to this information before. In fact, the Auditor-General referred to it in his report and said that we have to do a little more work in the Education Department and Department of Correctional Services. What has this Government been doing over the past five years? It is the Government that brought the occupational safety and workers compensation legislation before this Parliament, but it does not want to look after the people who belong to the public sector. Their record is far worse than one would find in the private sector.

This is a Government that believes in enacting laws for everyone but itself. The proof is within these budget papers: this blow-out in workers compensation is a direct result of this Government's neglect and its inability to address those things coming under its responsibility.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I wish to continue in this grievance debate where my colleague the member for Mitcham left off, namely, on the matter of WorkCover. I would like to detail to the House the situation of a contract shearer or contract agent. This person, who is resident in the electorate of Goyder and employs up to 17 shearers on a regular basis, is a reasonably large employer of labour in the rural sector. In fact, he has some 85 contracts, namely, the farmers who use the services of his shearers throughout the year.

Under the old workers compensation system, farmers took out workers compensation and the contract shearer acted as the organiser and tax agent on a percentage basis. Under the new system, it appears that it is not possible to be such an agent. However, the contract shearer now has to take out the WorkCover, being classed as an employer. So, there is the first difference which occurs under the new system *versus* the old.

I suppose that the obvious question is: how does this affect costs to farmers? Under the present system, farmers pay workers compensation at a rate, from the figures given to me, varying between 11.8 and 12.3 per cent. As a matter of interest, if the contract shearer wished to take out workers compensation for the same type of person, his rate would have been 28.3 per cent under the present system.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** My colleague the member for Murray-Mallee says it is up to 72 per cent in some instances—a huge difference. Perhaps I had better not dwell on the current system as it will be changing in a few weeks. The new rate for a farmer employing shearers, according to my infor-

mation, is 4.5 per cent, and it is interesting to compare that new rate for the contract shearer, remembering that the former rate for farmers was about 12 per cent; the contract shearer from 28 per cent upwards.

The new rate for the farmer is 4.5 per cent—a very significant reduction. Is the reduction as good for the contract shearer? My word! Not only is it as good, but it comes down to 3.8 per cent from about 28 per cent or more. I would love to know how they managed to arrive at such a variation when one would assume that they would use some of the old figures to work out what should be charged. Under the old system, the average salary cost to the farmer per shearer was \$346 per week over 47 working weeks, remembering that the figure I am quoting applied to this one contract shearer in the electorate of Goyder.

On those figures, workers compensation worked out at \$13.15 per week per shearer, or \$2.63 per day. It was that \$2.63 per day that the farmer or the contract shearer had to take into account. Under the new WorkCover system, from details currently available, the farmer will be liable to pay \$678 or more—and, apparently, that 'or more' could go up to \$1 000 for the first week a shearer is off work on workers compensation. That is a new cost.

The new cost for WorkCover works out at \$30.51 per week or \$6.10 per day, compared to \$2.63 per day previously. So, there has been an increase of \$3.47 per day per shearer under the new WorkCover conditions, because of the variations, first, to the percentage area; and, secondly, in the limitations on who can and cannot be an employer for the shearers, compared to the old system. This is estimated by my constituent to cost his clients—that is, about 85 clients—an extra \$6 000 in any one year. So much for what the new WorkCover will do for the rural sector! It will add a very unnecessary cost burden. In fact, on the figures I have quoted, it will cost the average farmer an extra \$10 per day for a three-man shed of shearers, and that does not take into account the roustabouts or the wool classer.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Hanson interjects and says, 'How are they going to recover that?' Obviously, the farmers will not recover it, because their price on the international market cannot be adjusted upwards. If their costs increase, they simply take a smaller return.

It is tragic that this appears to be the case. I would say that the contract shearers and some of the farmers concerned will take it to the respective people on the WorkCover System, and I hope it can be worked out. Why should it be only now, two to three weeks before the system is due to come into operation, that this sort of anomaly is discovered? Why could not the Government have given prior thought to making sure that such anomalies could be corrected a long time ago? This is something that I believe this House will hear more of and I hope that the Minister will at least show some commonsense.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Some chance, yes. No commonsense has been shown to date, but you never know; there is a first time for everything, and the Government can at least try to correct the situation for the rural producers.

The second item, with which I wish to deal briefly, is the difference in price between city and country petrol. I mentioned yesterday the major variation of 20c or more that occurred last week. I also mentioned that I welcomed the drop in the ocean, 2c per litre, that is not going to apply to Yorke Peninsula. I would like to mention the price that country sellers are paying for their petrol: the latest indication to me, as at 24 August 1987, was that 54.85c per litre was paid for super petrol and 54.54c per litre was paid

for unleaded petrol as a wholesale price. That is the price that the garage or the petrol reseller would pay on Yorke Peninsula before he sells it. Obviously he has to have some margin. Consider the absurdity of the situation when last week petrol was selling for 36-37c per litre in the city and petrol retailers were still making a profit.

The system is grossly unfair and it has to be corrected. The Government must step in and take action in a situation where the country petrol reseller cannot buy petrol for less than 54c per litre. I see a couple of members opposite laughing. I think it is time that they woke up, addressed the problem in South Australia, and gave some thought to the people who live in the country and have to travel long distances.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** That is typical of their inaction. As long as they are getting a good deal living in the city they are quite content. People in country areas are becoming sick and tired of it. Keep laughing, laugh all the more! The message will eventually get through. This is a situation that needs to be addressed. It cannot continue on as it has during the life of this Government. For nearly five years when it was in Opposition members opposite were up in arms asking that the then Government address the problem. They have had nearly five years to do something about it but have done nothing. That is a very poor reflection on the State Government.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I wish to refer to an article appearing in the newspapers in the last few days in which the member for Playford refers to the difficulties political Parties are having—including candidates in obtaining funding for elections. I wondered when reading that article whether the vast majority of South Australians—in fact, all Australians—realise that the taxpayer is already funding political Parties—and candidates if they are lucky—at elections. For example under an Act in Federal Parliament which was brought in by the Australian Labor Party at the 1984 election, money was authorised to be paid from the taxpayer's purse to those political Parties which had candidates who obtained 4 per cent or more of the first preference formal vote. That also applied to individuals if they stood independently from a Party.

The sum of \$17.8 million was made available that year. It is interesting to note how the money was allocated even though each State had to put in a submission on behalf of its Party—or, in the case of individual candidates, a submission on their own behalf. The major recipients were the ACT referendum first group, which received \$1 777 (that was not a large amount); the Australian Democrats throughout Australia received \$464 620; the Australian Labor Party, \$3 669 264; the democratic Labor Party, \$497 (not a large amount, but would have bought bickies for their party to celebrate the loss); the Liberal Party received \$2 597 282; the National Party, \$814 003; the Northern Territory Country Liberal Party, \$25 284; the Nuclear Disarmament Party, \$201 915; and Senator Harradine received \$7 039 (he ran as an Independent Tasmanian Senator). I will not go through all the minority groups, but the total was approximately \$8 million. We do not have the individual figures for the last Federal election, but the total amount paid was \$10.4 million.

We can see how clever political Parties can be. I belong to one of them, even though I sit here as an Independent. They are very clever, because when the ALP brought the Bill through Federal Parliament, it said in the Bill that a person would be entitled to 60c for every vote they could get in the House of Representatives and 30c for every vote in the Senate.

It included in the Bill other provisions to take account of inflationary trends and incremental gains. In fact, in the 1984 election, the first election to be publicly funded, the amount paid was 60.2c for the House of Representatives vote and 30.6c for the Senate. For the 1987 election the actual vote received for the House of Representatives was paid at a rate of 76.96c—in other words, more than three-quarters of a dollar for each House of Representatives vote—and for the Senate, 38.148c. In total, political Parties were receiving close to \$1.15 for every formal vote cast by an Australian citizen at the last election. Australian citizens were paying \$1.15 of their own money to support a political Party and in a couple of cases an Independent candidate. The more people who voted informal, the more the people saved in their taxes. So, if all of them had voted informally that would have saved \$10.4 million of taxpayers' funds.

The member for Playford argued that we could get rid of skulduggery in politics. He is saying that it is there and that it will get greater if we do not have public funding. He was telling us that political Parties cannot manage their affairs, yet they want the people to elect them to manage the country. What he is saying is that they cannot manage on the money that they receive: they overspend. They do not have to overspend. They decide to spend more than they have got in the great goal of winning to govern and, when they have overspent, they squeal and say that they cannot afford elections and that they might get it in some dishonest or some other area that is perhaps not very savoury.

It is unbelievable that anyone would argue that people seek to be elected to govern and manage the State or the country but that they cannot manage their own Party finances. It is a scandalous, a disgrace. I am amazed that the group in Canberra referred to as the Rat Pack, the journalists who sit in the Press Gallery, have allowed to operate in Australia a system where, in 1984, \$7.8 million of taxpayers' funds went to political Parties because Parliamentarians from those Parties passed the Bill through Federal Parliament. Within three years the cost has escalated to \$10.4 million. What will be the cost at the next election? About \$13 million or \$14 million of taxpayers' money will go to political Parties whose elected members get their salary, but the Parties are saying that they want taxpayers to fund their campaigns.

What happens to the poor individual? One can only claim these funds after the election, based on the number of votes obtained. If one believes in a democracy, if an individual has to have a chance and if he stands against a Party—not in the circumstances I was in, but where they are coming in from the wilderness out in the community and they want to run as an individual—they do not have any great publicity campaign behind them. They are not over-rich, and some political Parties, according to the member for Playford, are not over-rich. If an individual wants to run a campaign, the person cannot get the money until after the election yet the Parties have the millions that they have already been paid to fight the individual. What a disgrace. If we in this State go to more public funding of political Parties, I will attack it and I hope that all of those who have a genuine conscience about the matter will attack it.

What happens in the end is that we do not gain any extra justified expenditure of taxpayers' money. If we give \$1 million to one mob and \$1 million to another mob, they will use it to fight each other. They only spend more to achieve the same goal and they are advertising with one amount against another. We would be better off to give the money to the poor and to tell the political Parties to manage their affairs in a proper way. If they do not, they do not

deserve to govern. I oppose the proposition put in recent times by the member for Playford.

### JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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

This Bill proposes an amendment to section 106 of the Justices Act 1921 dealing with committal proceedings. The Bill provides a re-statement of section 106 with amendments to allow for a child's evidence to be presented at a committal through a person who took the child's statement. The amendments arose out of the recommendations made by the Government's Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse. Other legislative amendments arising from the report are being finalised and should be introduced into Parliament shortly.

The amendments to the Justices Act are being addressed separately because of the increasing number of cases where young children are being required to attend at committals to give oral evidence. This is seen as highly undesirable and places a child witness at a considerable disadvantage to an adult witness.

At the committal hearing the evidence of witnesses can be submitted by declarations, that in written statements which are declared and witnessed. This causes problems where a child is not considered old enough to make a declaration pursuant to section 106 (3). In such cases the only method of having the child's evidence considered at the committal is to require the child to give oral testimony.

The amendment to the Justices Act 1921 would allow the evidence of a child under 10 years of age to be admitted through the declaration of a person who took the child's statement. Where a videorecording of the child's interview has been made, the videorecording and a transcript of the recording verified by affidavit could be presented to the court. This procedure would allow the court to consider the transcript without having to resort to viewing the videorecording in full—a process which would be very time consuming.

The proposed amendment will ensure that the statements of young children are admitted and considered at the committal hearing.

The Solicitor-General has advised that, in his view, the amendments would be procedural and apply to any proceedings instituted before the commencement of the Act. The Government accepts this advice but considers that in order to remove any potential for dispute and unnecessary litigation the legislation should state specifically that the amendments extend to cover proceedings instituted before the commencement of the legislation. The Bill provides accordingly.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 provides that the amendments will apply in relation to legal proceedings commenced before the com-

mencement of the measure as well as those commenced after its commencement.

Clause 4 provides for the insertion of a definition of 'sexual offence' in the principal Act. The definition corresponds to the definition contained in the Evidence Act.

Clause 5 provides for the revamping of section 106 of the principal Act. The new provision will allow a record of interview or a video recorded statement of a child who is the victim of an alleged sexual offence to be admitted at the preliminary examination in respect of the offence.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL

Debate resumed.

(Continued from this page.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This evening, I wish to clear up any misunderstandings on the part of the Deputy Premier on my stand over the proposal that the Glenelg sewage treatment works pump sewage sludge into the sea. As I have said previously we at Glenelg North, and particularly my constituents at West Beach, are sick and tired of the attitude of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to the environment of our gulf. For 20 years there have been continuing reports of the degradation of the sea grasses and the marine life in that area. Indeed, there is now hardly any seaweed in an area that once contained luxuriant marine growth. When he was Minister, the Hon. Des Corcoran emphatically denied such statements and protected E&WS Department staff, and now we have the present Minister trying to do the same thing. It is about time that someone in the department faced the realities of life and the damage that the department's actions have caused the environment there.

To put the whole thing into perspective, I quote the following extract from a letter dated 21 August 1987 from the shop stewards of the AMWSU (ASE) at the Glenelg treatment works to the engineer of the works:

The operating personnel at the GTW have placed a black ban on the new by-pass pipework at sludge to sea pumping station as from 1500 hours on 21.8.87. We disagreed with the T.60 issued on 20.8.87, for health and environment reasons.

We feel that urgent attention is needed in this matter from the Health and Environment Departments due to the nature of the materials which would be pumped out by by-passing the screening system. The material is not only offensive but also pollutes the environment and could be a health risk to the public, bird and sea life. We would like to be notified within one week of progress on this matter.

That letter was sent by the very people who operate the treatment works and are involved in handling this material. For them to impose a black ban was a serious action because as they and everyone else, especially Government members, know, no-one places a black ban on a job without good reason. That is especially important when concern is felt for the health of the community. The following is the instruction issued in the T.60 to the works personnel of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on 20 August 1987 regarding the pipeline work change to sludge to sea pump station:

The pipework modifications being carried out at the sludge to sea pump station are to evaluate the feasibility of pumping digested sludge direct from the digesters to sea using the existing sludge transfer pumps. The successful modification will save costs in two ways:

- (1) reduce annual maintenance costs by eliminating the need for the sludge to sea pump station;
- (2) save future expenditure required to upgrade the pumps and screen in the sludge to sea pump station.

That notice was signed by Jerry Brown who is described as 'A/TE Glenelg'. On 4 September, Jerry Brown also issued the following notice:

As discussed three letters are attached providing approval to remove the screens on the sludge to sea P.S. on a trial basis.

I shall read those letters. The first, from the South Australian Department of Fisheries to Mr D.J. Alexander, Chief Executive Officer, E&WS Department, dated 24 July 1987 and directed to the attention of Dr D.A. Steffensen, states:

I respond to your letter of 15 July 1987 seeking agreement on the removal of course screens from the sludge to sea pipeline at the Glenelg sewage treatment works. Following our recent consultation and on-site inspection, the Department of Fisheries' view is that the screens may be removed on the understanding that the present pipeline is to be replaced within the next 2-3 years, discharging much further offshore and in deeper water. This removal is also conditional on agreement that, if there are either complaints from the public concerning the aesthetics of the sludge material on the metropolitan beaches or that it becomes apparent that the material is detrimental to the discharge area, the screens will be replaced.

The Deputy Premier, who is also Minister of Water Resources, knows jolly well the attitude of the Department of Fisheries. The letter from that department continues:

Conversely, if there are not firm proposals to replace the current pipe, the requirements of our original discussions should be implemented. That is, the screens be removed for a trial 6-12 months period during which time impact of the additional sludge load discharge will be periodically assessed. This option will require a pre-removal inspection. I consider this reflects our discussions and agreements reached.

The letter was, signed 'R.K. Lewis, Acting Director of Fisheries'. The next letter, dated 18 August 1987, and sent by the Chief Executive Officer of the E&WS Department to the Director of the Department of Fisheries, states:

I refer to your letter of 24 July 1987 regarding removal of screens from the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works sludge pipe. Although rehabilitation of the Glenelg sludge pipe is being considered, no firm decision has been made on the method to be adopted or on the timing of the work. It is proposed to proceed with the removal of the screens for a trial period of 12 months with periodic visual inspections of the area. The screens will be replaced if significant environmental deterioration, associated with the removal of the screens, becomes apparent.

The letter was signed by D. J. Alexander. So, there were no ifs and buts about the proposal or about the trial period. It is on. Mr Alexander and I have known each other for 20 years, during which time we have fought over the environment in my electorate. The third letter, dated 25 August 1987 and sent from the Department of Environment and Planning to the Chief Executive Officer of the E&WS Department, states:

I refer to your letter of 15 July 1987 on the above matter and our reply of 3 August 1987, which expressed our view that 'in the absence of a trial run to assess the impact of unscreened sludge we would prefer that screening operations be continued'.

I stress that this letter is from the Department of Environment and Planning, of which the Minister of Water Resources is also the ministerial head, so here we have a conflict of interest between the Minister for Environment and Planning, whose department says that the screens should remain, and the Minister of Water Resources, whose department wants the screens removed. As the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Water Resources are one and the same Minister, that Minister must shed one of his ministerial responsibilities. The letter from the Department of Environment and Planning continues:

Subsequent discussion on this matter had indicated that the quantity of screened solids (consisting of matted fibrous materials, plastic, etc.) could be substantially less than the amount envisaged and that there was adequate time to run a suitable trial, to assess

the impact of unscreened sludge, before any decision on capital works requirements (to change the pumping arrangements) needed to be made. We envisage that a simple low cost photographic or video assessment of the impact of unscreened sludge would be quite satisfactory. This could be run over a period of about a year—by which time any significant accumulation of additional debris could be readily identified.

So, even the Department of Environment and Planning backed down. Then, earlier this year, with regard to the effluent pipe, I complained that two holes had been discovered in it approximately 15 metres beyond the low water mark. The Minister said that the repair work would be carried out and informed me that the effluent discharge in the pipe is chlorinated in summer and that he considered there was no increased risk to bathers. However, the Minister made the following admission:

Nevertheless, arrangements have been made to erect a warning sign to the anchor block advising persons to keep clear.

So, the E&WS Department does not know what it is doing. The Department of Environment and Planning is in conflict with the Minister, who is responsible for these two portfolios, and the Premier should relieve him of one of them. One cannot have a Minister claiming that he wants to protect the environment and is in charge of the department when, on the other hand, he is in charge of another department which has caused the worst damage to the gulf of all time and which is prepared to take a risk on a 12 month basis to pump sludge directly into the sea and create an environment where we will not be able to use the beach. The local residents oppose this trial under any circumstances. We will not have the E&WS Department pumping sludge into the sea. It has done it under the screening system at present in the evening so that the big brown blob that comes up three kilometres from the coast cannot be seen. As soon as the sun goes down up comes the sludge.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Time and time again we see the Government, and particularly the Premier representing the Government, claiming credit for various developments that are going ahead in South Australia. On numerous occasions we have heard the Premier claiming credit for the ASER development but now that it is running into a massive cost overrun it suddenly is no longer a Government project but a private enterprise project. It is interesting to note that every project that goes financially bad in South Australia is suddenly no longer a Government project.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Yes, suddenly it is thrown back into the lap of private enterprise, whose fault it is. We have heard a great deal from the Premier, who is endeavouring to justify the overruns of the ASER project and is not accepting any responsibility for it. I now cite another example of the same sort of financial approach that the Government adopts in so many projects in which it becomes involved. Page 141 of the Auditor-General's Report, referring to projects under the Department of Marine and Harbors, states:

The two major items transacted through the Reimbursement Account during the year were:

*Troubridge Replacement Vessels:* In October 1984, approval was given to construct a vessel (MV *Island Seaway*) to replace the MV *Troubridge* and for the Department of Marine and Harbors to be the project manager.

A bounty, payable under Commonwealth legislation, estimated to be \$3.9 million is payable by the Commonwealth and will partly offset the costs of construction.

About the Government, it goes on to say:



Without going to tender a contract was let to a South Australian company in March 1986 to construct the vessel. The estimated cost of the project at that date was \$15.6 million or \$12.5 million net of bounty.

That is without the \$3.9 million provided by the Federal Government. The report continues:

It was expected that the vessel would be completed before June 1987.

This is another example of the Government deciding to build a new vessel involving what I would describe as a totally inappropriate way of spending what will now be something like \$20 million of taxpayers money without putting that project to tender. The Auditor General continues:

At 30 June 1987, the vessel had not been completed. Estimated costs, at that date had risen to \$19.4 million gross (\$15.5 million net).

This is in fact a net \$15.5 million allowing for the Commonwealth contribution. We really do not have much change left out of \$20 million. The report continues:

The increase of \$3.8 million in the gross estimated cost was due mainly to:

	\$'000
Rise and fall .....	1 350
Contract variations .....	976
Foreign exchange variations .....	410
Reimbursement of costs incurred by company due to late receipt of drawings .....	450

Payments to 30 June 1987 were \$12.5 million (net of bounty). Construction of the vessel is being financed by the South Australia Government Financing Authority (SAFA), which, to 30 June 1987 had advanced \$16.5 million.

We see this approach from the Government time and time again. Rather than putting things out to tender getting the best possible price and having a project completely tied up, we find these massive overruns time and time again. The ASER project is a good example. Where that project will finish is anyone's guess.

In the House only a few days ago the Premier acknowledged that the overrun was enormous, getting up towards double the original estimated cost, and the project is a long way from being completed. As long as the Government enters into its business arrangements on this basis, with Ministers entering into agreements for the construction of vessels or other projects costing large sums of money without going to competitive tender, the taxpayer will never get full value for money. This seems to be the way in which the Government works, and it is typical of many Labor Governments that we have seen in the past. As long as this continues, I believe that we will continue to see massive overruns such as we have in the budget, because that is indicative of the way in which the Government operates.

This State now has a total annual interest bill of something like \$575 million—an enormous amount. In fact, 56 cents in every dollar of revenue collected goes towards paying interest on former commitments. This climb has continued at an alarming rate. Only six or eight years ago it was 40 odd cents in the dollar, and that was bad enough. It has now escalated to 56c in the dollar only a matter of some five or six years down the track. One can imagine the situation we will be in 20 years time if we continue in that direction. We will not be paying 56c but 70c or 80c in the dollar for every dollar that is collected.

No wonder the capital works program is declining at an alarming rate—and that is exactly what has happened. The capital works program is down by 18 per cent but overall budget spending is up. This can only get worse from year to year. One does not have to be a mathematician to work that out. No private business could ever survive if it was forever paying a higher and higher percentage of its income

in interest. The capital works program in real terms is down dramatically to some 18 per cent, yet the total budget this year is up to \$4 018 million, which is a significant increase on what it was last year.

In fact, the people of South Australia are contributing considerably more in all forms of taxation in this State, yet the capital works program, which will create real jobs in the long term and create the permanent employment that is needed, is just not there. More and more of it is going in an ever increasing and inflated Public Service. When we look at the expansion that has occurred in that area since late 1982, when the Bannon Government came to office, we are talking about some 13 000 additional employees in the Public Service and the area of statutory authorities. That is where our money is going: in inflated Public Service and statutory authority employment, and in massive increases in repayment of debts when we consider that we are now up to 56 cents in the dollar.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate. I believe that last night we had a classic illustration of the newfound concern, 'Liberalism with heart'. That was amply demonstrated by the member for Murray-Mallee, who said:

This action is taken in those communities at the same time as the Government is fully funding four new health and social welfare councils, and 17 new child-care facilities in the metropolitan area. Those facilities are not for preschool education, or whatever. They are for the children of the yuppies: the greedy, not the needy.

If ever we have heard and had demonstrated a clear illustration of what the Liberal Party is about, it came from the backbenches last night. Here was their Leader mouthing off in the press, but the deep rooted and basic philosophy of the Liberal Party manifested itself in this House last night. A report in the *Advertiser* states:

The Address in Reply delivered this week by the South Australian Opposition Leader (Mr Olsen) may prove to be one of the more important statements of Liberal Party philosophy if it can be followed through to government in the 1990s.

It goes on to say:

The carefully written and researched speech put a human face on the Liberal Party by targeting those constituencies.

And so it goes on. That, of course, is what it is all about: to put up this facade, this falseness, to try to fool the people out there. I know in my heart who I represent. I know the people out at Munno Para, at Elizabeth, at Seaton and at Port Adelaide. They know who we represent. We are the ones—the Labor Party. Let us go back a few years in this country. Who started the child-care centres? Who were the ones from the Federal Government down to the State who were providing facilities for the working class in this country?

*Members Interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** The member for Coles can have her opportunity in a moment. I will go on without being interrupted. Let us have a look for that new-found concern for the Aborigines who want these child-care centres, and the ethnic communities in this state. Where is this concern? It manifested itself last night in this place in the member for Murray-Mallee, who has aspirations for the front bench. God help us if he ever gets there! These are the people who express concern about not enough nurses in the hospitals here in South Australia; not enough doctors; not enough professional people available—people who wish to go back into the work force, who wish to be retrained, but who need child-care centres.



Down in my patch in Albert Park we have them near the QEH, in Glenburnie Avenue, in my electorate. The member for Henley Beach has struggled ever since he has been in this place to try to get a child-care centre—and there are many others. The member for Coles is smiling, but deep down it is hurting, because the truth has been clearly demonstrated here.

**An honourable member:** She's ashamed of her colleagues.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, and so she ought to be. If a woman wants to be retrained and has the opportunity to go back into the workforce, let us provide the facilities whereby she can place her children. Let us give her the opportunity. Why should we have to bring doctors and other qualified people from overseas when we have these very same people in this country, in this State, looking for the opportunity? We need those 17 child-care centres and other facilities for those who are disadvantaged in our community.

Consider the member for Fisher, for example: 22.5 per cent of his electorate is under 10 years of age, and here is the member for Murray-Mallee talking about yuppies! The stupidity of that man is beyond belief! I can understand someone in Opposition attacking the policies of this Government, but let it be done in a proper and constructive manner, not with a diatribe such as we were fed in this place last night—an utter diatribe. It was the greatest load of drivel I have heard in the eight years or so I have been in this Parliament. Members opposite know it—and we know it.

This is the new-found concern—'Olsen pitches radical plan at traditional Labor voters': if that is a demonstration of what the Liberal Party is about, then I am pleased that it has come to the attention of this place. The Liberal Party will not forget what was said here in this place last night. Let us have a look at the caption to the cartoon in the *Advertiser* in August of this year:

We want to help the poor and underprivileged... like the Liberal Party!

Indeed, they certainly need some help when we hear such diatribe.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Bankrupt? Indeed, they are bankrupt. This is Liberal Party policy manifesting itself time and time again in this place in the past few days. We on this side know what it is like to be disadvantaged. We come from working stock. We came up through the traps, and we know what it is like. The member for Peake started work when he was 13 years of age: he knows all about being disadvantaged, as do many of us on this side of the House. The member for Murray-Mallee ought to be back there milking his goats, or looking after sheep and cattle, because that is about the extent of his concern for the electorate.

I was dismayed and disgusted at his contribution here last night. Correctly so, members opposite now want to duck for cover. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of 21 August, headed 'Liberalism with heart', makes a great statement:

It speaks of safety nets for the genuinely disadvantaged.

That is rather interesting. I do not know who wrote the speech for the member for Murray-Mallee. Perhaps it was written in the Leader of the Opposition's office. I would not be surprised. It continues:

It speaks of touching future voters, the young.

There is a good example of how they touch the young: they will touch them all right. They will touch them in such a way that we will have more problems in the community. Give those children the opportunity to go to the child-care centres where they can get the love and attention they need and have the opportunity to learn what life is all about,

rather than some of them being locked at home. It is in extreme cases I know, but mothers have gone out to work and left their children home locked up all day.

That is the situation we have had in this State in the past and here we have the member for Murray-Mallee really showing his true colours in this place last night. There was his so-called concern for the welfare and for the future of children in this State; his concern for the Aboriginal communities out at Munno Para and Elizabeth, as I said—those places where they are certainly in dire need of child-care centres.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I agree with the Minister, who knows and represents his area well. Down south we have the same needs, yet last night the member for Murray-Mallee was saying, 'They're for the children of yuppies: the greedy, not the needy.' I do not know where he has been. I think that he must have been in cloud cuckoo land for the past seven or eight years that he has been a member of this place, because he has certainly not shown a great deal of compassion for children, for those disadvantaged in the community and, particularly, for the women.

If that is the attitude that the Liberal Party has towards women in this State, women will not be fooled. There is an old saying that if you want to touch a woman, touch a woman through a child. That is a true statement. If you hurt a woman's child then you hurt that woman. Here is an example which was manifest last night by the Liberal Party. It will live to regret, as indeed the past member for Davenport, Dean Brown, lived to regret his statements about supporting the disadvantaged and those people in need of rehabilitation. I am talking about the period after I began in Parliament in 1979. The member for Mitcham knows what I am talking about and he is not going to shout me down. He may put on a false laugh, but my colleagues know of this false facade that has been adopted by the Leader of the Opposition. We need child care centres and we will get them.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** In this brief grievance debate I would like to speak about the future growth and development of metropolitan Adelaide. Yesterday in the House the Minister tabled a series of reports which reflect the Government's decisions in future planning in relation to the growth of metropolitan Adelaide. At the outset I would like to commend the author of that report, which is in the form of a booklet entitled 'Adelaide: its future development.' It is a pleasure to read a document that is simply, clearly and concisely expressed. All the relevant information is presented in an admirable fashion, and I feel sure that the booklet will serve a very useful purpose in informing the people of this city and this State and in encouraging public debate. It is the question of public debate with which I would like to deal tonight.

In the two years since publication of the policy paper 'Long-term options for the development of metropolitan Adelaide', commissioned by the Government from Kinhill, there has been debate about the planning for the future, but I would suggest that it has been on what I would call the planning intelligentsia level, that is to say the professionals and those people who have an interest of one kind or another, be it as elected representatives or as planning professionals, in the future growth of this city. I do not believe that at this stage the residents in the suburbs who will be affected by these future policies are aware of what is being proposed, notwithstanding some media reports, and

I think it is absolutely essential that the documents that were tabled in the House yesterday be presented to South Australians through the dissemination of simple literature as widely and as quickly as possible because the Government has allowed barely three months for public response to the document.

The proposals, which in simple terms amount to the choice of urban consolidation as the preferred method to accommodate the additional anticipated population of the city of Adelaide for the remainder of this century, will have tremendously far-reaching effects on this State. The proposals will affect land values, landscapes and lifestyles. For that reason it is tremendously important that every person who will be affected is aware of what is going to happen and has the opportunity to comment.

I commend those organisations that have already arranged seminars on this topic, including the Local Government Planners Association, the Institute of Urban Studies, the Metropolitan Central Region and the Royal Australian Planning Institute. I know there have been debates and presentations within the branches of the major political Parties—the ALP and the Liberal Party—and the Australian Democrats organised a seminar early last year within the confines of Parliament House. The media has contributed to the debate. In particular I would commend the *Adelaide Review* for its series of excellent articles, which I know are widely read and appreciated by those people who are interested in planning.

As both major Parties support the concept of urban consolidation—in fact that concept was embodied in the Liberal Party's planning policy which was presented before the last State election—there is unlikely to be intense political debate about urban consolidation being the preferred option. I believe there could be a bipartisan approach to the question of urban consolidation as being the most desirable way to accommodate the increase in population. It is essential to stop the urban sprawl and to ensure that the facilities and the infrastructure which already exist in metropolitan Adelaide are used to their greatest capacity.

There are a number of other benefits, most of which are enumerated in the booklet 'Adelaide: its future development.' One which is not mentioned is one which I would rate very highly, and that is the social benefit. Undoubtedly there will be stresses and strains, there may be disadvantages, but I believe there are tremendous social benefits to be gained from what I would describe as the three generational neighbourhood. In a speech to the Metropolitan Central Region on Wednesday 29 July I said that the benefits of urban consolidation for the changing population—that is, the family with a household size which is declining, the growth of non-traditional households, the factor of deferred marriage and couples living together as the norm whilst they are awaiting marriage or undergoing a transitional period in their lives—are obvious, not only for those groups but for all of us. The three generational home, with all its intrinsic human values and practical benefits, has long since ceased to be the norm, but the three generational neighbourhood with the potential to reinforce those same values and benefits becomes a real possibility with well planned urban consolidation.

I went on to say that the goals should be balance and harmony, which have traditionally been the hallmark of Adelaide's planning. We do not want whole streets or suburbs of cluster housing, home units or flats, but we do need to provide for compact economic living for an increasing number of people. It appears that both major Parties are agreed on that goal. I believe we differ, however, in the manner in which we attempt to meet the overflow, if any,

of those people who cannot be accommodated in the next 15 years through the implementation of this urban consolidation policy. The Government has suggested that the Gawler-Sandy Creek location and the Aldinga location should be frozen as sites for possible future housing development. I think it would be an absolute tragedy if the Barossa Valley were turned into a suburb of Adelaide and if the same thing were to happen to Aldinga.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The report does not say that, but that would be the necessary outcome. If those two areas were set aside for housing development we would see ribbon development from Gawler to Lyndoch, with resultant congestion and a most unattractive entrance to the Barossa Valley, the gateway to the Barossa, which is the principal wine growing region in Australia and South Australia's premier tourist region.

**Mr Duigan:** I don't think that is a fair indication at all.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That is an accurate assessment of what could also happen at Aldinga. The open plains provide a magnificent rest for the eyes when one emerges from the horrors of the South Road. The Aldinga area has a low water table which has already been adversely affected by urban development. Septic tanks are affecting the water table. The Aldinga reef is already degraded as a result of effluent and stormwater drainage. The prospect of using that area for future development is one which I believe should be rejected.

One option that has not been considered apparently by the Government is the possibility of decentralisation. Decentralisation will occur to some extent naturally and normally, even without Government incentive, as a result of three principal Western democracy trends in the next century: one is the growth of tourism; one is the growth of technology; and the other is changing lifestyles. There are an immense number of issues that flow from these reports that have been tabled. Undoubtedly, there will be intensive debate in this place: much of it will centre around the abolition of third party appeals.

A lot of policy development work will need to be done in the area of transport because, if urban consolidation becomes a reality, transport problems in Adelaide will intensify to the degree that the city may no longer be the pleasant place in which we live. If those issues are not addressed, we will be in a very serious situation with traffic congestion, and no-one should know that better than the member for Adelaide, whose constituents will be among the chief victims of that congestion. These are some of the issues that need to be addressed, and that is why I commend the distribution of this pamphlet.

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

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** In the 10 minutes available to me I want to make a few points in reply to the criticisms that the Opposition made yesterday about this financial year's budget. Most of the Opposition speeches were negative: not one positive contribution came from members opposite as to how they would have governed better—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will come to that. The setting of this year's budget was a very serious predicament for the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The honourable member must be patient. I know that what I am about to say will not please members opposite, but it is well to remember that at this year's Premiers Conference we lost \$107 million. Because of the

global borrowing limit, we were reduced \$50 million in borrowing and in the May mini budget we lost about \$30 million in Federal Government funding. All in all, that adds up to \$190 million in lost revenue.

On top of that our revenues were down 4.2 per cent for 1986-87 and our revenues for 1987-88 will be down by 6.3 per cent, something like a 10.5 per cent loss of revenue in that time. We have had a cumulative position of \$190 million in lost funding and about 10.5 per cent reduced revenues. Most Opposition speakers—in fact, all—were negative, and we heard not one positive contribution from members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition, in particular, was very negative in his presentation and said that the budget would lead to economic failure.

He was very critical of the South Australian Financing Authority, despite the fact that it is to contribute record amounts of revenue to this year's budget. I want to say, in answer to the criticisms of members opposite about how we managed the State's finances, that we need look only to the period 1979 to 1982 to see the way in which they managed the State's finances during that time.

What did they do in going to the people at the 1982 election? They told the South Australian people that they had a balanced budget, but that was not true, and we all know that it was not true. What had built up in the system was a deficit—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know that it is painful for the member for Eyre, because these are facts about the Tonkin Government's Administration, but these are the kinds of policies that members opposite would implement if they had the opportunity again. Coming into the 1982 election the then Government had built up in reality a \$63 million deficit in the system compared to the \$1.5 million surplus left by the outgoing Corcoran Government in 1979. Not only that, but during the same period the then Liberal Government used capital works moneys because it was not prepared to make the hard decisions that were necessary to ensure stability in the State's finances.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** What did members opposite do in August 1981? They transferred \$44 million in capital works moneys to fund their recurrent expenditure. They were not prepared to make the hard decisions that we had to make with FID in 1983 to raise revenue.

The Liberal Government transferred over \$44 million in capital works in 1981 and in 1982 it transferred another \$42 million in capital works moneys. This blew out to \$51.9 million. In two years they had allowed the use of capital works moneys to fund their recurrent program and, at the same time, they built up a deficit in the system of \$63 million: all in all, a loss of \$159 million or \$160 million. That is why we had a recession between 1980 and 1982: one cannot take \$100 million out of capital works without the State's economy collapsing. Indeed, that is exactly what occurred. What has this Government done in a short period? The budget papers show that the accumulated deficit to the end of June 1987 will be \$30 million.

So, since coming to office we have turned around a deficit of \$63 million that members opposite had built up in the system and we have reduced that to \$30 million. We have not used capital works moneys. Certainly, we had to in the first budget in 1983: \$28 million in capital works moneys was used to fund recurrent expenditure because of the critical condition we faced with regard to the State's revenues at that time. In August 1984 about \$25 million was proposed for the next financial year but, because we had passed the FID legislation, that did not have to be used and was not

used. As a consequence, that stayed with capital works and we were able to steer the State economically through some dangerous times by not using capital works moneys. That meant that more people were in employment and small business gained the benefits.

The only amount of capital works moneys used by this Government was the \$28 million in the August 1983 budget. Since that time no capital works moneys has been used. That is quite a remarkable turnabout in the position if one compares the way in which the Liberal Party managed the State's finances during those years. As I said, it built up a deficit of about \$63 million in the system, despite the fact that it told the people it had a balanced budget. Everyone in this place knows that that was not true. On top of that, the Liberal Government used \$100 million of capital works moneys, which induced a recession in South Australia and the Liberal Government was not prepared to make the hard decisions necessary to manage the State's finances. At the same time members opposite are critical. I heard the Leader of the Opposition being critical of SAFA, an initiative of this Government.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Whether or not it is a round robin, the fact is that, by harnessing all the moneys that are with statutory authorities, SAFA will contribute \$240 million this financial year to the revenues of the State.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I do not care how the honourable member wants to paint it: I know it is painful to learn of a successful initiative of this Government, but the South Australian Financing Authority, set up in 1983, has been highly successful. Not only is it now contributing \$240 million to this year's revenue, but it contributed \$164 million last year and \$89 million the year before that, because it is a successful Government initiative. On top of the \$240 million that it will contribute to this financial year's revenue, it has another \$209 million in reserve. Yet the Leader of the Opposition had the audacity yesterday to criticise the workings of SAFA, saying that it was not earning enough. What an absurd position to put up!

It is a Government initiative that, starting from no contribution to the State's revenue, in a few short years is now contributing some \$240 million, because it is a successful Government instrumentality. It is certainly true that it is administered by Treasury officers, but they have been successful in regard to their currency dealings overseas.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Members opposite do not like it. I am pleased that the member for Fisher has interjected. The fact is that members opposite do not like it. There is a degree of dependency on SAFA to steer us through rough times. That is why it is there: to harness the moneys available to the State Government through statutory instrumentalities, and to use that for the betterment of the State. If we took that \$240 million away, we would be in a very serious predicament. On top of that contribution to revenue of \$240 million, it still has about \$209 million in reserve, and that is endorsed by the Auditor-General. That amount is held in reserve, so that, although our revenue base may further diminish next year and the year after, we will have sufficient money to ensure that services are not depleted in South Australia.

In the time left to me I will discuss statutory authorities and the debate in the community about privatisation. We all know that members opposite would have sold off the lot, but the contribution by statutory authorities is very considerable. For example, the levy on sales from ETSA amounts to \$32 million; the contribution in lieu of income

tax from the State Bank amounts to \$20 million; and SGIC, which made a significant profit this year, will contribute about \$750 000. So almost \$53 million will go into State Government revenue as a result of the success of statutory authorities.

However, that is not the end of it because there is a return on capital from the State Bank of \$18.5 million, with \$6 million in interest from the Woods and Forests Department and ETSA contributing a further \$36 million in interest. So, all in all, we receive a significant contribution from statutory authorities. We have not heard from members opposite about how they would have managed the State's finances.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** The member for Hartley did a much better job yesterday afternoon when he was stretched out sound asleep on the Government's front bench not taking any part in what was a very vital debate. What misrepresentation the honourable member brought into the debate this evening when he talked about the Tonkin Government and its use of capital works money! The member for Hartley completely ignored the fact that the money used by the Tonkin Government from capital works was nowhere near the \$360 million of borrowings which has been taken up by the present Government this year to prop up recurrent revenue and which the people of South Australia will pay off for the next 25 to 30 years.

What about the capital works distribution for recurrent works? The member for Hartley talked about the activities of the Tonkin Government, but what it did was clear up the mess left behind after the years of the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments? The Tonkin Government had to write off \$23 million in relation to Samcor, \$16 million on Monarto (where the then Premier talked of driving around in a bubble car) and \$10 million on the frozen food factory. They are all failed ventures put up by the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments and written off by the Tonkin Government to clear the debt. That is where money from the capital works program went during the years of the Tonkin Government. The member for Hartley also conveniently failed to mention that in the first year of the Tonkin Government it reduced taxation for the people of this State by some \$30 million in relation to land tax, gift duties and stamp duties on the first home. Would the honourable member like to reintroduce that stamp duty on young people buying their first home?

The statement by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday was not based on dissatisfaction with SAFA, because it was the Liberal Party which set up the program for its creation. The Leader criticised the fact that the Government's management and direction in this enterprise is against the best interests of the people of South Australia. The Leader highlighted, for example, the fact that tertiary institutions are now being told that the money paid to them in advance by the Commonwealth must be placed with SAFA on fixed interest which is less than the interest that they could get on the open market. Therefore, the universities and colleges of advanced education will have less money to provide services for the young people who are crying out for higher education, and undue pressure will be placed on tertiary institutions which are trying to provide our young people with a rightful place in the education system.

A succession of examples was given today in the Auditor-General's Report about wastage by the Government, which the member for Hartley lauds and seeks to protect. As an example, I have only to mention the *Island Seaway* which, if it has not yet sorted out its steering, will completely miss

Kangaroo Island. There is also the millions of dollars sent down the gurgler to New Zealand. Examples are revealed every day of wastage by the Bannon Government. Quite clearly, the member for Hartley woke up from a deep sleep and thought that he was on a winner, but I point out that his contribution was far short of providing anything of use for consideration by this House.

I turn now to the Premier's reply to a question I asked on 27 August about *Survival In Our Own Land*, a book prepared on behalf of the Aboriginal community which was to have been edited and produced for the Jubilee 150. In the Premier's answer, which appears at pages 567 and 568 of *Hansard*, he attempted to belittle the work of Mrs Christobel Mattingley.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** No.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes he did. The Minister would claim that the Premier did not seek to put down Mrs Mattingley. Mrs Mattingley has attempted to respond to two letters from the Premier which appeared in the *Advertiser*, but unfortunately her letter has not been published. What are some of the truths of this matter? The Premier indicated that Mrs Mattingley did not forward the necessary material to the producer in time. However, she did provide it within the time scale allotted to her. Subsequently, the producer asked her to make certain changes, and she still provided the material in early 1986—ahead of the schedule set for her. Mrs Mattingley was also criticised for not providing an index. However, she did provide the basis of the index, although no-one can provide a final index until the galley proofs have been cleared. The index comes after—

**The Hon. H. Allison:** What about the pagination?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The pagination is extremely important if the index is to be meaningful. The Premier claimed that Mrs Mattingley was responsible for the delay, but it may be of interest to the House to know that Mr Christopher Pearson of the *Adelaide Review*, who is now responsible for production of this book, lost the galleys provided to him by Hyde Park Press, which was the nominated printer. When they went missing Mr Pearson claimed that the galleys were not delivered to him, but he has now found that he does have them and, in fact, he found them four days after the Premier replied to my question. They are just some of the facts of this matter.

He refers to the fact that I had suggested that the material be returned to the Government Printer for printing, but I did not mention the Government Printer. Indeed, that was not part of my agenda: it was merely a product of the Premier's imagination. The Premier did not refer to the fact that Mrs Mattingley had delivered to the security officer of his department, on 8 July this year, a reply to a letter that she had received from the Premier dated 7 July. It was Mrs Mattingley who required that the royalties go into a fund for the Aborigines, and it was the Premier who failed to sign the document presented to his office by Mrs Mattingley. Further, it was the Premier who wanted to alter the circumstances which would, in the opinion of Mrs Mattingley and of the Aboriginal community, not have assisted the Aborigines as well in the future.

They are but some of the answers that could be given in reply to the misleading answers given by the Premier as recently as the week before last. I do not doubt that there will be other issues relating to this Wakefield Press fiasco which will open up in the weeks and months ahead, because people in the community are less than impressed.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have the opportunity of saying a few words in this debate. I am disappointed that the member for Hartley is no longer with us, because

he was trying to get his foot on the first step of the ladder. He had his ministerial suit on, but he failed miserably. During the term of the Tonkin Government, of which he was so critical, he was in the wilderness: he was not in this Chamber, because he lost his seat at the 1979 election.

*Mr Duigan interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Adelaide will not be here after the next election, and one or two others will not be here, either. They should make hay while the sun shines. I have one or two important matters about which I wish to speak, because my constituents and other people involved in agriculture are facing many difficulties. Unfortunately, this budget and the Government's attitude are doing little if anything to help them. Agriculture is still the single most important industry in South Australia, as it provides 65 per cent of the State's export income. Unfortunately, however, the Government regards it as a willing cow to be milked.

Last week the Government increased by some 47 per cent the cost of seed certification in this State. This is a small industry with people involved in the export trade, yet the Government has obviously adopted a 'user pays' attitude toward it. That may be all right if it is spread across the whole State, but here we have a small successful group of people providing an important industry to South Australia and selling a large part of its products on the overseas market. Such trade is important for the welfare of this State because, if we cannot export, we will be in a difficult situation. What would have happened had there been a 47 per cent increase in one hit in respect of STA charges, water rates, or Housing Trust rentals? Outrage would have been expressed across the State.

The Government has selectively picked off small industries with only a few people involved. This is unfortunate and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will see the foolishness of his ways. The member for Hartley attacked the previous Government, but he failed on all counts to understand the benefits that the Tonkin Government gave to South Australians.

**Mr Duigan:** That Government was thrown out.

**Mr GUNN:** We had the greatest exhibition of untruths, half truths and misrepresentations ever inflicted on the people of this State. The Premier promised that he would not increase taxes, yet he was the first Premier to increase taxes by thousands of millions of dollars.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler):** Order! The honourable member for Eyre does not need the assistance of the honourable member for Briggs.

**Mr GUNN:** Thank you Mr Acting Speaker, of course I do not—I agree with you entirely. In fact, it was probably the member for Briggs who wrote the Premier's speech: he was the architect of the untruths. It is on record that he took the back page of a confidential report and handed it to the press, so we know what sort of a person he is. If the member for Briggs wrote the speech, he should feel guilty and hang his head in shame because he was responsible for helping to perpetrate these untruths on the people of this State. It is a fact that the Premier promised that there would be no increase in taxes and charges, and no back-door taxation; yet we have had record increases in taxes in this State. The Premier talked about the mirage in the desert at Roxby Downs, yet we have the largest single development in the history of this State. It is bigger than the submarines and it will last a lot longer than a few diesel-powered submarines that will be out of date by the time they get to the water.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am telling members the facts. The most successful submarines are nuclear powered. Going down the track a little further, the Roxby Downs project will create employment for over 100 years. The Tonkin Government had the unenviable task of picking up the bits after 10 years of the Dunstan Government's administration. It appears that this Government is going down the same track as that Government and adopting a policy of 'spend today; pay tomorrow'. The Government is borrowing more money but, unfortunately, is not using it properly.

In a large capital works program only \$200 000 is to be spent on the plant breeding program at Northfield. This is probably the last time that this line will appear in the capital works program because, if it is less than \$200 000, it will not appear in future. Indeed, on this occasion it had to be at least \$200 000 otherwise it would not have appeared. It was part of the Government's election manifesto, so it had to be included.

A real dispute is taking place between the officers at the Waite Research Institute and the Minister's officers as to what should be done. Can the Minister of Agriculture say when this project will be completed and whether he has reached agreement with the groups that are concerned in this matter? After all, \$200 000 will mean nothing to this project.

Much has been said about the Tonkin Government's taxation proposals. However, if the Tonkin Government had not initiated those proposals and concessions, hundreds of millions of dollars would have been shipped out of South Australia because people would not have left their money here to be taxed through death duties and other outrageous forms of taxation that could not be justified. South Australia would have been left with mortgages and people would have shipped out their assets to enlightened areas such as Queensland and Western Australia which had got rid of such forms of taxation.

It is unfair and unreasonable for the member for Hartley to make the charges that he has made. We still have a problem at Samcor. Since 1970, the Labor Party has controlled this State for all but three years, so it cannot blame the Liberal Party for the wrongs of South Australia. This Government has had financial control and has made a mess of things.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** What about your mate in Canberra? The current Federal Government has reduced funding to the States more than any other has done for years. Your enlightened colleague is trying to put into effect some Liberal policies to get himself out of his difficulties in relation to privatisation.

In the two minutes left at my disposal I would like members opposite to stand up and be counted. Where do they stand in relation to the identity card? These civil libertarians, these people who are so concerned about the rights and welfare of the individual—where do they stand? Where does the member for Playford stand—a learned member of the legal profession, who has stood on many occasions? Where does the member for Hartley stand—that prominent person in the legal profession? Where does the member for Briggs stand? Let them own up. Where does the member for Peake stand—the man who is going to sell wide combs? It is not a matter of standing over people or of selling wide combs.

Are members opposite going to fill out the forms? Where does the Minister of Employment and Further Education stand—the man who protested about the draft? He would not stand up and fight for or defend his country. Where does he stand on this basic civil liberty? I would like mem-

bers opposite to come clean. Their colleague in New South Wales has pulled the rug from under the Prime Minister. If I was a betting person—and we are not allowed to bet in this Chamber—I would have a wager to say this card will never get off the ground, because without the cooperation of the States, particularly New South Wales—

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

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** At the time of the 1982 State election the South Australian Labor Party in its pre-election campaign committed itself to a major upgrading of the Mount Gambier Hospital and its elevation to a teaching status hospital. Over the next four or five years the hospital board entered into a very extensive survey with the Health Commission and a nationally reputable firm of consultants engaged in formulating the design for the upgrading of the hospital. That design was completed some two to 2½ years ago and the redevelopment was approved in principle by the Government. In 1985 the commitment to upgrade the hospital was again made by the then Minister of Health, and now, in 1987, we find that unfortunately no funds are included in the budget for that upgrading.

Before I enter into some of the disadvantages associated with that lack of commitment, let me first compliment the nursing and administration staff and the surgeons and doctors who practise at the Mount Gambier Hospital. I am not one of those politicians who pay lip service only to his local hospital. Some 12 years ago I entered that hospital for a major spinal operation and I owe quite a deep debt of gratitude to both the surgeons and the nursing staff who were responsible for removing a spinal disc and restoring me to excellent health—in fact, such excellent health that I was able to campaign in the 1975 election, a few months later, and win with about 10 days notice.

On the positive side, the Mount Gambier Hospital has a tremendous amount going for it. In its development as a regional base hospital serving not only the South-East of South Australia but also the western districts of Victoria, it is recognised throughout the area as having a high calibre of specialist services including orthopaedic surgeons and an ophthalmic surgeon, with the result that there are many increased referrals for operations and technology to the hospital. It is a great credit to the staff that they are managing to enhance its reputation.

There has been the appointment of a biomedical technician and the establishment of a biomedical repair and maintenance service which is used by all South-East hospitals; the appointment of a manager of engineering services, who has a regional role to advise and overview other South-East hospitals. A pharmacy service supports other South-East hospitals and proposals are currently being finalised for support management services for the region. Radiology services from Mount Gambier Hospital are utilised by the Millicent Hospital on a weekly basis. There is also involvement with the Warrnambool Institute of Advanced Education for tertiary based nurse education and training. There has been the establishment of the South-East School of Nursing. Morbidity coding services for South-East hospitals have been enhanced by the appointment of a Medical Records Administrator.

We have also seen the introduction of ultrasound services. There is currently a review of the hospital's role in the provision of regional organ imaging services. The status of the hospital is such that it is associated with the Flinders Medical Centre. There is a recognition of the hospital's standing among South Australian hospitals to the extent

that it has been selected to pilot the introduction of a 38-hour week nursing career structure and for the introduction of large country hospital computing systems. Senior staff have been requested to serve on various inquiry committees. Many medical and allied health students seek training placement at the Mount Gambier Hospital and the Family Medicine Program for training general practitioners has been established in Mount Gambier for some years.

Over the past eight or nine years since 1979 we have seen improvements in facilities, including new boilers (coal fired to replace the old oil fired units); a new front entrance that was dedicated recently (the original heavy doors being replaced and easier access provided); new lifts (with computerised units replacing the original ones); the introduction of a central plating system with improved meal services to all patients; the installation of gas sterilising equipment; the redevelopment of the laundry (with the installation of modern equipment resulting in generally reduced costs and increased efficiency); an expanded radiology department; an upgrading in the engineering and maintenance workshops; and the establishment of a kiosk which is managed by the hospital auxiliary.

As I said earlier, there is planning for redeveloping the hospital in three major phases. Everyone in the South-East has been looking forward to the fulfilment of those promises, which I assumed at the time, and still assume, were made in perfectly good faith by the Premier and by the Minister of Health (John Cornwall). The hospital board has contacted the Minister expressing concern at the lack of financial commitment this year for the redevelopment of the hospital and asking, in view of that, whether it is possible to commence some interim work on certain aspects of hospital management and administration which are in sore need of replacement and refurbishment. Included in that is probably the worst section, the central sterile supply department, which is unsatisfactorily located. Its present siting slows down the upgrading of the recovery areas. The sterilisers are already 27 years old and are difficult to maintain. The cycles are very slow, with a delayed turnaround time for the sterile stock and instruments, and part of that end result is that the staff are working overtime and senior evening staff are also assisting in processing the sterile supply.

It is inefficient, heavy on energy consumption, and its unreliability means that it has to be monitored. The products have to be examined, and there is additional monitoring of the products. Sometimes, thanks to the monitoring by the staff, repeat cycles are necessary to ensure absolute sterility. I ask the Government to pay particular attention to that area and, if at all possible, if there is no money for the major upgrading this year, at least to ensure that the central sterile supply department is upgraded.

The theatre recovery area, which cannot be upgraded until the sterile supply department is looked after, is in itself inappropriate. It is really a small alcove big enough for one person, but sometimes accommodates four people in recovery. That is obviously an area which is subject to overcrowding and should also be attended to as a matter of urgency. The radiology department, again, is poorly designed. After all, it is a post war-designed hospital, constructed in the 1950s, which has really given excellent service, thanks to the work of the staff. It is clean and hygienic: there is no disputing that. But the radiology department straddles one of the main traffic areas in the hospital which comes through from the inpatient area, and it has been developed and redeveloped over the years to the extent that the waiting area space is insufficient. Patients spill out into the corridor when they are awaiting treatment. There is insufficient space



for the staff who have to use the corridor itself as a common area.

The reception area facilities are inadequate. There is a small doorway hatch which at present is utilised for receiving and booking in some 12 000 patients per annum who go through that radiography department. There is no available office space for the Chief Radiographer, who has to oversee and supervise his whole department. I ask the Government, as a matter of urgency, to also consider that as an interim problem to be resolved. In casualty, a very busy area, the situation is again unsatisfactory. It shares activities with all the inpatient admissions and outpatient attendances. The treatment room serves the dual purpose of treatment area and nurses station. There are large groups of people, including patients, staff and relatives who come in with their sick sons, daughters, mothers and fathers, who congregate at that point, and there is no easy facility for separating them. It is almost impossible to administer during times of acute trauma when we have two or three serious accidents.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I am very pleased that the Minister of Housing and Construction is at the bench this evening, because I want to speak for a few minutes about some of the educational facilities in my electorate which have caused particular concern. I want to refer, first, to the very real problems that are being experienced at the Hills TAFE college, with the two campuses at Mount Barker and Aldgate. Up until last year the Hills college was on top of the priority list for redevelopment and, in fact, an area of land had been purchased for a new college.

The staff and those associated with the college were very excited about a proposal by which we hoped that a new college would be erected at Mount Barker for the Hills district. I am not quite sure what has happened to that priority list but, as I understand it, the Hills college is not now at the top of that list, and I hope that the Minister will consider ensuring that that college receives the attention it desperately needs.

I have referred in this House on a number of occasions to the conditions experienced at the college, and I want to do that again tonight. In the local paper, the *Mount Barker Courier*, which was published today, we have a headline on the front page which reads, 'Hills TAFE "A disgrace"'. I explained earlier that we have two campuses, one at Mount Barker and one at Aldgate, and one of the senior lecturers at Aldgate has found it necessary to come out and indicate just how severe are the problems in those campuses, and I strongly support what he is having to say. He states:

The buildings, equipment and staffing of the Hills TAFE college are a disgrace to the Government and this community.

The proposed rebuilding program was given top priority last year, but has now been postponed indefinitely.

He said the recent Government funding would mean reductions of between 20 and 50 per cent in vocational courses offered this year. 'The Hills community has the dubious honour of attending the most run-down college in the State,' he pointed out.

'The college has been under-resourced for many years, using classrooms rejected by the Education Department a decade ago. The old Mount Barker and Aldgate primary school buildings have not been significantly upgraded in more than 10 years. The situation is so bad, we can not even get enough desks and chairs for our students.'

Some taking typing courses are having to perch on telephone books stacked on chairs to give the correct height. Their desks were made by lecturers during the summer break. When the rebuilding program was announced last year, it had top priority. The announcement was greeted with great satisfaction by staff

and the college council. However, the program has now been postponed, with no date in sight for the project.

He goes on to describe some of the totally unacceptable conditions under which staff and students are working on that campus. I hope that the Minister will be able to seriously consider the problems being experienced in that area, and that he will do everything he can to ensure that the appropriate priority is given to a new college for the Adelaide Hills.

I referred in Question Time today to some of the bungling that has taken place in regard to the block of land which has been set aside in Mount Barker for the new college. It concerns me that some \$50 000 was paid out in compensation for the loss of dedicated reserve land as a result of the bungling that took place. That money could have gone towards a new college, or at least upgrading the present facilities. I hope that the Minister will give that serious consideration.

There are three other schools to which I wish to refer in the short time I have, the first being Upper Sturt Primary School. Again, I can only describe that as an absolute disgrace. For many years we have been trying without success to get that school upgraded. We have made representations on a number of occasions to the Minister, also without success.

It concerns me that, looking at the estimates for the next 12 months, no mention is made of an upgrading for that school. It was established in 1878, and the main building was built in 1967 to accommodate 40 students. Since then the school has grown to almost 100 students. Four transportable steel classrooms were added in 1978, 1980, 1982 and 1984 and placed in the children's play area, cutting it into two. No levelling of the ground took place when they were delivered, so the buildings have steep flights of stairs which are slippery when wet.

We recognise that this part of the Hills is one of the wettest areas of the State. The stormwater from the building is also directed onto the playing area, making the walkways and playing areas slippery and wet at the best of times. It would be impossible for a handicapped student to use the school, as all the classrooms are reached by quite steep steps. Students in years 3 to 7 have to leave the classrooms and walk across uncovered playground areas to reach toilets in the main building.

I could go on at length about the condition of that school: it is a disgrace. The Minister of Education has continually sidestepped the issues which have been brought to his attention. There is a desperate need for the department to recognise a higher priority for the school and the students who attend it. It amazes me that the parents of students attending the school and the school council have put so much effort in trying to improve conditions, and they are to be congratulated for that.

The second school to which I want to refer is Heathfield Primary School—again a school that desperately needs attention. Much has been said in the local media about the condition of that school, and the school council has worked very hard to improve its condition. Recently the Chairman of the school council stated through the local media that if the facilities that students work in at the Heathfield Primary School are good enough then we are in a very poor country. The basic problem is that the main building is nearly 90 years old and was designed for education when it was built in 1897. The rest of the school consists of portable buildings spread out all over the place including a library, four classrooms, a dog box used for food preparation and art, a shed in which music and craft work are done on occasions and another storage shed that is used for sports facilities. Student education at Heathfield Primary School is suffering mainly



because of inadequate facilities, and I assume that the Government will give a high priority to the re-development of that school.

The third school I refer to is at Mylor. Some months ago the Minister of Education visited that school and indicated that he would ensure that some work was carried out as a matter of urgency. Some of that work is being carried out at this time, but a considerable amount of work still needs to be done. I wonder whether the Government intends closing down some of these smaller schools. I hope that that is not the case but, unless higher priority is given to their redevelopment, I would not blame people involved with those schools for thinking that that is likely to happen. I repeat that I would not support the closure of these schools, but it is absolutely necessary to upgrade them and I hope that the Minister makes that a priority.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I begin tonight with the member for Hartley and his comments about the transfer of capital and recurrent funds by the Tonkin Government. Last night I reminded the House of the Premier's hypocritical statements, and tonight I will read them to the House. Page 26 of the Premier's Financial Statement states:

Full funding of the State Transport Authority deficit, the funding of depreciation for Engineering and Water Supply operations and changes in relation to mortgage and rent relief involve transfers between capital and recurrent activities.

That is the criticism that was made of the Tonkin Government. The report continues:

There is no overall impact on the net financing requirement although the capital and recurrent deficits are affected.

As the member for Hartley so eloquently said tonight, the figure associated with the Tonkin Government was \$40 million. I remind the House that the transfer figure mentioned by the Premier in his Financial Statement is \$37.4 million. Here we have the Premier doing exactly the same thing with almost the same level of funding for which he criticised the Tonkin Government five years ago.

I now refer to comments by the Auditor General for the third year in a row in relation to the State Aquatic Centre, as follows:

Despite the fact that the centre has been in operation for two years the council and the department still have not reached an agreement on the amount to be provided by the Government. Prompt action needs to be taken to resolve this matter.

The current Minister has been in office for over 12 months. The previous Minister had this same comment put to him in the past two Auditor General's Reports. Why is it so difficult to get the department and the council together to resolve a very simple issue that the Auditor General continually reminds this Parliament of? Perhaps it is too difficult; perhaps the Minister has too much spare time.

In the same report on page 171 the Auditor General refers to the athletics tracks, as follows:

In 1985-86 an amount of \$100 000 was paid to the company as a result of a claim for cancellation of the contract. In 1986-87 the company agreed to accept a further \$165 000 in full settlement of its claim. That amount was paid in June 1987.

Just over two weeks ago the Minister of Recreation and Sport, in answer to a question in this House, said that a sum of \$300 000 would be paid by the department as its contribution to the setting up of this track at Olympic Sportsfield. I point out to the House that \$265 000 of that \$300 000 has already been paid to get out of a contract that was ill-advised, ill-informed and badly contracted. Perhaps we should have an explanation from the Minister of Recreation and Sport as to where the funding will come from for this track at Olympic Sports Field.

Last night I mentioned the difficulty that I had with the fact that only \$500 000 had been allowed for road safety

funding. I believe that funding for publicity in the road safety area is very important and it should have been increased. Over the past three or four days I attended a road safety seminar organised by the Police Department through Sergeant Max Arthur and presented to children at two schools by Senior Constable Dave Hearn. Four hours of tuition were given to students in both a practical and theoretical sense. He explained clearly to the children in year 11 the problems of careless driving and drink driving; and he explained very clearly the need for driver responsibility and the road safety requirements. However, I found it difficult to understand that this division was funded by the SGIC and that it received no Government funding. I think it is quite scandalous that the Government talks about the need to ensure that young people know how to drive but does not back this excellent program with funding. I hope that the Minister, when looking at road safety funding in this budget, will consider spending more money in this area.

The next point I make relates to the period of drivers licences. In his report the Auditor General makes a strong comment about the possible problems for cash flow in relation to the five year period of licences. When this extension passed through Parliament, reference was made to possible cash flow problems in the fourth and fifth years. This is again highlighted by the Auditor General who warns the Government that in years 4 and 5 there may be a very significant problem. The Opposition highlighted that problem because the money from motor vehicles registrations and licences goes into the Highways Fund. We already have a difficulty in that area because of a lack of funds. I hope that the Minister notes that comment of the Auditor General.

Another matter that concerns me is on that same page under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Trust Fund, as follows:

The Commonwealth legislation requires the State to maintain in real terms its own expenditure on roads in order to receive its full share of available funds.

The Auditor General goes on to note that in the past year there was a short-fall of \$11.5 million and he also notes that, to date, the Commonwealth has not exercised the reallocation provisions of this legislation.

What it clearly points out is that the State Government has allowed its funding in the roads area to fall by \$11.5 million, and it is something that I hope the Minister will take up and correct as soon as possible. Even though we have a shortage of funds, all we require is a change in priorities so that funding and the legislative responsibility is maintained. If we are going to accept funds from the Commonwealth under an Act where we have a responsibility to balance those funds, that responsibility should be carried out.

The next point I would like to comment on is that there has been a significant drop in the use of private contractors by the Highways Department. In his report, the Auditor-General clearly states that, to the end of June 1987, \$38 million was sent out to private contractors compared to \$53 million the previous year, a drop of some 39 per cent in the use of private contractors by the Highways Department.

Of course, we had a significant increase in departmental undertakings going from \$139 million in 1986 to \$155 million in 1987. We have had a significant increase in work done in-house by the Highways Department. However, there is much evidence to prove that the contract system is the best way to go and that in this reversal, where we have gone into the use of the department's workforce, we should question whether our costing is still reasonable. The Auditor-General states:

Overall the value of work placed with outside bodies in 1986-87 decreased by \$19 million to \$59 million, representing 28 per cent of the total value of work compared to 36 per cent of the total value last year.

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

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I want to pick up some of the points made by the Premier when he tried to belittle and question the figures put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, he spent 30 minutes fudging the facts. It is the Government's budget: the Government has put up the figures, and it is the Opposition's role to point out where the Government is not doing its job and where it is trying to mislead the public. It is quite clear that, every time the Premier talks about economic matters, he does not understand what economics are all about. He may be trained as a lawyer but, unfortunately, that does not mean that he has the training to run the State. It is the Government's budget. It is the Ministers who run the departments, and it is on their heads if they do not perform.

If the Premier could stick to, and understand, the facts we could more sensibly discuss where the State budget is taking us and much better discuss where the State has been led over the past 12 months. In the next seven or eight minutes I am going to pick up some of the facts of the budget—indisputable facts—and put them before the House. One of the facts of the budget is that taxation has increased, and it has increased over last year's figures, indisputably, by 11.3 per cent. I do not hear the Premier talk about that: nothing was said about that, but it is a fact.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The Premier is trying to hide the facts from the public. Land tax has increased by about 30 per cent over last year—there is no argument or dispute about that: it is a fact of life. Gambling tax has increased by 16.5 per cent over last year. Revenue from motor vehicles has increased by about 11.3 per cent in the past 12 months. Your business franchise tax is bringing in an extra \$20 million, but the franchise gatherings in the past 12 months have increased by some 24 per cent. Fees for regulatory services have increased by some 44 per cent. How can the Premier fudge these figures and say that the Opposition is not doing its job or that the Leader of the Opposition is not using facts and figures? Obviously, the Premier had not read the document properly and one cannot keep getting away with trying to fool the public all the time. I turn now to page 13 of the Premier's document, which says it all, as follows:

Consequently, no allowance has been made for the payment of the so-called 'second tier' wage increase. We believe that this increase must be completely offset by productivity gains and that any increases granted must be paid for from savings achieved above those already incorporated as budget measures.

Fancy putting forward before the public of South Australia a budget claiming that the Government is not going to pay the 4 per cent wage increase because it will be saved in some other way. It is incredible, and it is more incredible when we look at the facts. The facts are clear: public sector employment in South Australia last year increased by about 2 100 people. How can there not be an increase? How is the Government not going to pay the 4 per cent wage rise when last year it increased the number of employees by 2 100? The budget figures show that there will be an increase this year. The Premier cannot go on fooling the people all the time.

Of course, it is interesting to see what the Government's union mates say, because the Public Service Association, those wonderful people who said that we were going to rip

the shirts off their backs with privatisation, had this to say about the 4 per cent wage increase:

The Public Service Association has emphasised in negotiation the changes which have already occurred justify the 4 per cent salary increase.

Changes have already occurred. From where is the money coming? Something has to happen. Perhaps there will be some retrenchments in the Public Service about which we have not been told, but the figures do not show that. The figures show that there will be an increase in expenditure. The Government cannot hide it all the time, and it is about time that the Premier came clean with the South Australian public and told it what was going on.

The House must remember that, for every 1 000 extra public servants employed each year, there is a total cost of about \$30 million: that is a fact. The Premier cannot fudge it, and one cannot get away from that. The Auditor-General's Report shows, and this is where it really comes to light in the management of the State, that the Public Service has 21 people in unattached jobs. How will they get 4 per cent productivity wage increase? It will be pretty hard to justify the increase for a person who does not have a job, but those people will no doubt get it because they will do a deal. The Auditor-General states:

The Government must consider negotiating individual separation packages with some public servants employed on full-time salaries without any regular or permanent work.

It is going to be hard to get a productivity increase for those people. Even some of the untrained people on the Government side of the House would find difficulty in fudging that, and I am sure the Minister will have a problem. The Auditor-General went on to refer to many more than 206 people who have to be redeployed in different wage and salary areas were normally paid by the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations.

It will be interesting to look closely at the Auditor-General's Report, which we will be doing in the next few weeks in the Estimates Committees, because that is what Government performance is all about. It is all in this report. If the Government has done a good job, if the Ministers have run the State properly and diligently in the past 12 months we would not need to have an Auditor-General's Report: he would not have to keep writing page after page of criticism, which is showing gross waste and mismanagement in this State. We would not have to have the Premier fudging the figures when I know (and I think he knows) that he does not understand them.

**An honourable member:** They really need some businessmen on the front bench.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** That is the problem. Members opposite stand up and tell us about SAFA and what is going on, but they forget to tell us that this State borrowed an extra \$350 million last year to prop up its recurrent expenditure. No-one can deny that—it is all in the budget. The member for Light spoke about this a moment ago. It is an undeniable fact. Members opposite who have contributed to this debate have really not said anything about this—there has been absolute silence, because the budget is a gross embarrassment to them and a gross indictment on the management of this State. The budget shows that the Government is mortgaging our children's future as it continues over the next 12 months to recklessly manage this State as it has for the past 12 months.

Another more ticklish area of mismanagement is the South Australian Timber Corporation, which has received a little bit of publicity in the past couple of months—and it will receive a bit more over the next couple of weeks. The South Australian Timber Corporation must be the greatest disaster seen in this State, along with the ASER

project and the other projects mentioned by the member for Light. The South Australian Timber Corporation has been conned.

The Minister has asked for three reports, but he will not place any of them on the table. We will pursue this matter during the Estimates Committee. We are led to believe that each report shows that the Minister has been conned to the tune of some \$37 million of taxpayers' money. The taxpayers of this State want to know why that happened and who is responsible, and they will be calling for an explanation from the Minister. The Auditor-General's Report devotes about five pages to the South Australian Timber Corporation alone. During the Estimates Committees I will quote some of his comments.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I am pleased that the Minister of Transport and the members for Mawson and Fisher are present tonight, but I am sorry that the members for Brighton and Bright have had to leave the Chamber. I refer to a subject that I first raised in the press on 8 July when I reminded people living in the south-west corner of Adelaide that the third arterial was to be placed on the back-burner. At the time the silence from Labor members who represent that area was quite unique. Not once did any of those members rise in this place and say that this should not happen to their constituents. They did not say a word but simply criticised me for daring to publicly air this travesty that the Government was about to impose on the south-west corner of Adelaide.

In July I warned the public that the third arterial corridor would be placed on the back-burner indefinitely, but not one member opposite said a thing. If members opposite had been doing their jobs, they would have been in the Minister's office and on the floor of this Chamber saying that the third arterial was the most essential road in the strategic planning for the southern region. However, we did not hear a word from them. I had to wait, but every dog has his day and, sure enough, it all came out after the Federal election and after the tumult had died down.

I chose to announce my information from within the department in early July to ensure that it was on the record before the Federal election. If John Howard had won the Federal election and had taken power in Canberra, he would have been blamed for this decision which had already been taken within the walls of the Minister's office in Victoria Square. That is the scenario, and every Labor member from the southern region would have known about it. The decision had been taken but they decided to wait until after the Federal election in the hope that John Howard would win the election and they could all come out and say that the rotten Liberals had taken control of the Treasury benches in Canberra and that is why the corridor could not be built.

The decision to axe the corridor and place it on the back-burner is unbelievable. Initially, only one arterial road was available from the developing southern regions, that is, the Main South Road. As the density of traffic volume increased the Government decided that a second arterial was required and to its credit it built what is now known as Ocean Boulevard, which immediately took the pressure off South Road and, as a result, the number of vehicles travelling along that road dropped. In the meantime, the population in the southern region continued to swell. The Government denied that it was swelling, and after it sold off the north-south corridor from Darlington to Anzac Highway it said that there was only a 2 per cent increase in population in the southern region. The member for Fisher knew that that was wrong, as did other members, including the member for Mawson, because they could see the number of homes

being built in that area. The 1986 census also established that the Government was wrong. The Southern Region of Councils had said since about 1984 that the population projection in some areas was up to 11 per cent, but the Government went ahead and sold off the north-south corridor between Darlington and the Anzac Highway.

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** You will get your turn in a moment. That corridor has gone and can never be repurchased, and none of that money will go back into road funding. The Government purchased the land for that corridor at book value and the money it received for that land in 1987 has gone into General Revenue. That money was committed to road funding in this State, but it will not be used for that purpose—it has gone into General Revenue. That corridor from Darlington to Anzac Highway has been sold off and the third arterial has been placed on the back-burner.

We have been told that work on the third arterial will not start before 1993. The Minister was careful not to say that it will start in 1993; he said that it had been placed on the back-burner and work will not commence before 1993. It is a five to seven year project, which means that we will be into the turn of the century at least before the road is completed, and it will probably be well into the year 2000 before vehicles can use it. In the meantime, South Road is now back to the vehicle density per day that was common before Ocean Boulevard opened.

**Mr Robinson:** That's wrong.

**Mr OSWALD:** That is right, and the RAA has the up-to-date and verified figures. They are not my figures but official figures from the RAA. Vehicle density on South Road is back to the level that existed before Ocean Boulevard opened. We must have a third arterial. In a press release the Minister states:

The money is just not there at the moment, particularly with the reduction in road funding from the Commonwealth. To undertake this major new highway would take up all the funds devoted to construction of metropolitan arterial roads for a period of five years.

I will not say that that is a lie, because it is unparliamentary to use that word—but it is a gross distortion of the truth.

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

**Mr OSWALD:** I will put it on the record as I see it but, if the Minister can prove me wrong, I will be delighted to hear it. The Auditor-General's Report states, under 'Road Category Expenditure', that urban arterials last year received about \$43 million and this year about \$33 million will be available. The Minister also knows that he will pick up an extra \$10 million in the Highways Fund from increases in motor vehicle registrations.

He will also get an extra \$23 million as a result of the 50 per cent increase in petrol tax. However, that is not going where it should go: collected on the roads from motorists, it should be dedicated for use on the roads. Those two figures alone (the \$10 million from the additional motor registration fees and the extra \$23 million from the increased petrol tax) will give the Government an extra \$33 million in this year alone. The third arterial road will cost \$70 million so, if this total expenditure is spread over seven years, only \$10 million a year will be required to build the road. The Minister could find this sum from the additional revenue from fuel tax and registration fees without even going to his normal funds in order to build arterial roads.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OSWALD:** I do not mind the interjections; they know that I am right.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair minds the interjections.

**Mr OSWALD:** Government members know that, if they were standing on this side of the Chamber, they would advance the same argument. The silence from the southern members has been deafening because they know that prior to the past two elections the Premier has used the third arterial road as his big plank in his election promise to con the local electors. He used it time and time again, saying 'Elect me; elect the member for Fisher; elect the member for Mawson; elect them all and I will build you a third arterial because it is needed.'

The Premier is right only on one point: the road is needed; it is essential; and it is an absolute tragedy that it will not be built until about the year 2000 and something, when none of us will be members of this place. The southern regions need that road and the Government must find the money to build a third arterial road. It cannot hide behind a lack of funds all the time.

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

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** It is interesting that the *de facto* shadow Minister of Transport has been talking about the third arterial road. I, too, wish to make a few statements about that road. It is also interesting that we appear to have two shadow Ministers of Transport in this Chamber and that it takes two Opposition members to look after the Bannon Government's Mr Fixit.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will take his seat. I remind him that he must address members in the House by their correct title and not mention them by name. The honourable member for Fisher.

**Mr TYLER:** I thank you for that warning, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I apologise. What we have heard from the member for Morphett has been mistake after mistake because, prior to the recent Federal election, he said that the third arterial road would be axed. In fact, he repeated that statement in this Chamber. However, he got it 100 per cent wrong because last week the Minister of Transport announced the final alignment for the third arterial road from Bedford Park to Reynella. Although the Minister said that the road alignment had been decided, he said that it was not expected that the State would have the capacity to commence the construction of that highway before 1993. I appreciate the Minister's frank statement on the future of the road. The local community is delighted that the alignment has been settled, because concerns had been expressed in the community.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** If the member for Morphett thought there was no concern about the alignment, he should talk to my constituents and to those of the member for Bright. There were concerns about the alignment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. The honourable member for Fisher.

**Mr TYLER:** There were concerns in the community down south about the alignment. Various alignments that were proposed for consultation led up the escarpment south of Darlington. My constituents and those of the member for Bright are pleased about that. At present, the money is not available to start work on this road because of the reduction in Commonwealth funding for road works. It is interesting that the member for Morphett has said that that is not the case, but it is on record that the State has lost \$190 million in funding. Before the last election, the Opposition advanced the case for the expenditure of \$220 million, on 1982 prices, on a north-south corridor but, as a result of the policies with which the Federal Liberal Leader went to the recent

Federal election, no Federal money would have been available for road construction in this State had he been elected.

Clearly, the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Howard) said that he would slash funds for the States and obviously road construction is a major part of Federal Government funding that would be slashed, so the nerve of the Opposition to raise this matter in this Chamber as an issue is staggering. The Minister pointed out that the commencement of work on this highway would have taken up all the funds allocated for the construction of metropolitan arterial roads for the next five years. No other work could have been done and the Government was faced with a dilemma. My constituents did not want their taxes increased to pay for such a project. Further, I understand completely that the Federal funds that are committed to national highway projects such as Mount Barker Road cannot, under the legislation, be transferred by the State to this type of road in the southern area which is classified as urban arterial.

I hope that the Southern Region of Councils understands this difference. It was suggested by that organisation that such a transfer could be effected, but the Minister has written to it explaining the details. Further, I have spoken to some members of that organisation and they understand what is involved. However, I join with that organisation and members of the local community in saying that we are bitterly disappointed with the decision to defer construction of this road, as there is a pressing need for the road now.

The Minister has said that another factor for deferring work on the road at this stage is a slow down in the increase in population in the southern area. Although the Minister would have access to much more information than I, that is not the assessment that I have made as a result of observation and perception in my electorate. As I move round, I see many houses being constructed. Hickinbotham, Pioneer and Jennings are building large numbers of spec homes in my electorate, and the Housing Trust has just completed a building program. With the onset of summer and the easing of interest rates, I can only see the current rate of building commencements in this area continuing.

A study of the 1986 census figures reveals that the Fisher electorate has experienced a population increase of 42 per cent since 1981. A year ago the population was 37 210 and there has been a significant growth since then, so I would expect that the present population is now much larger. The 1986 census figures indicate that about 60 per cent of the electorate is between the working ages of 15 and 64 years. This represents about 22 000 people, most of whom travel north to work each day using the existing arterial and local road network.

Travelling through my electorate during peak periods, one finds that Chandlers Hill Road carries a steady stream of traffic, as do Manning Road, Black Road and Flagstaff Road. Many motorists also travel to the city via Blackwood along Murrays Hill Road and Old Belair Road. The idea of the third arterial road was to help cater for the needs of people living south of Reynella who could travel along South Road and down the third arterial road. This would have freed up the existing South Road allowing it to take the increased traffic load, particularly from around the Morphett Vale East area, and carry it from the electorates of Fisher and that of my colleague the member for Mawson.

The third arterial road would also provide my constituents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park with improved access to South Road, giving them a much better chance of getting to Adelaide in some sort of reasonable time. However, I appreciate that roads are expensive and I acknowledge that many millions of dollars have been spent on road improve-

ments in the southern area during the past three or four years. In fact, in excess of \$7 million would have been spent in my electorate alone in recent years. However most people take improvements for granted; that is a fact of life.

While I should again emphasise that I am disappointed that this decision had to be made, I do understand the reasons for deferring the program. However, I honestly believe that the road is needed now and that we have an adequate population base to justify it. I will ask the Minister, as a result of this deferral, to see whether some of the money that has been freed up by this delay can be used on some urgent priorities. I regard the improvements to the Darlington intersection as an urgent priority.

I also urge the Minister of Transport to start planning for the upgrading of Flagstaff Road. It is obvious to anybody living in Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley and Darlington that when the new Happy Valley Drive (most people would know it as Reservoir Drive) comes on stream there will be an increase in traffic on Flagstaff Road.

I am aware that the Minister is very conscious of this fact and the Highways Department has set up a process to monitor this very important road link that runs through my electorate. I am certain that the residents of the Fisher electorate would welcome the action of the Highways Department or the Happy Valley council, which are currently responsible for the road, to improve and upgrade this vital transport corridor.

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** A number of matters have been raised during the course of this debate which impinge quite directly on the electorate of Adelaide. First, urban consolidation or the better use of existing urban space for the purpose of new population growth within the whole of metropolitan Adelaide and, secondly, commitments in the budget to a road development program within the electorate of Adelaide. The two matters are directly related, as the member for Coles indicated earlier in a contribution this evening.

A document released only yesterday by the Minister for Environment and Planning entitled 'Adelaide—Its Future Development' is a discussion paper released by the Government for the purpose of eliciting public commentary on the preferred option that has been taken by the Government for future urban growth expansion in metropolitan Adelaide in the next 15 years. In that document the trends of the past 10 or 15 years have been identified. The major trend is that the inner suburban areas both within the electorate of Adelaide as well as in the adjoining suburban areas have, over that time, suffered a population decline. The opportunity therefore exists, as a consequence of that decline, to concentrate planning and development and housing redevelopment opportunities in that area so that the population in the older area of Adelaide, from Grand Junction Road to the top of Tapleys Hill Road, can see a revitalisation of housing styles and population.

The report importantly notes that it is necessary to provide an increased range of housing simply because the types of families that we currently have in the community vary considerably from the family types for which many of those houses in the inner suburbs were developed. As the member for Coles indicated in her contribution there exist opportunities, which are supported by both sides of the Parliament, to make better use of those areas. In commenting on the trends that were identified in the Minister for Environment and Planning's report, I also refer to a document that was recently made available to all members of Parliament by the research service of the Parliamentary Library. That report looked at population changes that have occurred in

metropolitan Adelaide between the 1981 and 1986 censuses and compiled for members the change in the population characteristics for each of the metropolitan and country electorates.

Interestingly, the report indicates that, of the 10 inner suburban or inner city electorates, there has been a population increase in one and a population decline in the other nine. The one moving against the tide is the electorate of Adelaide, where the population increased by 5.5 per cent between 1981 and 1986. The adjoining electorates have suffered declines which on the eastern side vary from a minor decline in Bragg of 0.2 per cent to a 4.1 per cent decline in Hartley and a 1.6 per cent decline in Norwood. There has also been a decline in the north and north-eastern electorates, as there has been in electorates to the western side of the city.

When one looks at the changes in the age cohorts that have been identified in the Library's report, it indicates a substantial population regeneration going on in the electorate of Adelaide, brought about by an increase in the variety of housing types that are available within those electorates, which in turn is a result of the direct investment decisions that have been made by State and local government, encouraging both private and public housing opportunities.

The more interesting aspect of that population change is that it is occurring in the younger family area. In the electorate of Adelaide the population increases are 10.7 per cent for the age group 0-4 years and, not surprisingly, a similar 10 per cent increase in people between the age of 20 and 34 years—obviously the parents of those children. What we are seeing is not a flash in the pan increase but a direct commitment by people to move back into the inner areas of Adelaide which has been accompanied and is perhaps consequent on the decisions that have been made by local councils and State Governments to get a better utilisation of land within those areas.

The other item I would like to refer to, in the context of this being a grievance on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, is to note that the public works allocation for roads in the budget is some \$111.6 million, which involves expenditure on 22 major projects that are already in progress. I will concentrate on one of those, namely, the Park Terrace aspect of the north-west ring route on which \$1.9 million is to be spent in 1987-88 as part of the nearly \$10 million that will be required to finalise the north-west ring route, which is extremely important both to the city of Adelaide as well as to the western and inner northern suburbs.

What it will do is divert traffic away from the inner city area of Adelaide to ensure that congestion within the city is not created by heavy transport and is diverted away both from the commercial and retail area of central Adelaide and also from the inner suburban and residential areas of near eastern, western and northern suburbs. That is extremely important for those people. The north-west ring route is part of the whole of the ring route around Adelaide. There are three major parts of that north-western ring route still to be completed. The part for which some allocation is being made in this budget is for the Park Terrace section, which is the area of parklands between the Adelaide City Council area and Hindmarsh.

It is extremely important to divert traffic away from the North Adelaide residential area and to be able to feed traffic from the southern and south-western suburbs around that part of central Adelaide, so that motorists can use the major exit routes to the Riverland and to Sydney which are available through the Main North Road. Two other parts of the ring route are planned further down the track, and there is

a great deal of concern within the electorate for their completion. The first, and perhaps more important of those, is the completion of the Robe Terrace section, which is that section commencing where Main North Road comes out onto the parklands and extending to what is commonly known as the Buckingham Arms corner. This is a very short section of the ring route, but for transport heading from Port Adelaide out onto the South-Eastern Freeway and going in the reverse direction it is an extremely important part of the ring route.

It is also extremely important to those local residents who are having to cope with large volumes of traffic, including a large volume of heavy commercial traffic, using that road without any buffer between them and their residences. The residents, together with representatives of the council and myself, have made a number of overtures to the Minister to try to include in the public works program the completion of this project, and I hope that we will see it in future budgets.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I wish to continue the remarks I was making during the grievance debate on the budget, and to put before the Chamber the statistical evidence which I have extracted from *Hansard*.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much conversation.

**Mr LEWIS:** This information shows the number of occasions on which graphs, bar charts or histograms have been incorporated in the record for the purpose of illustrating the point the member concerned is making to the House. I began by pointing out that the first of such material was incorporated by the Hon. Peter Duncan, formerly the member for Elizabeth, on 30 March 1982. On that occasion, at pages 3707 and 3708 of *Hansard* he incorporated a graph, two diagrams and a series of diagrams and tables. On 27 July the former member for Newland incorporated two such instruments. On 10 August, at page 346, the Hon. Peter Duncan incorporated a further three. On 10 August of the same year, at page 358, the member for Peake incorporated a table of shares of total tax collected. On 11 August the current member for Davenport, the then member for Fisher, incorporated such a table on student/teacher ratios.

On 12 August the member for Heysen (the then member for Murray) incorporated a table showing the quarterly net migration gain to South Australia—and so on throughout the record. On no fewer than 46 occasions some 57 such instruments have been incorporated into the record of *Hansard* in both Houses in the bound volumes to the present time. With your leave and that of the House, Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek to incorporate in the record the list of the occasions upon which that has taken place, showing the date, page number, the person seeking and gaining leave of the House, the substance the material incorporates and the number of such instruments. To that extent, they are identical to similar tables which have been incorporated in recent days, and I seek the leave of the House to have the list incorporated in the record.

Leave granted.

Date	Page No.	Speaker	Subject Matter	No. of Graphs
30.3.82	3707	Peter Duncan	Mine Safety	3
30.3.82	3708	Peter Duncan	Mine Safety Chart/Diagram and Tables	5
27.7.82	177	Brian Billard	(1) Mining royalties as a % State Budget (2) Annual operating surplus	2
10.8.82	346	Peter Duncan	(1) The Rich Get Richer at the Expense of Everybody Else (2) Shares of total tax collected (3) Percentage of Government Tax Revenues deriving from personal tax and company tax	3
10.8.82	358	Keith Plunkett	Shares of total tax collected	1
11.8.82	441	Mr Evans	Student Teacher ratios	3
12.8.82	456	David Wotton	Quarterly net migration gain to S.A.	1
14.9.82	1011	Lynn Arnold	Ratio of Gross Farm Debt to Net Farm Income	1
15.9.82	1074	David Tonkin	Quarterly Net Migration Gain to S.A.	1
15.9.82	1083	Lynn Arnold	Pre-school Centres	1
15.9.82	1084	Lynn Arnold	Operating Costs in Kindergartens	1
15.10.82	1228	David Tonkin	SA's Share of the Nation's Bankruptcies	1
7.10.82	1285	David Tonkin	Education spending	1
12.10.82	1354	David Tonkin	No. of Teenagers looking for full-time work as a % of total unemployed September 1978-82	1
12.10.82	1356	Kevin Hamilton	West Lakes Shore Primary School. Where is it headed?	1
22.9.82	157	John Burdett	Est Com B—Consumer Services Branch: Complaints received and completed 1980-1982 (monthly)	1
23.9.82	167	Brian Billard	Est Com A—Staffing Formula	1
22.3.83	515-518	Ted Chapman	(1) The Sequential events in the life cycle of the Western King Prawn (2) Distribution of juvenile prawns (3) Catch statistics (4) Areas fished (5) Size Gradings and Length frequencies (6) Projected movements	6
30.3.83	749	Legh Davis	Interest rates	1
11.5.83	1443	Legh Davis	Income share of corporate trading enterprises in gross non-farm product 1959-60 to 1981-82	1
19.10.83	1130	Robert Lucas	(1) Centrally Planned Economics (2) Free Market Economics (re cigarette consumption)	2



Date	Page No.	Speaker	Subject Matter	No. of Graphs
22.3.84	2765	John Cornwall	Out of Hundreds—(Maralinga area)	1
27.3.84	2870	Dean Brown	Out of hundreds—New Schedules	1
18.9.84	892	Legh Davis	S.A.: Percentage of population aged 65+, 1851-1981	1
18.9.84	893	Legh Davis	S.A.: Age distribution 1976 and projected age	1
23.10.84	1373	Kevin Hamilton	Total No. of new dwellings	1
12.3.85	3061	Legh Davis	Apparent Aust per capita consumption of alcohol per annum	1
27.3.85	3616	Ted Chapman	Vegetation Clearance Control Monthly Status	1
Book 84-85 Vol. 5—Est Committees A & B—replies to questions				
	557	Roy Abbott	Dickinson's Corner Roads—(map)	1
	558	Roy Abbott	Transport Futures	1
	559	Roy Abbott	Transport Futures	1
	562	Roy Abbott	Ranging tables & graphs	
14.8.85	291	Roger Goldsworthy	Australian Labor Party	1
6.11.85	1840	Legh Davis	Indicative Gas Prices	1

20 books research from 1981-82 to 25 March 1986

**Mr LEWIS:** Subsequent to my examination of the bound volumes, I have looked through the record. I would point out that the last occasion in the bound volumes on which any member incorporated a table involved a table incorporated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at page 291, on 14 August 1985, showing what has happened to membership of the Australian Labor Party. Then we find that on 13 August 1986—barely a year ago—the member for Albert Park incorporated a graph. He said it was a graph and, indeed, it is a graph, which is shaded in density around the curve which it illustrates. On the X axis we see 'blood alcohol concentrations' and, on the Y axis, 'risk of crash times more likely'.

On 14 August the Hon. Peter Dunn in another place incorporated a linear projection of what has happened between volumes of rural production and prices received and paid by farmers. On 14 August 1986 there was the same sort of thing again. On 27 August 1986, at page 659, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw incorporated a histogram. On 27 August 1986 the Hon. Robert Ritson incorporated a graph about brothels and prostitution activities. At page 778, on 28 August 1986, a pie chart was incorporated by the Premier in the budget papers. At page 2452, on 27 November 1986, a pie chart was incorporated by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw; table 28, 'Crisis care, time and source of referrals 1981-82'.

On 28 August 1986, a table was incorporated showing payments of a recurrent nature at page 780 (again in the budget papers); at page 786, on 28 August 'Aggregate capital outlays' (again in the budget papers); and at page 3662 on 1 April this year, 'Fatalities by age in road accidents', incorporated by the Hon. Legh Davis. Subsequent to that, as recently as 18 August 1987—just three weeks ago—Ms Gayler, the member for Newland, incorporated a histogram illustrating percentages and, by virtue of the way in which the lines are drawn across the bars, it is a histogram quite clearly fitting into the category of material in this group.

In the budget papers in *Hansard* of 27 August 1987 we have no fewer than four pie charts illustrating the point the Premier is making about the way in which certain items of expenditure relate to each other. Yet, to my distress, I found during the course of my Address in Reply Speech that my leave was withdrawn after having been granted by the Chamber, when no explanation was ever given to this Chamber that such a withdrawal of leave for the inclusion of such instruments would be taken arbitrarily. We do have the technology to print them: we do have the means by which they can be incorporated in the record.

This Parliament is served in both Houses by the same instrumentality for the publication of the record and I therefore find it inexplicable that it was impossible for this House to incorporate in the record the bar charts, histograms and

pie charts which I sought to incorporate during the course of my remarks. As I said, Sir, with the greatest respect at that time, I could show you—and I now have—exactly where this has happened and it strikes me that for some funny reason there is one rule for some members of this Parliament in some Chambers and another rule for others. The logic as to why there are two sets of rules defies explanation and escapes my capacity to comprehend.

Whereas this Parliament has shown the way in the past as to the fashion in which we should attempt to incorporate into the record the nature of the statements being made to Parliament by its members in a more comprehensible form and therefore ought to resume and continue the practice which it adopted in 1982, other Parliaments in other States have now done so. Victoria and New South Wales have incorporated graphs in *Hansard*. In Tasmania the written record was only recently made a verbatim record. However, graphs are incorporated, but only in circumstances where the Presiding Officer of the Lower House approves. In Western Australia a recent example of that happened on 27 July, I think. In Queensland graphs have also been incorporated. I do not understand why we should change the rules and give members of this Parliament no notice of the intention to do so and indeed the decision which was exercised arbitrarily against me in doing so.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Over many years before I came to this Parliament a promise was made to people in my electorate that the West Lakes Boulevard would become a reality. Since 1979, when I first came to this Parliament, there has been a great deal of procrastination about the route that the boulevard would take. To cut a long story short eventually the Minister of Transport at the time (Hon. Roy Abbott) reached an agreement with the Australian Railways Union to allow the use of the old Hendon spur line as a connector between West Lakes Boulevard and Clark Terrace. That agreement has brought about roadworks which have been in train for some months. The capital works program referring to proposed expenditure, mentions West Lakes Boulevard, Tapleys Hill Road, and Clark Terrace, provision of new link, completion date March 1988, estimated total cost \$1.3 million, proposed expenditure 1987-88 \$1.1 million. I am pleased to see that allocation and, as the Minister is here in the House, I would like to congratulate him because it is sorely needed.

However, having congratulated the Minister on the provision of that \$1 million I would like to reiterate what I have placed on record in the past that, once the vehicular traffic begins using the West Lakes Boulevard extension from Tapleys Hill Road into Clark Terrace, there will be a bottleneck at the intersection Port Road, Clark Terrace and

Cheltenham Parade. I appreciate that the Government has constraints in terms of capital works expenditure, but it would be wrong of me not to raise this matter again.

I can envisage increasing problems at this intersection. Already I have seen a large bank-up in peak hour, particularly in the morning, of traffic wanting to make a right-hand turn from Clark Terrace on to the city bound track of the Port Road. Unless one of two things happen in the near future I know that, as the member for that area, I will receive numerous complaints. The first solution I would suggest is to provide turn right indicators on the corner of Port Road and Clark Terrace. I think that would be the cheaper alternative. If this is not done I anticipate receiving numerous complaints from residents who live in the Seaton, Royal Park, West Lakes and Tennyson areas, who use the boulevard and then come down Tapleys Hill Road, turn left into Morley Road, then on to Clark Terrace and turn right on to the Port Road. There are different ways to get on to the Port Road at present, but people like to take the easiest and quickest route into the city. In normal periods apart from peak hour that is the best way to travel.

The second alternative I anticipate will cost millions of dollars. That is the widening of Clark Terrace from the Morley Road intersection through to Port Road and a sweeping right-hand turn will have to be designed and laid by the Highways Department for traffic to continue through to Port Road. A similarly designed intersection exists at the junction of Port Road and East Parade, near ACI. In my view it is important that this matter be addressed immediately.

I am aware that the Minister has been advised of my concern about five other projects that come within his portfolio, all of which my constituents in their respective suburbs consider very important. I refer to the need for pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Acacia Court, on Tapleys Hill Road. Last December a close mate of mine in his 70s was knocked over and was lucky not to lose his life. I am pleased to say that occasionally he can use his walking frame to walk to the local bar of the Hendon Hotel. As I related in this Parliament last November—and I was somewhat distressed about it—a dear old lady well known to me was knocked down and killed outside the Shell service station on West Lakes Boulevard. That is at the corner of Turner Drive and West Lakes Boulevard, and the Minister has agreed that traffic lights will be installed there subject to finance.

The corner of Bartley Terrace and Bower Road at Semaphore Park is a very dangerous intersection. Unfortunately, people are impatient and, despite a heavy flow of traffic, in some instances they try to force their way out into the traffic. This results in a considerable number of accidents in which motor vehicles have ended up on the lawns of my constituents. Local residents have tried to assist distressed and injured people in those accidents.

Finally, a couple of months ago two young girl students from the Tennyson area, wheeling their bicycles across Military Road, were knocked over. Both were lucky to escape with their lives. I went around to visit one young lass who was covered in plaster from her neck down to her knees, with both legs in plaster, as well as her whole body. So, it is a question of which is the top priority in terms of pedestrian crossings or traffic lights systems for my electorate.

In conjunction with the Minister and the Highways Department I have the difficult job of trying to determine what are the most important sets of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings to be installed in my district. As I said, all these projects are subject to finance. I raise this matter because, when my constituents visit me and ask me to

pursue their just demands for traffic lights to be installed, I will be able to provide them with a copy of the speech that I have made here tonight.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** On behalf of one of my constituent companies, a member of the South Australian Road Transport Association, I have been requested to read the following letter into the record:

The members of our Furniture Removal and Storage Division wish to voice their disapproval of the State Government and sections of the local government granting financial assistance to self help groups to enable them to operate in direct competition with legitimate private sector furniture removalists.

We acknowledge there are people in the country who require assistance and we agree that Government bodies are obliged to give them assistance but not to the extent where those providing it are enabled to compete with legitimate business which cannot compete.

**Mr Lewis:** Scab labour!

**Mr BECKER:** You are right. The letter continues:

Our members employ permanent staff, adhere to award conditions, pay award wages and provide sick leave and annual leave benefits. They provide training courses, under TAFE, to improve skills, employ apprentices and are currently employing trainees under the Federal Government's traineeship scheme, all of whom spend only two-thirds of their time on the job.

Our members pay all of the required taxes which apply to business but they strongly object to indirectly supporting quasi-businesses which contribute nothing and use their cost advantages to quote and win work in an attempt to provide additional support for themselves.

If these self help operations used the funds provided to help those people who really needed it, those who were unable to contribute anything to 'moving house', they would be doing what they were established to do—to employ a few of the unemployed and provide help to others, but we object to the Government or local government purchasing old removal vans so that organisations such as SHAUN (Self Help Adult Unemployed Norwood), PUSH (Port Unemployed Self Help) and the Brighton Helping Hand Society can advertise themselves with, in some cases, local government assistance as legitimate furniture removalists and compete unfairly in the industry.

We know there are people in the country who have to move around who don't require the type of service our members provide and who cannot pay our prices. They do need help and maybe the SHAUNs and PUSHs are the way to provide it with the help of community funds but they must not then be permitted to promote themselves to those who can afford a legitimate removalist, which is what is occurring.

The present state of the State shows a downturn in business generally and particularly in our members' industry. With the competition from the self help groups it is even more difficult to maintain a business and continue to employ trained staff.

We ask you to consider these views and express them on our behalf.

The letter makes this appeal, and I can fully understand why.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** These companies pay taxes and virtually put themselves out of business, because that is what is happening. This company and the industry recognise that there are people in need and people who need assistance. Whilst it is regrettable that such a large number of people are unemployed, through no fault of their own, in the community, except because of ridiculous Government policy—be it State or Federal—and recognising also that this industry is prepared to support people who want to help themselves, it is morally wrong to provide financial assistance to unskilled people and encourage them to advertise their services as professional removalists. It is totally wrong to do that.

**Mr Lewis:** What happens—

**Mr BECKER:** That is what we have to find out. They compete on the open market. If there is a group who need

assistance, certainly they should be able to club in and help one another, but furniture removal is a profession and a skilled industry, the same as anything else, and the extent of add on costs of wages is about 60 per cent in employing someone these days. So, if one pays wages, one has to make a provision of another 60 per cent to cover insurance, insurance against property damage—

**Mr Lewis:** Workers compensation.

**Mr BECKER:** Workers compensation, yes, and pay correct award rates. Members are required to belong to the respective industry unions, so that there are many requirements to be met. There is also the need to have the correct vehicle, a pantechnicon or van to carry the furniture and the condition of the vehicle must be A1. All these conditions must be met.

As we know, and as reported at page 372 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1987, there is a need for assistance for people in unfortunate circumstances. Under the line 'Emergency Housing Office' assistance to various persons, including removal expenses for 1987, was \$141 000. In 1986 it was \$93 000 and in 1985 it was \$44 000. So, the Housing Trust, State and Federal Governments, through the Office of Emergency Housing, are providing sufficient funds to help transport people and their furniture and effects from point A to point B, whether it be in the city or in the country.

The Education Department, the police, the E & WS Department, the Department for Community Welfare, health and the railways and all Government authorities who require people to be employed in the country need to use the services of a properly competent and reliable furniture removalist. At one stage Government contracts ran into millions of dollars. That is falling because of the smaller number of persons moving to the country but, nevertheless, it is an important industry. It is a viable industry where there is keen competition, and that should be so, because the consumer benefits from that competition.

Let me remind the House and the Government that the complaint by the industry is fair and legitimate. No-one has

the right to set up as a professional in an industry that does require certain skills if they are not present. As I said, it is regrettable that people are unemployed. It is regrettable—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** The Government should provide the correct assistance to people in need so that the industry can employ more people and train them. There is an apprenticeship training scheme. The mature unemployed face the toughest conditions in the community.

*Mrs Appleby interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** Therefore, it is up to the unions—the masters of destiny in this country (and let us not kid ourselves about that)—to swallow their pride occasionally and allow employers to provide opportunities for mature age persons and, if necessary, provide them with training opportunities or apprenticeships. How will we get people back into the work force if we do not provide incentives for recognised businesses in our community? There is no way that we will get on top of the unemployment problem if the Government continues to undermine private enterprise.

I fully support the requirements of industry and I know that it is feeling the impact. It is concerned that its taxes are being used to buy old second-hand vans to advertise services and undercut competitors by not paying correct wages, benefits or whatever. It is very hard for a business when it sees that taxes are used to help establish someone who is not 'toeing the line' in relation to the regulations that legitimate industry must abide by. I feel for these people. As I said, let the Government continue to re-establish its priorities by providing assistance. That is clearly done in the Emergency Housing Office where money is provided.

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 September at 11 a.m.