

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 8 October 1987

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

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

That this House acknowledges and supports the need for the South Australian economy to be restructured with greater emphasis being given to export oriented manufacturing industry initiatives and investment and gives its whole hearted endorsement to the Government-sponsored trade and investment missions being taken to Asia and South-East Asia, particularly Japan, China and Malaysia and that the South Australian Parliament expresses its confidence in the economy of South Australia and its belief that the economy holds out the prospect of substantial investment opportunities, of greater employment and sustained and continued economic growth.

In speaking in the Address in Reply debate in response to the Governor's opening of Parliament, I took the opportunity to go through the various trade and investment missions that have been conducted and led by the Premier to Europe and Asia and also the tours that have been taken by the Minister of State Development and Technology to Asia and North America. On that occasion I emphasised the efforts being made by the Minister of State Development and Technology in concentrating on the areas where the export oriented industries, where the greatest opportunity exists for the South Australian economy to take advantage of the growth and investment potential, had been bearing substantial fruit. Today I want to continue along this same line and look at the ways in which the Minister of State Development and Technology has been able to capitalise on some of the tours he has conducted.

In particular, I refer to the most recent edition of the South Australian-Shandong Newsletter, which has now become a regular feature of the reporting on the development of the economic relationship between Australia and one of the major growth economies of Asia. Edition No. 13 indicates that not only is this an initiative that is being sponsored by the Government but that in fact it has the substantial support of the South Australian business community.

The most recent of the trade missions led by the Minister of State Development and Technology involved representatives from a number of major companies, namely, the Crompton Group, Wauchope Pty Ltd, Celtainer Ltd, Tubemakers of Australia, Luminis Pty Ltd, British Aerospace, Safcol, Pak-Poy & Kneebone, Kinhill Stearns, Michell & Sons, Stratco Metal, Basin Exports, and the South Australian Malting Co. Pty Ltd. Many of those companies are involved in some major development projects in South Australia. This involves the major city-based development projects as well as people who are actively involved in new technology developments—and I refer particularly to Luminis. Also, a number of companies represented on that most recent delegation are the most active and largest participants in Technology Park. The mission spent a number of days in Beijing and Shanghai and, whilst business contacts were being made by the representatives of the firms that I have referred to, the Minister for State Development and Technology was ensuring that the links between South Australia and China were being developed with local, municipal and regional authorities.

This was but one of the missions to Asia led by the Minister for State Development and Technology. Perhaps

later in my remarks I will address the benefits that are starting to flow from these trade missions that the Minister is leading to South-East Asia and China, in particular, and also the benefits that are flowing from a number of other trade missions to Europe as well as to our closer neighbours like New Zealand.

I now refer to the South Australian export performance. I refer to a table which I had incorporated in *Hansard* during the Address in Reply speech that I made on 6 August (page 34 of *Hansard*). It gives details of South Australia's export performance and compares the position for the first nine months of 1985-86 with the first nine months of 1986-87 and lists the percentage change in export performance in a number of key industry areas. The figures in this chart are particularly outstanding and indicate extraordinary growth in South Australia's export performance, of some thousands of per cent. I shall refer to just one or two of these in order to indicate to the House the magnitude of the increased performance in relation to exports from South Australia. For example, export of household appliances has increased from a value of some \$380 000 in the first nine months of 1985-86 to a value of \$1.3 million.

Although that in itself is not a major increase in terms of value, it represents a percentage increase in performance in that area of more than 3 000 per cent. In air conditioning machines, for example, the increase in performance has gone from a turnover of \$821 000 worth of appliances to over \$6.5 million worth of exports—an increase of some 702 per cent. So, the record goes on in the electronics and communications area, where the increases in performance vary from a low of 54 per cent in telecommunications equipment to a high of 643 per cent for the export of electronic micro-circuits. Similarly in engineering, electric motors and electric generators, there have been substantial increases, as well as in instrument analysis, while a number of increases have occurred in the general categories of parts and accessories for bicycles as well as parts and accessories for aircraft, and so on.

I am sure that members will find great interest in some of these percentage increases, and the point has to be noted in particular that, while some of the areas of activity are not major, they are going into China and South-East Asia, where there will continue to be a substantially increased capacity for South Australia to continue to improve that performance over a period of time.

I will now move away from the actual increased performance and look at the areas in which both industry and Government can improve their performance and their standing in order to take greater advantage of existing export opportunities. Professor Skinner, of the US Harvard Business School, believes that it is important to improve manufacturing management, because otherwise there is unlikely to be much of an improvement in the manufacturing process and in the outcome of the manufacturing process itself. He argues that it has been recognised that the emphasis on productivity as the key factor in competitiveness is wrong, and he believes, to the contrary, that the focus on productivity has led to a loss of jobs and markets and to an increase in imports. Instead of finding new products for new markets, argues Professor Skinner, a number of US companies are spending time trying to get what are really only small gains in productivity. He says that managers should look at new organisational systems and technologies to meet the rapidly growing and changing nature of our markets and the changing nature of competition.

Members might note that manufactured goods are the single most important component of the world merchandise trade at the moment: they account for something like 60

per cent of the annual total and are the fastest growing component of world merchandise trade. Within that category, the bulk of the world trade of manufactured goods are what are called ETMs (or elaborately transformed manufactured goods), which represent the higher valued goods, those products in which there has been a substantial change to the nature of the components which originally went into their manufacture. So, if we try to match together those two observations of Professor Skinner, it is necessary that, when industries within the manufacturing sector are thinking of retooling and of investing in their operations, they must also think of a substantial investment in the quality of their management.

It is important to do this, because the argument is often raised that the cost of labour is the major impediment to increasing productivity and output in the manufacturing sector. I think that Professor Skinner's argument is that one of the major impediments to increasing productivity and output would be the quality of management, and the sophistication and the way in which the organisation was structured and the way in which the people in it were able to contribute to the decision-making process as a whole in terms of objectives for markets, and the way in which all the people in the organisation were able to contribute to decisions about the manufacturing process. It is important, therefore, that management tools ensure that all people within an organisation feel that they are part of that organisation, and can contribute to its overall objectives and to the way in which the company is structured and its products are developed. This will be the key difference between companies that survive and those that do not.

I return to the point that I was making earlier that labour costs are seen as a particular impediment to increased productivity. I will now refer to a table, produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which attempts to compare the percentage cost that labour represents in the total cost of a product in South Australia with the cost that it represents on a national level. The ABS has attempted to do this by taking each of the categories of manufacturing activity used in many of its analyses. The component that labour costs represent as a proportion of the total production cost is lower in South Australia than in Australia generally in the following manufacturing sectors: food, tobacco and beverages; textiles; wood, wood products and furniture; non-metallic mineral products; fabricated metal products (again, an area to which I referred earlier, where the growth in export performance has been the most staggering); and transport equipment. If one takes into account those industries that have a lower labour cost, along with the half a dozen areas where the cost is slightly higher, South Australia compares extremely favourably on a national level with other parts of the country in relation to labour costs as a proportion of total production costs.

The production figures to which I have referred indicate that labour costs in South Australia comprise only 26.7 per cent of total production costs. A recent Chamber of Commerce study has indicated a 10 per cent fall in the number of firms who see labour costs as the most significant disincentive or barrier to investment.

In other words, they see that South Australian labour costs are no longer the major contributing factor to investment. In fact, that Chamber of Commerce study further indicates that the major factor that is now seen by manufacturers as a disincentive to investment is the availability of skilled labour. Interestingly, that occurs at a time when there are high levels of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment.

This apparent dichotomy (namely, that investors see the major obstacle to increased investment opportunities as the lack of suitable skilled labour, at the same time the community is experiencing relatively high levels of unemployment, particularly in the youth market) needs to be specifically addressed by Governments. I believe that it is being addressed by a number of initiatives in the TAFE and trade training and qualification areas at both State and national levels. Nationally, recent decisions that are designed to target training programs to those industries where the skill deficiency is highest have been announced in the Federal budget. Over the past few years there has tended in TAFE to be an expansion in the number of qualifications that are available. However, they are not being targeted sufficiently to those industries in relation to which there is a desire to invest and which can see the opportunity for increased export markets.

The initiatives that are being taken by the Federal Government are designed to zero in on companies which can see that a certain qualification, skill or category of employee is needed in their area of activity so that they can increase their production but which cannot find them in the people who are completing the various TAFE courses. Then, having identified a particular area of productivity, a training program can be specifically tailored to meet the skill shortage in that area.

I believe that that is an example of what Professor Skinner was talking about when I quoted him earlier—the need to have very much more sensitive, imaginative and tailored management programs that can specifically identify the skills that the companies need, so that they can go to a Government that has a training package that is sensitive and responsive to industry's needs and, together, develop a training program, some of which may involve TAFE, other parts of the tertiary sector or the various existing apprenticeship programs. Then management, Government and floor managers can say that they recognise that these are the people whom they need, and they can get them together to operate a program that will provide the skills that will enable them to specifically increase investment and production. I believe that that is an example of management being far more sensitive to the needs of their workforce, to the national economic goals and to the opportunities that exist in the export market.

Another part of the strategy that is also important in terms of developing our capacity, because of the small nature of the South Australian regional economy in the larger deregulated world economy in which we are now having to be an active participant, is that there must be specialised industry support mechanisms that can link together the needs of industry and the national economic goals that are being defined in relation to these export markets, so that we can move to the second area of giving a great deal of support in developing the industrial and technical techniques that are part of the new industrial climate.

On the one hand, we have the first part of the strategy dealing with the work force and trying to capitalise on the recognised opportunities, making a more skilled work force that will enable us to increase production. The second part of the strategy involves the Government being prepared to invest heavily in industries which have identified opportunities and which need some Government support in a variety of subsidies, tax concession arrangements, and so on, so that they can take the risks that are involved in some of these areas.

Some of the things that are necessary are already being done in South Australia and elsewhere. I refer, for example,

to an industrial laser application centre, and an electronic testing area, where new techniques and devices can be tried out. Despite the high growth environment for manufactured goods in world trade, South Australia's manufacturing sector has experienced a sharp decline over the 1970s up until recently, and it has been necessary to work, if you like, on the smaller canvas rather than with the broad brush approach, which has not been sensitive enough to the needs of individual companies.

The initiatives that have been taken, particularly in South Australia, in addition to the Centre for Manufacturing, are the establishment of the Small Business Corporation; the establishment of Manufacturing Week which, in the words of the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia is 'in the simplest possible terms, one of the greatest initiatives that have been taken for manufacturing industry in South Australia'. It has the support of industry, of Government and of the trade union movement, and its objective was to raise the awareness in the community of the significance of the role of manufacturing and of the importance of a skilled work force in that new manufacturing industry, as well as the importance of highly sophisticated technical applications of the new technology also within the manufacturing sector. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### BELAIR-BRIDGewater RAIL SERVICE

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I move:

That this House, recognising the strong support on the part of Hills residents and the tourist industry generally for a train service between Bridgewater and Adelaide, calls on the Minister of Transport to introduce a rationalised Bridgewater rail service in line with the findings of the study carried out by the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics that either 2 000 or 3 000 series rolling stock be utilised and that the service be adequately promoted to ensure that patrons are encouraged to use the service.

I want to spend a little time speaking on the extremely sad state of affairs that surrounds the closure of the Bridgewater service. On 28 September 1985, the *Advertiser* reported the current Minister of Transport as saying that the Adelaide to Bridgewater rail line would be retained and upgraded. The *Advertiser* report stated:

The decision follows a meeting held yesterday between Mr Keneally and members of the Hills Transport Action Group. Mr Keneally said the meeting had been 'very constructive' and the Government was committed to retaining the line and gradually improving it.

He went on to say:

The STA had recommended in April that the line be closed completely. . .

Mr Keneally was stating that he had spoken against that and, in fact, was keen to have the line maintained. On 15 August 1985, the same year, the Minister of Tourism is quoted in an *Advertiser* article as being strongly in favour of the retention of the Bridgewater line and stated that it would do much for the tourism industry in this State. The sad facts about this matter are that the Government, and particularly the Minister of Transport, have refused to listen to the wishes of the people who are affected by the closure of the line.

I go back to a situation many months ago where about 600 people attended a public meeting at Aldgate called to discuss the possible closure of the Bridgewater service. It was the largest public meeting that had been held in the Hills. The strength of feeling expressed at that meeting was such that it was important enough that the Government should have taken notice and acted to support the people who were in attendance.

Coming out of that meeting was a resolution to meet with the Premier to discuss matters raised by the numerous speakers at the meeting and to go to the Premier in an attempt to ensure that the line was not closed. The Premier refused to meet the deputation and continually indicated that the only person who was able to meet such a deputation was the Minister of Transport. Therefore, a meeting was held with him that was an absolute waste of time. That has been referred to on numerous occasions publicly by the people who formed the deputation.

The Minister stated at the outset that he was not prepared to listen to the wishes of the Hills people, that he was not prepared to consider the retention of the service. So we have seen the closure of that important service. I do not want to go over all the material that has been raised in this House previously: I want to come straight to the matter of the study carried out by the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Which one?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister of Labour has raised an interesting point—which study? As I understand it, there was only one study. The problem is that there were two reports, and I will refer to that later because it is absolutely scandalous that no-one, and certainly not the Minister of Transport in this House, is prepared to come clean as to what happened in this matter. The Premier has not been prepared to carry out an investigation in this State or to see that an investigation is carried out by his colleague the Federal Minister.

It is interesting talking about the Federal Minister for Land Transport and Infrastructure Support (Mr Duncan). In a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* on 17 August, under the heading 'Rail survey', the Federal Minister states:

The Federal Government has no direct interest in the outcome of the Adelaide Hills rail dispute. By allowing the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics to conduct an independent study into the viability of the Adelaide-Mount Barker rail corridor I have sought to make available the professional expertise of an unbiased 'umpire' to all parties in this dispute.

Of course, he was replying to a letter, which appeared a few days before, from David Weston, Chairman of the Hills Transport Action Group, to the Editor. Mr Duncan further states:

It is therefore quite ill-conceived for any parties involved to be attacking the 'umpire'. I wish to assure Mr David Weston and the Hills Transport Action Group that the bureau has an extensive and independent research capacity in its own right and that I have asked for there to be wide consultation on all issues relevant to the study.

We know how wide it was. It was a matter of only a few weeks in which submissions could be presented. The Federal Minister further states:

I appreciate the concern expressed regarding the short time-frame for the study. However, I am sure that with full cooperation of all parties involved the integrity of the study will not be jeopardised.

It is essential that all parties involved in this dispute demonstrate their willingness to maintain an open mind on the independent study being undertaken by the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics.

I now turn to the findings of that study. The BTE was asked to examine the viability of the Bridgewater rail service as it existed prior to July 1987 and, also, to consider the possible extension of the service to Mount Barker. In its conclusions, the report states:

Discussions with the railway union and submissions from residents of the Adelaide Hills suggested that a rationalised rail service to Bridgewater should also be examined.

The report further states:

The possible extension of the rail service to Mount Barker was found to be not justified on financial or broader social criteria.

I support that conclusion. As much as I would like to see a greater choice provided to the people of Mount Barker as far as public transport is concerned, at this stage I do not think that such an extension is justified. That does not mean that in a few years time my opinion will be the same. I suggest that, as a result of the growth that is being experienced in the Mount Barker area, in a couple of years time such a service could be justified but, at this stage, I accept the suggestions made by the report. The study looked at the social costs associated with closing the rail service and, under the heading 'Complete closure of the Bridgewater rail service', the report states that a number of social costs discussed in chapter 5 cannot be quantified, and that it is a matter of judgment whether those costs are sufficient to outweigh the net savings that have been estimated. The report further states:

There are some groups clearly disadvantaged by the closure of the rail service. Some people in Upper Sturt are no longer adequately served by public transport and there are others who previously used the train to travel to work or educational institutions close to stations on the line between Adelaide and Belair.

The report goes on to refer to some of the bus routes that may be able to provide an alternative route to Belair which will enable people in the Hills to use the train service. We are aware that those services have not been provided, and that some of the services that have been provided are totally inadequate in relation to the services that are required by many of these people. The report further states:

The BTE understands that the timetable for these routes is not designed to link with the rail service although the coordination is reasonable.

That is hogwash; that is not practical. The report further states:

Road safety was also raised as an issue by proponents of a rail service who were concerned at the increase in traffic on Mount Barker Road that would result from the rail service closure.

That has been a major factor. I am sure that every member of the House would be aware of the concern that has been expressed over a period of time about the conditions that are experienced by those people who drive on that stretch of road. In more recent times we have learned that about \$7 million is to be provided on an interim basis for upgrading the road. We hoped that the works would have been well underway but, at this stage, all we have seen is a little cosmetic work, cutting down a few trees and erecting a few elaborate signs. Really, nothing has been done to overcome the serious problems associated with that road.

Those who travel along that road frequently, as I do, will see that the number of accidents is not being reduced; and I believe that there are still immense problems as to the number of people who travel in overcrowded buses along this extremely dangerous road. In fact, many people say that it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident involving one of those totally overcrowded buses. Under the heading 'Rationalised Bridgewater rail service' the report states:

The other option examined was a rationalised rail service proposed by the rail unions. Other possible rationalised services were proposed by others in submissions to the BTE. The union proposal was examined principally because it had fewer services and appeared to be the one with the best chance of being viable. If a rationalised service were to be introduced there is no guarantee that this particular proposal is optimum and further examination would be required.

I accept that. The report then states:

The union proposal was also found to be financially not viable in the sense that the additional costs compared to total withdrawal of the service were not offset by savings elsewhere or by additional revenue. It did have the advantage that many of the disadvantaged groups referred to earlier would have a public transport service, albeit a reduced one—

and this is the interesting part—

It would also exhibit fewer of the social costs than would be incurred by the total withdrawal of the rail service.

Under 'Concluding comments' the report states:

The STA operates a bus service which competes directly for patronage with the rail service along most of the route.

That is hogwash, because there is no STA bus service to Bridgewater. The Minister knows that and it was made quite clear in a number of the submissions put forward. The report then states:

The rationalised proposal while still incurring a net financial and social cost still achieves 75 per cent of the savings estimated for the complete closure option. At the same time it provides a service for all the groups identified in chapter 5 as being disadvantaged by withdrawal of the rail service. The level of service provided by the rationalised service is not as frequent as particular groups or individuals may wish but as noted previously the pre-July 1987 level of service cannot be justified. . . The option of some form of a rationalised service similar to the one analysed, while not meeting financial or social audit criteria, could meet the transport preferences of the community at a cost which is substantially below that of the pre-July 1987 service.

That important aspect concludes the report. I wish to say much more on this subject, so I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## OPPOSITION ROLE

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I move:

That this House registers disgust at the Opposition's tactics to lower this Parliament's standing in the community and, further, this House rejects the Opposition's role as 'Ambassadors of Despair' in South Australia, as part of their attack on the Government.

It does not give me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion, but I think it should be on the record. We heard as recently as Tuesday of this week an attack on the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee—

**An honourable member:** Disgraceful!

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, as my colleague says, it was disgraceful. Since I have been a member of this place I have held the view that, if criticism is to be levelled at a particular member, it should be done fairly and with reasons given for the attack. I am certainly no angel when it comes to having a serve of other members in this place, but in the time that I have been here I do not believe that I have resorted to personal attacks.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** If members opposite want to give me a serve first up, by all means, I will respond, but I can say to the member for Murray Mallee that if he would care to peruse *Hansard* since September 1979 he will find that, unless I have been personally attacked, I have not gone out of my way to attack any members of this House or tried to personally denigrate them. Let him check the records. I know he has a computer; let him do that. The sorts of thing that get up my nose as a member of this place are comments like the one recorded in *Hansard* on Tuesday 16 September 1986, as follows:

What does one expect if one has a reformed alcoholic as a Prime Minister?

That sort of statement by a member of the Opposition is made in an attempt to denigrate Government members and the Labor Party itself. Few members in this House do not have a skeleton in the cupboard, and if the Opposition wants to resort to these gutter tactics then it is only natural that people will respond.

**Mr Meier:** Tell that to Keating.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The honourable member himself can respond to what Mr Keating has to say; I am talking about

remarks made in this place. I have said repeatedly in this House that I respect the member who made the remark to which I have referred for his ability to look after disadvantaged groups within South Australia (I refer to the member for Hanson), but I was appalled when he made that remark. I know of his activities in looking after many disadvantaged groups and I believe in giving credit where credit is due. Here is an instance where somebody has erred from the straight and narrow and possibly gone through a rough patch and had a drinking bout. I do not believe it does any good. I have been in this place long enough to be able to tell stories (but I have not chosen to do so) about problems of individual members. One only has to look at an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* some time ago written by Randall Ashbourne. I think he hit the nail on the head when he said:

There is an adage in politics to the effect that if enough mud is thrown some is certain to stick. But stick to whom? Ever since the Tonkin Government was pipped at the post in 1982, the SA Liberals have been throwing allegations of political and personal impropriety at the Bannon Administration.

It goes on to say:

One might have thought the 1985 election result would have persuaded the Opposition to try a new tack. Not a bit of it.

It goes on further to say:

For instead of rejecting what the Government has dubbed the politics of sleaze, the Opposition has convinced itself that more is better. Since the election, there has been a constant stream of alleged scandals—not one of which has stuck.

It would appear to me that the Opposition should change its tactics. I do not believe this Government, or any Government, is perfect, but let us be fair in our criticism. If people want to resort to personal attacks on someone who has a problem or a disability, I believe the Government's standing in the community will be increasingly lowered. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, South Australian parliamentary salaries should be linked to Federal parliamentary salaries.

In moving this motion I know that at least some members have a copy of a speech that I intended to use in relation to this matter. It is quite lengthy and time does not allow for that contribution today. So, I will be brief. It is also recognised that I would try to introduce a Bill today. That cannot be achieved, even though I dropped off my first two motions. I realise that that opportunity has gone also. It may have related to other matters that tied in with this proposition. I move the proposition today that our salaries be linked to Federal parliamentary salaries; we should try to get Parliament to establish the principle by which we may be able to be guided in the future. If that is achieved, we need to look at how we implement that proposition and to what degree when at some time in the future an Act may come before the Parliament.

I am conscious that in 1984 the State ALP Convention passed a resolution agreeing to this proposition and I am also conscious, from talking to members of Parliament from all philosophies (I do not say that I have spoken to all politicians but to politicians from all the different philosophies), that they do not disagree with the proposition. After I first gave notice that I was going to do this, and even after the ALP Convention, I do not believe that I read one article in any section of the press criticising the principle involved in this motion. Nor have I received any letters or heard

any comments, since publicity was given to the motion I was intending to move, condemning or criticising the proposition.

The general view now is that we in this State should try to take the decision making process on what our salaries should be from time to time out of State politics and away from the political point scoring arena as it has been in the past and tie it to the Federal scene. In saying that, I am conscious that, at one time when there was a move for us to get an 18 per cent catch-up, the Federal politicians attacked us and told us that it was not justified. They gave us a going over through the media, but within six months they gave themselves a similar or greater rise. That was hypocrisy which has done our cause here no good as far as salaries are concerned. In this motion I am not advocating any increase in salaries but rather a matter of principle that our situation be tied to the Federal scene.

The other point I wish to make in relation to salaries can be said at a later date. It is fair, however, that we record in this debate the salaries paid in the mainland States and the Northern Territory so that they are on the record for those who want to see them. The Western Australian parliamentarians receive \$44 477 per annum; Federal parliamentarians, \$46 065; Queensland parliamentarians, \$45 698; Victoria parliamentarians, \$45 565; Northern Territory parliamentarians, \$44 301; New South Wales parliamentarians, \$43 620; and South Australian parliamentarians, \$41 378. I do not wish to say any more, because of the shortage of time. However, it is time to set this principle and at some future date, with whatever criticisms we have to carry, we can leave the salary as it is by tying it to \$5 000 behind the Federal parliamentary salary or set it at some other figure that Parliament can decide later. I ask members to support the proposition, which will establish the principle of tying our salaries to the Federal parliamentary salaries, as is the case in Victoria and in Western Australia according to the new regulation that that State put through in recent times.

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

## TOBACCO ADVERTISING (PROHIBITION) BILL

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to prohibit the public promotion, by advertisement or other means, of cigarette smoking and other forms of tobacco consumption; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** 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

Tobacco consumption is the single largest preventable cause of death among Australians and any steps which this Parliament can take to reduce the number of South Australians who will take up the habit in the years to come must be a significant, if not the most significant, contribution to public health which we can take in the next several decades. There can be no doubt that if tobacco was to be discovered now, it would never be allowed onto the market but would be dealt with as a controlled substance and condemned as a carcinogen of some potency. However, the reality is that tobacco products are here to stay and it is unrealistic to think in such terms given that nearly one-third of our

population is dependent on the drug to some extent. What we must not do is to turn a blind eye to the problem because it is so massive. Governments of all persuasions have so far often chosen to place the health problems associated with tobacco into the too-hard basket. However, this situation is starting to change.

In 1983, the Western Australian Government sponsored a Bill to prohibit tobacco advertising and while the Bill was approved in the Lower House, it failed narrowly in the Legislative Council after an unprecedented campaign against the measure by the tobacco industry. The situation was reversed in South Australia, with the Legislative Council approving a Bill with similar effect but the measure lapsed in the House of Assembly when it failed to find a sponsor.

More recently, the National Drug Summit placed significant emphasis on tobacco and our own Minister of Health and Minister of Recreation and Sport have both been prominent in drawing attention to the issue at the national level. The 1986 report of the Commonwealth Better Health Commission identified a complete ban on the advertising and promotion of tobacco products as a significant priority in the progress towards improving the health of all Australians.

The Victorian Government has now announced a series of measures with very similar objectives to this Bill. It prohibits most forms of advertising and sponsorship and establishes a fund of some \$23 million to be known as the Victorian Health Promotion Fund, which will be administered by a foundation whose board will be composed of eminent persons from cultural, sporting and health fields. The fund will use the revenue from the proposed increase in the business franchise fee to ensure that all sporting clubs who were formerly dependent on tobacco company sponsorship are not deprived of funds when advertising is banned.

This Bill is no longer a mere voice in the wilderness, when taken in conjunction with the decision of the Federal ALP Caucus to ban smoking on all domestic flights, of whatever duration, the days of tobacco advertising are clearly numbered. Legislatures across the country have started to act on their belief that tobacco advertising must end in the interests of the health of all Australians.

While advertising continues on a massive scale in the print media and through sponsorship, we will not begin to make serious inroads into reducing the number of young people who take up the habit and become the consumers of the next generation and the victims of the following generation.

To quote from the Better Health Commission report 'Looking Forward to Better Health':

Tobacco advertising promotes the notion that smoking is a desirable activity and does much to undermine the credibility of health education programs.

Children being taken through school health education programs on smoking find their corner milk bar festooned with point-of-sale advertising, and family magazines littered with advertisements for cigarettes. The final message that gets through is 'if it's alright to advertise cigarettes, then smoking can't be all that bad.'

The industry clings desperately to the fiction that there is no established link between smoking and lung cancer and other related medical problems. They dismiss the clear and unequivocal scientific studies which use statistical techniques to link the activity with the result as lacking in causality. Naturally, they can hardly do otherwise since to admit that they are aware of the link between smoking and cancer would be to expose themselves to total legal liability and the immediate demise of the industry.

In science and medicine, statistics are a perfectly proper and appropriate way to establish the correlation between cause and effect. Society does not wait until the absolute intricate detail of the precise pathway of each threat to life

is established before acting to regulate the obvious causal agent.

We are aware of the effects of nuclear radiation even though our understanding of the exact process of radiation damage is far from perfect. Indeed, this analogy is very useful and should be explored further. It is reliably estimated that the Chernobyl accident will result in over 1 million additional cancers of greater or lesser seriousness over the next few decades in those populations indirectly affected by the nuclear fallout. Here the 'causality' has not been established to the satisfaction of the tobacco lobby but there is no doubt that the cause is Chernobyl and that radiation is responsible for the illness which will manifest itself over the next 20 or more years.

Just like radiation, tobacco is carcinogenic and the effects are spread out over a generation. The cause and effect are well known and while the nature of our society means that we can not simply ban tobacco, we must act to ensure that future generations do not begin to smoke and that those who do give up voluntarily are not driven back into the habit by subtle and persuasive advertising.

The argument that if it is legal to sell it should be legal to advertise is simplistic and at the surface, persuasive. Closer analysis reveals it for what it is—a subterfuge. There are many products which are legal to sell but which may not be advertised and the Controlled Substances Act of this Parliament prohibits the advertising of most poisons and prescription drugs. Tobacco is at least as harmful as many of these drugs and more harmful than most. The active constituents of cigarettes, including nicotine, tar and carbon monoxide would all be banned in any other food or drug and they are unable to be advertised separately outside of their use in tobacco products.

It must also be understood that an advertising ban is directed at minimising the number of new smokers who take up the habit. It does not affect in any way the right or ability of existing smokers to continue to smoke. The existing smoker is not affected in any way by the proposed ban on advertising since tobacco adverts are notoriously deficient of information such as tar content, nicotine content or the probable ill-effects of consuming the product.

Almost universally they are designed to create a favourable, glamorous and attractive image of cigarette smoking and thereby encourage potential new smokers to take up the habit. In particular, they are looking towards the new market of young people and women who may replace the mature age males who are leaving the market.

To suggest that advertising does nothing to attract new people to take up smoking is to test our credulity. The whole basis of all other advertising in our society is to create an image and to promote a product. Why should tobacco be any different? They do not spend millions on advertising simply to bring about brand change, although that may be an added benefit. Overall, the strategy is aimed at introducing new people to the industry and creating an image about smoking which will induce young people to see it as a means of establishing their identity and projecting themselves as mature.

Even though surveys may suggest that it is peer group pressure that induces most young people to smoke, that begs the question of why the peer group thought it was an acceptable form of behaviour at all. Clearly, advertising sets the stage and brings the market to the point where other smaller influences can take over. The industry would not be so concerned if they really believed that an advertising ban would not affect their long term sales. It is critical that children are not persuaded that smoking is a positive attrib-

ute since studies show that over 80 per cent of adult smokers took up the habit in childhood.

I would now like to turn to the other group in our community who have become dependent on tobacco even though its effects on health make it an anathema to them and that is the sporting clubs and cultural groups who rely on sponsorship from tobacco companies. The generosity of the tobacco industry towards this group has much to do with the way in which it can later be used to resist any changes to the law such as are contemplated by this Bill and to ensure that young people in particular perceive tobacco to be a clean and healthy activity even though this is far from reality.

If tobacco advertising and sponsorship are to be banned, then these groups must be protected. While one would like to think that the companies would continue to show their social conscience by supporting their favourite charities, even without the related advertising, I am sure that this would not occur. In this sense, the tobacco companies are exposed for what they are since many other corporations who sponsor good works in the community do so without the publicly demanded by the tobacco companies. In this context, I would cite the Ludwig Foundation which has endowed cancer research centres around the world with large sums of money and who do not crave the recognition which the tobacco lobby demand. Such is the hallmark of real philanthropy.

Accordingly, an essential component of this Bill is the replacement of the tobacco company sponsorship for sport and culture with a public fund established for the purpose and financed through an increase in the business franchise fee. Since about 75 per cent of all spending on promotion by tobacco companies is on advertising and only 25 per cent on sponsorship, this should not require a very significant increase in the fee.

Even though there are tax concessions for advertising and some sponsorship, the low relative percentage of the sponsorship component means that the overall effect on company revenue even after they have absorbed the increased franchise fee necessary to provide the same amount for public sponsorship as was previously provided directly should be positive. In the longer term, the amount could be increased to ensure that the effect was in fact neutral.

Unfortunately, the Constitution and the Standing Orders prohibit me from introducing a money clause and I must seek assistance from a Minister of the Crown to introduce the necessary clause into the Bill by way of amendment should the Bill reach the Committee stage. I hope that this Bill will be treated by all honourable members as a moral and humanitarian issue to be decided on its merits and free from all Party political connotations.

It is of far greater importance in this context than the Liquor Licensing Bill, the Casino Bill and the Controlled Substances Bill, all of which were treated in this way. The people of South Australia are entitled to expect that we will treat the long term health of this State with that kind of respect and in my view there is no better way to make a start on the prevention of some 1 500 unnecessary and preventable deaths a year than through the measures contained in this Bill.

I do not suggest that this is an immediate solution—the very nature of the problem is such that it will take as many years to solve as it did to create but at least through the prohibition of advertising we will have made a significant first step in addressing the problem seriously and in the long term we will save more lives than the elimination of the road toll and addiction to all other drugs combined.

The Bill is not directed at existing smokers and the Bill should not affect them in any way. It is primarily directed at benefiting the children who will be born the day after it becomes law. They will grow up in a society free from tobacco promotion and may therefore have the opportunity to avoid addiction to tobacco as adults. I commend the Bill to the House.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### WATERWORKS CHARGES

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That the regulations under the Waterworks Act 1932 relating to scale of charges, made on 18 June and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1987, be disallowed.

In moving this motion, I draw to the attention of all members of the House the fact that these charges are new—they are new from the point of view that previously there were no charges for connecting water facilities to blocks of land in urban areas if the water was not currently running past the door. The E&WS Department took this into account in its overall charging, and certainly those facilities were provided year after year. The charge is \$1 200. To people in the metropolitan area, who have to pay upwards of \$30 000 for a block of land—although I do not know how many blocks of land would be available in the metropolitan area for \$30 000—\$1 200 would probably not be a significant sum. In relation to higher priced blocks—and I believe that some blocks in the metropolitan area are getting nearer to \$100 000—

**Mr Lewis:** And many of them are fully serviced.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, many of them, if not all, are fully serviced. To people buying a block of land in that price range, \$1 200 would be a drop in the ocean—nothing at all. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks later. Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### TAFE PRINCIPALS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That the regulations under the Technical and Further Education Act 1976 relating to principals, leave and hours, made on 6 August and laid on the table of this House on 11 August 1987, be disallowed.

(Continued from 10 September. Page 892.)

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** I oppose this disallowance motion on a number of grounds. First, the Minister of State Development and Technology indicated, in a ministerial statement to the House yesterday, that the Government had been involved in negotiations with SAIT on behalf of TAFE staff, and TAFE principals in particular. He indicated in that statement that, in respect of TAFE staff and their working conditions, negotiations had led to a position where the Government had indicated that it would be withdrawing the regulations. However, in giving that undertaking as part of the negotiations, the Government had reserved its right to reintroduce the regulations in the same or an amended form following the outcome of discussions and negotiations with SAIT. The Minister also indicated in that statement that the issue of whether or not TAFE principals and their conditions ought best be addressed under the ambit of the TAFE Act or under the ambit of the Government Management and Employment Act was the subject of continuing discussions and that in fact legal action was being taken by

SAIT and was being responded to by the Government in the Supreme Court.

So, the best that can be said at this point is that an extensive process of negotiation and discussion is being entered into by the Executive with representatives of SAIT, on behalf of the TAFE staff. Therefore, I believe that, with the Executive having indicated a particular course of action, it would not be proper for this Parliament to pre-empt what has been indicated by the Executive as a course of action it wishes to take pending the outcome of these discussions with SAIT.

My second reason for opposing this motion is that the whole issue of the regulations is still before a committee of this Parliament, namely, the Subordinate Legislation Committee. That committee has received both written and oral evidence from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, addressing itself to a number of concerns about the process followed by the Government in declaring these regulations that relate to working conditions. Following the evidence that had been received by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the committee wrote to the Minister, asking him to respond to the points of view that had been put to it by the SAIT representatives, and arrangements are being made for the Minister or his representative to appear before the committee. So, I believe that the Parliament should not take any precipitate action in respect of this part of my argument, thus pre-empting the decision of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Those are two of my arguments: I do not believe that the Parliament should pre-empt the decisions of the Executive outlined yesterday; and I do not think that the Parliament should pre-empt decisions or the outcome of discussions undertaken by the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

My third area of objection is a more general one. The whole process of developing regulations under the TAFE Act, and the way in which the Government has gone about that in the past, has not been the subject of dispute and has not led to substantial differences of opinion as it has on this occasion. Since the TAFE Act was promulgated in 1976 and the regulations under that Act were approved by this Parliament, there have been no fewer than 13 separate occasions on which the regulations have been amended. On each of those occasions the amendments dealt with the same area of general concern as they are dealing with now, namely, the working conditions of TAFE staff. This set of regulations also deals with working conditions of TAFE staff.

The Government has been criticised about TAFE staff working conditions being dealt with by way of regulation. That is exactly how those working conditions have been dealt with on occasions when it has been necessary to amend the regulations over the past 13 or so years. So there is nothing untoward, different, out of character or underhanded about the way in which the Government on this occasion is using the regulations under the TAFE Act to determine working conditions for its staff.

It is indicating that, of the total package of hours worked in one week, there shall be a particular allocation for lunch breaks, contact time before students, and the way in which those hours can be counted, so the quantum of hours has not been changed and what has been addressed in these regulations (in order to do what every member of this House wishes every Government spectrum to do, namely increase efficiency and get better value for taxpayers' money spent in the TAFE area) is increased productivity, output and efficiency of the TAFE sector. The Government is not changing the quantum figure but altering the way in which

hours are allocated. For that more general concern, I oppose the motion.

Motion negatived.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 September. Page 896.)

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** The member for Davenport has placed before the Parliament an interesting proposition in the form of this motion. The purpose of the Bill is to place on the statutes a law which will clearly indicate to the courts and the public that, where the most horrifying of criminal offences are committed, the courts have the power to put an offender away for the term of his or her natural life. I think that there is an expectation abroad in the public sector that, if a person has committed a heinous crime (and there are certain degrees of such crimes), or has committed the sort of atrocity sometimes experienced in the community, the judiciary should have the power to put that person away for the term of his natural life.

There was a time when a criminal could expect the supreme penalty of capital punishment. I do not have much difficulty with the question of capital punishment. If a Bill was introduced into this House in relation to it, I would probably be one of the members who would support it. However, I am realistic enough to know that that will never happen in South Australia.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Don't hold your breath!

**Mr OSWALD:** The member for Alexandra says, 'Don't hold your breath.' Many of us feel that capital punishment should be reintroduced. One needs merely to listen to talk-back programs, read the newspapers and try to understand what the public is saying to know that a certain section of the community would like to see capital punishment reintroduced. Realistically, however, I cannot see a Bill ever coming into this House to bring back the death penalty.

The member for Davenport's Bill has some validity. The honourable member is saying that the courts should be given power to put someone away for the term of his natural life. If the member for Hartley was here he would soon tell me that the courts already have that power. However, if the courts decide to put someone away for the term of their natural life the Cabinet of the day, through the Governor, has the power (as I understand it) to grant a pardon. For example, if a weak Cabinet read what it thought was the mood in the community at a certain time, it could, through the Governor, grant a pardon.

The member for Davenport and the member for Semaphore picked up something from Western Australia whereby the Parliament of the day, and not the Cabinet, ultimately has the power to grant a pardon. If someone was put away for the term of their natural life that person could be released only by a resolution of the Parliament, and not by Cabinet (which is the normal course for a pardon), and that would be a satisfactory arrangement. I congratulate the member for Semaphore on floating that idea, because it has some validity.

The member for Davenport observed, interestingly, that once the death penalty was removed from the statute book the defence of insanity to a charge of murder suddenly disappeared. In other words, murderers today appear to be saner than they were in the past. Of course, that is not true; their sanity is just the same. When the death penalty was on the statute book, the lawyers of the day used insanity as



a prime means of defence, and nearly every person who was charged with murder was defended on the grounds of insanity. As soon as this State stopped hanging people those people ceased to be insane and the lawyers forgot the plea of insanity and went for lower penalty pleas.

The public is sick and tired of people who have committed heinous crimes being given life sentences and then, in seven years, being released into the community. This Parliament has to pick up that point and redress it. I congratulate the Government on the stance that it, through the Attorney-General, is taking in relation to the number of appeals that are being instigated. It is good to see that the Attorney is appealing against what the public views as manifestly lenient sentences.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** I am being generous. It is no use having these inane interjections; I am trying to give credit where it is due.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr OSWALD:** I hope that the Government takes on board what I am saying because the expectation is abroad that the Government should appeal against lenient sentences. The member for Davenport must also be congratulated for bringing this Bill before the House, because it is one way by which we can demonstrate our concern that sentences for heinous crimes are light and that we have abroad criminals who should be put away. I believe that, if any Bill gives the courts power to put someone away for the term of his natural life, and the only way that he can get out is by resolution of Parliament—not by Cabinet, which is through a pardon from the Governor—it will mean that, if a criminal is committed for the term of his natural life and escapes, he will know that there is no point in going out and shooting people right, left and centre because nothing more can be done to him. At least that person would know in the back of his mind that one day the Parliament might let him out if he behaved himself.

I want that safeguard against a weak Cabinet which might let out a criminal who is in for the term of his natural life. If it has to go to both Houses of Parliament, they reflect public opinion, and I think it would be a good track to take it down. I do not know whether or not the Government will support this Bill. It has the numbers to reject it: I hope that it does not do so. I think that the Bill is commendable. It reflects the views that are held by the public. If the Government decides to throw out the Bill, I would urge it to bring it back in the form of a Bill which may suit the Government's philosophy. However, I urge it not to get away from the principle of this Bill. It is a good Bill, and I think that the member for Davenport is to be congratulated for bringing it in and trying, at least, to reflect the public's concern about criminals who have committed heinous crimes being released into the community after what appears to be a relatively short period of time. I support the member for Davenport in what he is trying to achieve.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### BRIDGEWATER TRANSPORT SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.G. Evans:

That in the opinion of this House the Government has ignored the transport needs of many disadvantaged people and everyday commuters with its decision to remove STA public transport from Bridgewater and other Hills residential areas.

(Continued from 10 September. Page 898.)

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** I listened intently to the member for Davenport in his contribution to the debate on his motion, virtually condemning the Government for ignoring the transport needs of many disadvantaged people and everyday commuters with its decision to remove STA public transport from Bridgewater and other Hills and residential areas. Despite being the grandfather of the House, the member for Davenport obviously has not learned a great deal in the past 20-odd years during which he has been a member of the House, because he still fails to understand the role of Government and, particularly, the policy of this Government as it relates to public transport.

This Government has a policy of providing adequate access to public transport throughout the metropolitan area. Indeed, it has a very impressive track record in that area. I now move the following amendment to the motion:

To delete all words after 'that' and insert in lieu thereof:

This House congratulate the State Government for its policy of providing adequate access to public transport throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area. However, this House urges that its commitment to an investigation into viable long-term public transport options should be implemented quickly with full consultation with commuters, community groups, local Government and trade unions.

It is true to say that the whole area of public transport is under the microscope as never before. We are assessing its value and assessing the community service that public transport systems provide. All of this is against a backdrop of declining State Government revenue. I acknowledge that it is a very vexed area for the Government and a very difficult task for the Minister. It is a matter about which everyone seems to have an opinion. People will tell you that they are experts in the area because they are commuters. It is true to say that commuters, as people who travel on the transport system, provide an excellent starting point.

They are good people to talk to, and that is why I urge the Minister of Transport to have the inquiry consult commuters. Another important group are the people employed to provide public transport; the bus drivers, train drivers and guards are a vital component in the transport system. They make the transport system work. Also, I urge the Government to consult with the unions. Despite what the Opposition might have to say in this Parliament, I know that union officials are sensitive to the changing role of public transport. They are conscious of the changing needs that are occurring within South Australia. They acknowledge that changes have to be made, and they are as keen as anyone to ensure that our public transport system is viable and relevant in our modern society. So I, for one, would welcome their participation. I believe that it is vital that they participate in any review or assessment of the transport options for metropolitan Adelaide.

In the past I have expressed in this House my belief that the STA has been operating in a piecemeal manner. The STA has generally reacted to problems rather than anticipate problems that might be around the corner. Having said that, I should emphasise that often this piecemeal approach, especially in the area of bus services, has resulted in better bus services, and that is particularly so in my electorate. The STA has been able to respond to the growing and changing nature of my electorate. However, a coordinated approach to our transport system is what is needed. We need to look at where we are going and what we expect from a public transport system.

We need to work closely with local government, in particular, to access the future planning needs of local government areas. A good example of poor forward planning is to be found in the district of Fisher, and the member for Davenport would be familiar with this case. The Hillview Retirement Village is home to more than 250 people who

are living out their retirement years in a pleasant and beautiful setting but more than 1 km away from Chandlers Hill Road, which is the major road in the area carrying the bus system and the bus stop. Clearly, 1 km would be difficult for most elderly people to walk, but members must appreciate the nature of the geographic area I am talking about—it is very hilly and, frankly, it would be impossible for most elderly people to walk to and from the bus stop.

I believe that it is vital for planners, whether they be subdivisional planners or planners of retirement villages or other facilities, to be conscious of transport services. Planners need to communicate with each other in order to understand what is happening in an area. The STA should be sensitive and receptive to community needs. I have found this Minister particularly receptive to and conscious of the changing needs in my electorate, as has been the STA. It understands that the area has grown dramatically and it has adopted a flexible approach.

A number of minor changes have been made to bus services in my electorate. I realise that not all bus services are economically viable and that some of the services that have been changed in my electorate have carried only a few people. Indeed, the services were initiated on a trial basis a few years ago.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** What's that got to do—

**Mr TYLER:** The member for Heysen wants it both ways. He always protests and complains whenever anything is changed in his electorate yet he continually demands that Government be smaller, claiming that Government needs to get out of the way of people. The member for Heysen wants to have it both ways the whole time: he wants to have his cake and eat it too.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr TYLER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will try to ignore the inane interjections from the member for Heysen. Before I was rudely interrupted I referred to some changes that have occurred in my electorate. Those changes were initiated about two years ago on a trial basis. The changes are not earth-shattering but, considering the growing nature of my electorate, I believe that they will become fairly significant in the long term. A community does not alter its habits overnight. As a direct response to the inadequacy of services in my electorate, many people have got into the habit of driving their own cars. It is interesting that the member for Heysen's constituents have the choice of a couple of transport options into Adelaide. They voted with their feet by catching buses and by not catching trains. Constituents in my electorate do not have any option—they have to catch the bus.

**Ms Gayler:** Neither do mine.

**Mr TYLER:** The member for Newland says her constituents do not have options. Most of my constituents have only two options, either private transport or public transport of the STA bus to Adelaide.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** We haven't got any alternative.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A few less interjections will enable this debate to get back on the rails.

**Mr TYLER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I believe that the STA has an educating role to play and, therefore, it should have the courage and faith in public transport to sell the benefits of that system to the South Australian community. In the past four to five years the southern suburbs have changed drastically, and there is no better example than the growth in my electorate. I would point out to the member for Heysen, if he would care to listen for a while, that the

latest census figures relating to my electorate indicate that in the past five years there has been a 42 per cent increase.

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

**Mr TYLER:** Well, he tut-tuts. Obviously, the honourable member is not interested in the commuters and people in the southern area. During election campaigns he is quite prepared to go doorknocking and to ask people to vote for the Liberal Party but, for the remaining 3½ years, he is not interested in anybody who lives outside his little patch. I pointed out that during the past five years I have had a 42 per cent increase. This growth issues a tremendous challenge to local, State and Federal Governments in coming to terms with the needs of the growing population. I, more than most people, appreciate the demands and pressures that the State Transport Authority faces in attempting to curtail its deficit whilst also improving service delivery. It is quite obvious that, in the growing areas within our community, there has been a substantial improvement in the delivery of STA services. The STA has been very conscious that it needs to provide a service to the whole of the metropolitan area.

My philosophical approach (and I know that this is shared by the Minister of Transport) is that public transport systems, whether they be in Adelaide or elsewhere, cannot be expected to operate on a completely commercial basis. I believe that public transport should be justified in terms of the community benefit that a public transport service provides, particularly in predominantly dormitory suburbs such as my electorate. This is especially important for people living in the eastern portion of the southern suburbs which has experienced huge population increases over recent years. That region includes my electorate and also that of the member for Mawson. As I pointed out to the House and to the members for Heysen and Davenport, these are dormitory areas where more than half the work force is employed in a clerical or administrative capacity, or in professions and, because of the lack of industry in the southern area, many of these people commute daily to Adelaide for employment.

In summary, I ask members to support this amendment and also I urge the Government to quickly implement its promised review of our transport options. Such a review should consider all aspects of the public transport system including trends—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** The inquiry will have an important role and no doubt it will look at some of the transport options in the honourable member's electorate. The inquiry should look at all trends, particularly in relation to patronage, commuter attitudes, and expectations. It should examine efficiency and service demand, and also consult commuters, community groups, local government bodies, unions and, if I might say so, members of Parliament could have a significant input, as well. Such a review or exercise would, I believe, provide all parties with a clearer understanding of the demands and needs of developing a more effective and efficient public transport system. Most importantly, it would provide metropolitan Adelaide with a system that we can all feel very proud of. One of the tragedies of the recent transport debate has been the undermining effect on the public transport system of members opposite. I believe that such an inquiry will enable the public to have considerable confidence in the future of public transport in this State.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I give notice of a further amendment, and seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## DAYLIGHT SAVING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

That the regulations under the Daylight Saving Act 1971 relating to standard time, made on 16 July and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1987, be disallowed.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 560.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I support the member for Flinder's concerns about daylight saving and its effect on people in his electorate. I know that even within my metropolitan electorate there are people with young families who are concerned about daylight saving provisions that prevail in this State, and in particular they are concerned about any extension to the daylight saving period. I have said before that I find daylight saving a curse, because I usually rise when the sun comes up and I usually stop doing some form of manual or parliamentary work when the sun goes down. So I do not find that setting the clock to vary the traditional times that I must do certain things to a program is of any benefit to me; in fact it is a damn nuisance.

Overall, daylight saving may save a little bit of electricity. It is a practice that came in during the war years, and I believe that it disrupts the lifestyle of many people, but I admit that for those people who want to play sport and use up their energy in that way and not by work, it is a great idea. Those who want to go swimming or take on some vigorous activity usually find the next day that they are too tired to carry out the duties they should be carrying out, but everybody says it is a great idea. People can go home and do their gardening. If the situation is left as it is they are too lazy to get up in the morning to do the gardening because they are not motivated enough, so they do it in the evening. The member for the north-east bush area, the name of which I forget—Newland, I think—suggests that it is too cold to get up early in the morning.

**Ms Gayler:** That is not what I said. I said, do you want to make gardening compulsory?

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The member says do I want to make it compulsory. I am not out to make gardening compulsory, even though Adam and Eve started in a garden, but many people use their time gardening, and it is their form of recreation; there is no doubt about that.

*Ms Gayler interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The member for Newland says that she does it at night: that is her business, it has got nothing to do with me. People will have to change their lifestyle in order to accommodate certain activities because of a stupid Act that this Parliament has passed. I have often wondered why business houses argue that it would be easier to communicate if our time was tied to Eastern States time. A significant section of our business community has been communicating with Western Australia, and other business houses in this country and in this State have been communicating with businesses in other lands, but I have not heard the argument that we should tie ourselves to Greenwich mean time: that would be rather difficult.

For business houses to argue that it would be a distinct advantage to tie South Australian time to the Eastern States time I think is hogwash. This matter is not directly involved in this resolution, but it is related. I wonder how the community would respond if the one million people who live in Adelaide lived on the West Coast and the producers on the West Coast produced their goods in Adelaide. If those few people who produce the farming commodities on the West Coast were to do so in Adelaide and wanted to change to daylight saving, as has been done, what would be the response of the million people living on the West Coast?

What would their argument be? I guarantee daylight saving would never have been brought in in this State.

I admit that Parliamentarians govern when they get a majority, as the majority rules in Parliament, but when the majority rules to the detriment of a significant minority that produces many things, then I believe that we should be concerned. The member for Albert Park shakes his head: that could be a result of my comments or some affliction he has, but that does not matter. There are children on the West Coast who really suffer because of daylight saving.

We should consider them. I heard the debate today in Federal Parliament when they were arguing that there are a significant number of disadvantaged children in this country. We have one of the second highest proportions of disadvantaged children in the western communities: America is the only country with a higher percentage. Yet we as a Parliament are not concerned about the situation on the West Coast involving the time at which children have to rise, with parents having to put up with those children being upset and trying to get off to school.

However, we find that the member for Fisher gets all the benefits about which he told us today. He told us how he is served by the Government in his southern electorate and gets more than the rest of us, and we understand that, although it is hard for him to interject at present, as he is in the Chair. It is an indication of how Governments are concerned mainly with winning votes in areas where it counts for them to stay in office. The West Coast does not matter, though.

It is a disadvantage, whether or not we like it, for young people to have to get up to catch buses (provided by the Government, I admit) and travel up to 100 km a day as they are compelled by law to go to school. We do not express much concern about this at all. Even if we agree with daylight saving, we can still admit we know that the member for Flinders' constituents are disadvantaged, not only the children but also their fathers and particularly the mothers. If each and every one of us had children in the same position as the young children on the West Coast, the daylight saving proposition would never have passed this Parliament. We can divorce ourselves from that because a significant number of people in metropolitan Adelaide find it advantageous to use the extra recreational time in the evening, not being motivated to use it in the morning.

An advantage exists in the community for people being able to do the things they want to do in the evening after they have finished so-called work. If they become tired they can sleep and wake up reasonably fresh in the morning. However, if they undertake all those hard activities—gardening, sport or whatever else—in the morning, they may be even less motivated to work. I understand the concerns that the member for Flinders has raised. I know how he feels about his community being neglected because it is remote. It is like the electorate of the member for Eyre which is also remote and sparsely populated: Parliament can ignore any inconvenience or suffering that a regulation or a by-law places on such communities.

In recent times the Executive has taken control and become all powerful, using its numbers to change and apply Standing Orders, to some degree, to the benefit of the ruling Party. Whilst that prevails one can understand why these minorities are not considered and are ignored. If Ministers or members of Government admitted they were concerned and there was a problem and a disadvantage to those communities with this sort of regulation, one could perhaps think they were a little more genuine than they have shown themselves to be in recent times.

I do not have any strong views on what effect it will have on my electorate if we do away with daylight saving. My community is motivated enough to pursue its own lifestyle regardless of daylight saving, and most of metropolitan Adelaide would be also if we went back to the former system. Many business houses do so. At one where I was working we started at 4 a.m. and finished just after midday to avoid the heat of the day.

There are still some business houses which do that involving areas where hard work is done out in the elements and where the sun gets a bit difficult to stand in the summer months after about 1.30 or 2 o'clock in the afternoon, under normal time. So, I support the member for Flinders' motion, and I hope that other members will do likewise.

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

### SUBMARINE CONTRACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House congratulate the Premier and the Government in achieving yet another success by obtaining the submarine contract for South Australia and the thousands of jobs that will be created as a consequence of this contract.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 561.)

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I recall that during the term of the Tonkin Government, between 1979 and 1982, I was invited to visit the Chamber of Commerce in Pirie Street and to have a look in a 'top drawer' at the plans that were being formulated by the chamber for a submarine project for South Australia. I make those opening remarks because I think it is relevant to this debate to put the sequence of events that led up to securing this magnificent project for South Australia. The project was first conceived in the days of the Tonkin Administration. It is unfortunate that members of the Labor Party, for obvious political reasons, have implied all along that it is their project and that it has never had the support of the Liberal Opposition in this State. Labor members are wrong: the Liberals have been enthusiastic about this project since we all started to find out about it, I think in about 1980.

The way that members of the Labor Party have attempted to politicise it as being their project and have painted the Opposition as being negative and anti the project is scurrilous. Members opposite know that it is wrong to do that and that it was done for political gain. The matter surfaced once again during the campaign for the Federal seat of Hawker. The Premier wrote to the electors of Hawker saying, 'Don't vote for Kim Jacobs, vote for Mrs Harvey, because the Liberal Party won't support the submarine project and you won't get the submarine project if the Liberals win in Canberra.' That was a continuation of what has really been a quite scurrilous campaign. Labor Party members know in their own minds that the Liberal Party has been very supportive of the project. We are pleased that the project has come to South Australia; we are delighted, in fact, and it will do the State a tremendous amount of good.

The member for Albert Park, by putting forward this motion, has once again tried to use the Notice Paper to imply that only the Government supports this project. I put on record once and for all and very clearly that the Liberal Party is delighted that the submarine project has come to South Australia. We acknowledge the tremendous amount of work that went into securing the project. We are aware that the New South Wales Government worked extremely hard to get the project for that State, as also happened in

the case of Western Australia, I believe. We are delighted that it has come here. Let us not forget that the Leader of the Opposition also visited Europe in an effort to ensure that there was no doubt in the minds of the contractors that we were supportive of the project.

One point that I think should be made regarding the benefits to South Australia is that it is not really new money that is circulating, but it is still tremendous that that Commonwealth money which was going to be spent somewhere in Australia is in fact to be spent here in South Australia. If credit has to be given to the Government for lobbying its colleagues in Canberra to ensure that we got the contract and that Federal money required to set up the base in South Australia was in fact spent here, we would have to congratulate those concerned with that lobbying process, because we will see millions of dollars spent in South Australia that could have been spent elsewhere. The Opposition is pleased that this money will be spent here. If one looks at a project such as Roxby Downs (another Liberal initiative), one sees that that involves new money being generated out of the ground. It is new wealth for the State, but that is perhaps another issue. The submarine project does not involve new wealth; Commonwealth money will be spent in South Australia—

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** It is taxpayers' money.

**Mr OSWALD:** It is taxpayers' money, which could have been spent elsewhere. Regarding the benefits to the State, one thing I do hope is that, when the last submarine leaves South Australia after it has been assembled, some 10 years hence, these overseas companies will look back to the period of the project—bearing in mind that, unlike Roxby, it will finish in 10 years—and recognise that the technology here in South Australia is of world class, and that will lead to new developments and new industries.

The Liberal initiative of setting up Technology Park has also been a draw to the final selection of the site. Although he is no longer a member of Parliament, Dean Brown, I must say, had something to do with that project. The Liberal Party has had an input into this ultimate project, albeit a small input when we were in Government from 1979 to 1982. The Liberal Party is extremely supportive of the project. We certainly hope that it will bring to the State every possible benefit that has been advertised until now. It will be interesting to see what we can do with this hundred million dollar base construction site when the submarine project is over. We will have a site that can be used for the servicing of ships, both of the navy and, hopefully, the merchant marines. The job capacity that will be generated is something that we have to work on, but it is tremendous for South Australia. The increased naval presence on the surface perhaps would not seem much, but we must bear in mind that the navy officers who will be tied up with this project are all on extremely high salaries; while they are living in South Australia, their salaries will be spent here and will benefit South Australia.

More than 60 per cent of the weapons systems being used on this project could be built in South Australia, and from memory I think that is worth about 500 jobs in that area of technology. It is a possibility that we will get the battery factory here, and the new technology involved could put South Australia on the map. Testing facilities are also set up with an assembly plant of this size. Our tradesmen will be trained in the testing of machinery such as periscopes and engines, and even though a lot is being built interstate, it will be assembled here, and we will have a skilled work force second to none in the Commonwealth.

I hope that it will continue to attract new projects into the 21st century. The spinoffs that will come from the

marine dockyard are such that we can start looking at working on naval frigates using a work force that is familiar with such work. A suggestion has been made that this project should have been sited at Whyalla where there are existing shipyards. I have some sympathy with that suggestion, as I cannot see why the project should come to metropolitan South Australia, where new earthworks and facilities would have to be constructed, when facilities and expertise already exist in Whyalla.

Nevertheless, the Government took that decision and brought the project to the metropolitan area. This might have been done so that the massive amount of Commonwealth money to be spent in the State will be injected into the metropolitan area, or because it is close to Technology Park or some marginal metropolitan seats where people can see the Government at work. However, the project has come to South Australia and Whyalla has missed out. When the project is completed we will have shipyard facilities in the metropolitan area that are superior to those at Whyalla. The maintenance and refitting of submarines will continue into the future and is something that Governments will be able to capitalise on for many generations.

I will now look at the down side of matters for a moment. Navy land test facilities for operational software are unfortunately not coming to South Australia and sheetmetal manufacturing will continue at Port Kembla, work which could have perhaps gone to Whyalla, but I suppose to be fair we cannot expect to get the whole project into South Australia. There will be offshore manufacture of the diesel engines and other equipment that cannot technically or economically be undertaken in Australia, including some weapons work.

We are a country, not separate States, separate entities, and Commonwealth money is involved. The fact is that South Australia has secured a reasonable percentage of the overall project, particularly when one considers the demands made by other States. The Liberal Party is delighted about this project, is supportive of it, and will continue to be supportive of it. If South Australia can continue to generate work in the merchant marine and Royal Australian Navy areas as a spinoff from this project in years to come, the State can only benefit.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** I was pleased to see this quite stunning turnaround by the Liberal Opposition on the question of the submarine project. We have just heard the member for Morphett say that he is delighted that we won this project. However, let us remember that the very day it was announced in Canberra that South Australia had been chosen as the construction site for this project, what did the Leader of the Opposition say? He issued a two-line statement under the headline 'Disappointed says Olsen', saying that he was disappointed that South Australia did not do better and did not win more of the project.

I also recall the remarks made by Alexander Downer at the time of the last State election campaign when on several occasions he set out to torpedo South Australia's hopes of getting this project by saying that we were not equipped for it and that New South Wales had the edge. Meanwhile, the Leader of the Opposition's office was spreading stories to journalists that the submarine project coming to South Australia was a figment of electoral imagination for the sake of the election campaign. That is the sort of support that the State Opposition gave the submarine project, the biggest project ever won by this State. It has absolutely enormous potential in terms of technology transfer and job creation and it has a demonstration effect, attracting other people to this State to invest. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

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

South Australian College of Advanced Education—  
Underdale (Nursing Building).

Ordered that report be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

### COURT FEES

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier reject a proposal from the Attorney-General for increases in court fees which are well over the consumer price index? I have in my possession a Cabinet submission from the Attorney-General. It reveals that he wants existing court fees increased from 30 November and the introduction of some new fees. The submission estimates that, while these increases will be imposed at no cost to the Government, they will boost revenue by more than \$1.5 million in a full year—a 35 per cent rise. The submission also reveals that, despite the Premier's repeated claim that the Government tries to keep increases of this nature within the CPI—only \$350 000 of the additional revenue to be generated in a full year (or less than a quarter) is to take account of inflation. If these fees are approved, they will mean a real increase in the price ordinary citizens will have to pay for access to justice, with the inevitability that the greatest burden will fall on those who can least afford to pay it.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thought that it was the Opposition that was one of the strongest advocates of the 'user pays' system and was demanding that it be implemented wherever possible. The question has startling characteristics. I cannot recall a submission such as the Leader claims that he has and I certainly do not recall it either being considered or being canvassed by the Attorney-General. Therefore, I cannot comment.

### AIRLINES DEREGULATION

**Mr ROBERTSON:** In the light of the Federal Government's decision to deregulate the Australian airlines system and to allow Qantas to operate as a domestic carrier, can the Premier say what are the likely effects of the coming deregulation on the tourist industry and the general economy of this State?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member's question is highly relevant, because the Federal Government's decision represents one of the most radical decisions in relation to the airlines system that we have had probably since the war and the creation of the Australian National Airlines Commission, which was TAA. It does have implications for this State. In terms of the principle, the South Australian Government has consistently supported deregulation of the domestic airline system, because our analysis suggests that, because of our geographical location, population base, and so on, we have been very poorly served by the existing two airline system. It has been demonstrated

that costs are higher, fares are higher and ticket mix is restricted under such a system, and one of the things that has been of greatest disadvantage to us in South Australia has been the parallel scheduling, which certainly is one feature that is often commented on by the public and really reduces passenger convenience and the flexibility of people getting to and from places such as Adelaide and South Australia.

We made submissions along those lines to the Review of the Economic Regulation of Domestic Aviation in June 1985, saying that we believed we would be better served by a freer system. That is why we would say that in principle we should see benefits from this in South Australia. The other feature of Qantas' decision was this matter of interlining by Qantas. This is something that we have supported very strongly. I think that my colleague the Minister of Transport should feel some considerable satisfaction in this decision, because in March 1987 he wrote to the Federal Minister for Aviation pointing out our position in relation to interlining. It has been discussed at tourist and other levels in this State. I would just like to quote from Mr Keneally's letter, which said:

South Australia would support the reintroduction of interlining rights to Qantas, especially given the potential benefit to the economy and the suggestion made by the review that Australian Airlines and Ansett could significantly reduce the impact on them by undertaking appropriate marketing strategies. As argued by the review, potential customs and other difficulties could be overcome. It is also agreed that the present policy restrictions on the carriage of domestic freight by Qantas should be removed. Removal of these restrictions could provide additional benefits, as Qantas would then be able to engage in freight interlining activities.

Certainly, passenger interlining has been adopted and, again, I think it will see benefits in terms of numbers of tourists using Qantas and making this more accessible and, while we still pursue (as we are doing vigorously at the moment) the question of additional flights, particularly direct flights from Japan, this will enable us to at least in part increase our share of that sort of traffic but, equally, the competition that that will provide with the other carriers should also be beneficial in helping to increase the overall market.

Incidentally, we are currently discussing with Qantas the question of additional flights to Adelaide Airport. Later this month the Minister of Tourism will lead a delegation (which will include the Lord Mayor) to meet again with Qantas to press our case for additional flights and additional airlines coming to Adelaide International Airport. I hope that some of the freedoms that have been introduced now will ensure that our ongoing case will be listened to more sympathetically than it has been in the past in relation to the Japan direct flights. There is no question that the flights we have are being extremely well patronised at the moment and Adelaide as a destination is increasing in popularity and numbers of flights. I thank the member for his question. We will be monitoring the situation very closely indeed, hoping to get maximum advantage from it.

### SPORT SPONSORSHIP

**Mr INGERSON:** Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport intend to support the Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall) in his proposal to prohibit sponsorship of sporting events by tobacco companies and, if so, what evidence can he give that this will reduce cigarette smoking?

**Ms GAYLER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the House dealt with a Bill this morning on that very matter, and I ask you to rule that the question is therefore out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I will give that consideration. I will give the call for the moment to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Speaker, my question is on the same topic, but I would ask it anyway.

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps the honourable member can defer to the member for Coles.

### ALDINGA LAND

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Has the Minister for Environment and Planning taken to Cabinet, or does he intend to take to Cabinet, any proposal to either purchase the land or otherwise compensate the owners of large landholdings in the areas which the Government has frozen for the purpose of possible future housing development; and, if not, what does the Minister intend to do for these people who are presently bearing the full cost of possible future community benefit?

Broadacre farms at Aldinga, some of which were frozen more than 20 years ago for a possible future airport, were frozen again early last year pending the Government's decision about long-term options for the development of metropolitan Adelaide. The Minister's recently announced decision to maintain the freeze for a period of 15 years or so has meant that the difficulties which these property owners have experienced will now become entrenched. Those difficulties include an inability to undertake proper farm management such as crop spraying because of the proximity of urban development; an inability to raise sheep because of the numbers of domestic dogs on nearby properties; a risk of fire damage to ripening crops from neighbouring housing areas; an inability to raise finance on their land because no bank will lend on frozen land; and an inability to sell their land as farming land for obvious reasons and the impossibility of selling it for any other purpose because of the freeze on subdivision.

In 1978 the Joint Working Party on Draft Supplementary Development Plans for the rural zones of Meadows, Noarlunga and Willunga recognised that many farmers are facing severe and continual penalties in remaining in full-time production. The committee agreed that assistance and consideration needed to be given to these people and 'the few who have not subdivided would not be forced to bear the communities' full cost of preservation'. The committee further recognised that in most cases the farmer is not the party who gains from speculative dealings in land and that capitalisation of assets in land represents for most farmers the only way to achieve a reasonable and equitable return. This untenable situation requires a positive response from the Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Nothing has been taken to Cabinet at this stage, nor am I certain that I can at present take to Cabinet the sort of proposition that the honourable member has in mind. The honourable member talks about compensation. I suppose that it could be styled as something like acquiring the development rights of the properties on the part of the Government.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Purchase is another thing. Of those first two matters, I am not sure that there are any statutory powers that would allow me as Minister to move in that way and, therefore, I could be under severe criticism from the Auditor-General if I were to proceed. That is one of the things that is being checked out.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I understand that. Acquisition at this stage is quite premature, because the Govern-

ment strategy has been to reserve this land out of an abundance of caution with a view to further examining the sort of planning prescriptions that are appropriate, but to work as hard as we can to try to ensure that these areas will not be brought into urban development.

I want to make clear what we are talking about here, because I received a deputation from some people locally about a year ago from what is called the 'cereal belt'. Only a small proportion of that cereal belt is affected by the area identified in the Kinhill report as being possibly prospective. I did say to those people at that time that we would be entering into dialogue with the local government authority with a view to determining what should be done to the planning prescriptions for the area to help solve their problem, which relates to the fact that the land use in which they are involved is no longer economic and, therefore, these people are trapped in a situation where some assistance is required, and that matter is proceeding. Superimposed on that is the area to which we have been directing our attention in recent times.

At this stage all I can say is that the Government is looking sympathetically at what should occur here and we have tried to keep at bay many of the problems identified by the honourable member via the strict planning prescriptions which have applied ever since 1978. The urbanisation which has brought the sort of problems mentioned by the honourable member—roaming dogs, and all the rest of it—would have been considerably accelerated if we had allowed the planning prescriptions in place before 1978 to remain. At the time there was something like a four hectare minimum subdivision allowed, which would have meant that by now hobby farms would have been all over the place and, perhaps even worse (depending on one's attitude to that sort of thing), in this area.

So the sorts of problems associated with urbanisation already affecting those people would have been considerably exacerbated if the Government had not taken steps in the meantime to try to maintain the present pattern of land holding and to prevent fragmentation. That remains the position, except for this local population—a small group of people, as the honourable member indicates—who are trapped in a land use which is no longer economic. We are looking closely at the prescription for that, but as yet nothing has been taken to Cabinet.

#### TRAFFIC LIGHTS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Can the Minister of Transport tell the House whether the Highways Department has approved the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of South Road, Connington Crescent and Randell Road at Morphett Vale? On Tuesday afternoon I accompanied a constituent, Mr Owen Williams, on a deputation to the Minister of Transport to present him with a petition of 4 500 signatures of local residents and business people calling for the installation of traffic lights at that intersection. The reason put to the Minister by my constituent was that, with recent shopping and business development (including the recently opened Morphett Vale Post Office in the immediate vicinity of the intersection), there has been an increase in both vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the intersection, as well as a significant increase in the number of accidents there.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for her question. For some time, largely at the instigation of the honourable member and her constituents, the Highways Department has been examining this intersection at South Road, Connington Crescent and Randell

Road. The Highways Department has advised me that there is a warrant to establish traffic lights at the intersection. However, funds are not available for the purpose this financial year but will be provided in the 1988-89 financial year. At this time I cannot give the honourable member an exact date for commencement of work.

The decision of the Highways Department was not made necessarily on the traffic flow, because it was not of a level that would normally result in the provision of traffic lights. However, two factors concerned the Highways Department: first, the number of accidents occurring at the intersection, because it was far in excess of the warrant needed for traffic lights; and, secondly, the number of pedestrians crossing the road not only at the intersection but within 200 or 300 yards of it. The number of pedestrians involved altogether was more than 1 000, and that in itself is a matter of some concern. So the decision has been taken that traffic lights will be erected at that intersection and funds made available in the next financial year. As soon as I am able to tell the honourable member when work can commence I will do so.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bragg can ask his question again, as I rule that it is not out of order.

#### SPORT SPONSORSHIP

**Mr INGERSON:** Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport intend to support the Minister of Health's proposal to prohibit sponsorship of sporting events by tobacco companies and, if so, what evidence can he give that that will reduce cigarette smoking?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I have been reading the press, as has the member for Bragg. I understand that the Minister intends to put a number of proposals to Cabinet in due course. I shall wait to see what those proposals entail and following due consideration of them by Cabinet and my Caucus colleagues I shall make my decision. Following the public debate with the honourable member, my views on tobacco sponsorship are clearly on record. Aspects of this matter were dealt with recently at the Sports Ministers conference, and I need not canvass those. My views are on the public record and have been referred to in both the television and print media. The question that one must put to the member for Bragg, of course, is, 'What is your position in regard to this?' He vacillated very clearly—

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Yes, I know; he does not have a policy. He vacillated very clearly in that debate: he was not sure which way to jump. The honourable member ought to make very clear whether he believes that tobacco sponsorship aimed particularly at young people has a detrimental effect on their health and where he stands, as Opposition spokesman on those matters, especially in view of the fact that the information provided by the Minister of Health to the Sports Ministers conference indicated that 80 per cent of drug related deaths were related directly to tobacco smoking. It is quite obvious that the evidence presented through the eminent professionals in the area supports very strongly that argument that was adopted by the State Government, which position was put by me at the public discussion that we had on the *7.30 Report*. So, the question should go back to the spokesman as to what his position is and what his Party's position is on this issue. He has not made his position clear at all, and we are still very interested to know exactly what it is.

### CHLORINATED WATER

**Mr TYLER:** Will the Minister of Water Resources assure the House that chlorinated water does not represent a health risk to South Australians?

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

**Mr TYLER:** The member for Chaffey laughs—Mr Speaker, I will explain why I have asked the question. With your leave, Sir, and that of the House I will explain to the member for Chaffey and the House why I have asked this question.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order, and the member for Fisher will have to resist the temptation to respond to any out of order interjections.

**Mr TYLER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Yesterday, two local newspapers which are circulated in my electorate carried an article quoting a South Australian senator as having warned that pollution and chemical levels in Mount Bold Reservoir could cause cancer. Senator Coulter said that the increased pollution level in our water could see a rise in the level of a compound which has been shown to cause cancer in animals. The article states:

'What of course is happening is that, as the levels of bacteria are increasing it is necessary to more heavily chlorinate the water,' Senator Coulter said. 'As you more heavily chlorinate the water you increase the production of those chlorine organic compounds which have been shown to be cancer causing.'

As the Minister would be well aware, this has caused considerable anxiety among my constituents, as well as constituents of the Minister and of those other members who represent the southern suburban areas where this newspaper was circulated yesterday. I know that they would appreciate an explanation from the Minister as to whether there is any cause to worry.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I also saw the article when I picked up the newspaper referred to from my front lawn last evening, as did the honourable member. This is a replay of several articles that were in the *Sunday Mail* quite some time ago. The matter has been picked up by the junior senator in Canberra, who has decided to give it a bit of a run. It is true that where there is a fairly high incidence of organic pollution in the water supply it is necessary that chlorine be used in order to kill pathogens. It is also true that once an organic laden water supply is chlorinated it is possible that trihalomethanes will be produced, and in sufficiently large concentrations trihalomethanes can be shown to be carcinogenic.

Our water supply has levels of trihalomethanes well below levels identified elsewhere as causing concern for human beings. Out of an excess of caution, one of the things that we have instituted on a trial basis, notably at the Myponga reservoir, which services my electorate and maybe some of the Fisher electorate (although I am not sure of that), is a chloramination process whereby ammonia is added at the same time as chlorine and acts as a stabiliser in the system as one would stabilise the contents of a swimming pool, resulting in the chlorine being released more slowly, persisting for longer in the system and tending to inhibit the production of the trihalomethanes.

This trial has not been without adverse comment in the community, because it marginally alters both the taste and appearance of the water. Water from the Fleurieu Peninsula is naturally dyed by tannins in the environment and the old chlorination process tended to bleach that dye. That is less effective now and, therefore, people have noticed that there is a higher colour in the water. The trial seems to have gone fairly well. It is not impossible that we will move back to chloramination of the whole of the metropolitan

water supply and beyond; in fact, I think one country water supply is also subject to a trial using chloramination. I can give an assurance that there is no health concern from trihalomethanes, but out of an abundance of caution we are experimenting with chloramination with a view to the future.

The one thing that I welcome in relation to Senator Coulter's statement is that it serves to remind us of the importance of the two year review of the Mount Lofty Ranges and how important it is that we maintain fairly rigid controls on those sorts of land uses and developments that might otherwise increase the organic load of our water supply.

### SPORT SPONSORSHIP

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I direct a question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Following a statement by the Minister of Health that the Grand Prix and Test Cricket will be exempt from any ban on the sponsorship of sporting events by tobacco companies, and in view of the fact that that is where they are likely to get maximum exposure by way of displays on billboards and use of other major displays, does the Minister agree that it would be completely hypocritical to allow this exemption where smaller sporting bodies would be discriminated against in terms of this ban?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** As I indicated to the shadow Minister, the member for Bragg, the proposals that have been considered by the Minister of Health will come before Cabinet, and those aspects will be considered, presumably taking into account what the Bill before the House would do. I will look at those matters in consideration of the proposal that comes forward from the Minister; I will consider those aspects in relation to the sporting organisations, their sponsorship and their role in the community. It is as simple as that.

### TEA TREE GULLY TAFE COLLEGE

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Minister for Employment and Further Education make representations to the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training urging continued capital works funding for construction of a new Tea Tree Gully TAFE college? The Commonwealth allocated funds in 1985-86 and 1986-87 for planning and design of the new Tea Tree Gully TAFE college which has been undertaken. The north-east suburbs have a fast growing population served by a small college with an extremely limited range of courses and number of places.

The new college has been designed with a joint Tea Tree Gully Council library and resource centre to link with the Tea Tree Plaza and the new Tea Tree Gully O-Bahn terminus in order to create a multipurpose regional centre of shops, offices, transport interchanges, and education and training. The recent Commonwealth budget changed the basis for TAFE capital funding. An article in a recent edition of the Australian states:

From 1988 funds for new TAFE capital works will be allocated on the basis of competitive bidding by States and individual colleges, with priority being given to projects in economically important areas, such as computing studies and hospitality, and areas which involve joint funding with industry.

My north-eastern community wishes to meet the necessary guidelines and to ensure that the new Tea Tree Gully TAFE College proceeds post haste.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question. I shall be having discussions with



the Federal Minister in the coming weeks and officers of TAFE will be having discussions with officers of the Department of Employment, Education and Training regarding, among other things, capital works for TAFE. True, the guidelines have changed and we are anxious to see that the projects that we regard as high priority at this stage in South Australia for TAFE are getting the best possible consideration from the Commonwealth in respect of allocations. These include such projects as the Tea Tree Gully redevelopment project, the Millicent multipurpose workshop project and others, including the Hills project.

It is certain that those projects that have not already proceeded to design documentation must be subject to consideration as to how they meet the new guidelines, but I believe that, where projects have been significantly advanced already, they should be given some consideration to continue on the basis of previous advice. On 3 December the Assistant Commissioner of the Capital and Equipment Branch of CTEC notified the Director-General of TAFE in certain terms about the Tea Tree Gully project and, in part, his letter stated:

The project [Tea Tree Gully College of TAFE, Stage 1] has been examined and I am pleased to advise that the project has been approved at the developed sketch plans stage as follows:

Then follows a list which includes the incorporation of facilities for business studies, hospitality, art and craft, general teaching areas, and a library with a usable floor area of 7 000 square metres and a designed student capacity of 1 186. It states that the cost is being borne largely by the Commonwealth, with a smaller contribution from the Tea Tree Gully council, especially for the library area. That is the formal advice that we have at this stage from the Commonwealth. I shall certainly be eager to follow that up with further discussions at the ministerial and officer level to confirm the status of this and other TAFE projects in South Australia.

#### BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Whom does the Premier now hold accountable for the major discrepancy between the draft and final reports from the Bureau of Transport Economics on the Bridgewater railway?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yesterday, the Premier told this House that questions about this matter should be referred to his friend and colleague Mr Duncan. Mr Duncan apparently was so angry about being dumped by his friend and colleague the Premier that he spoke to radio 5DN this morning in terms which were not suitable for broadcasting. So, later on 5DN, to mollify his friend and colleague Mr Duncan, the Premier backed off, saying he no longer held Mr Duncan accountable. The Premier also told the House yesterday that he would be interested in finding out the reason for this discrepancy and I therefore invite him to nominate now whom he would regard as being responsible so that further information may be sought.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As the honourable member continues to flog this issue, I suspect that he may have had a role in it himself. I shall be interested to know whether he made representations to the Bureau of Transport Economics. Someone apparently did. Perhaps it was he, because he has taken such an interest in this matter.

If this response the honourable member describes were in terms not fit to broadcast, I am not sure how he managed to hear it—or perhaps it was not broadcast—and I do not know the context in which such response was given. But let

me speak about my direct intervention in this matter. This morning I said nothing more nor less than I said yesterday in the House in response to questions from the honourable member, and in terms of accountability I invite him to look back in *Hansard* at what I said in that matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### PESTICIDE SPRAYING

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Can the Minister of Labour inform the House what action he has taken over the screening of a television commercial for a new agricultural spray manufactured by the Ampol oil company? A constituent has approached me regarding this issue after seeing on ABC television's *7.30 Report* on Monday evening a news item which related to a television commercial for a new oil based spray called D-C-Tron, which is used in spraying fruit trees. While it was pointed out that D-C-Tron is relatively harmless, my constituent is concerned that the commercial shows a farmer spraying his trees while not wearing any protective clothing. I feel that this type of advertisement could give viewers the wrong impression about the proper and safe way of handling other sprays which may be dangerous.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, he is well known (as a former organiser and President of the AWU) for attempting to ensure that people engaged in spraying in the agricultural industries were doing it in a proper manner. When I first saw this advertisement I was, quite frankly, appalled. I think it is the height of irresponsibility for the Ampol company to promote an advertisement such as this.

I concede that on the information I have the substance allegedly being sprayed is relatively harmless but, as a role model for people spraying and using agricultural chemicals, it really is, as I said earlier, appalling. The person engaged in the spraying is pouring containers of this material, which is splashing everywhere. He is wearing no protective clothing: the spray is saturating the area; and the worker is, in effect, having a shower in this substance. For a company of the stature of Ampol to put out an advertisement like this and to state, as a spokesman for the company apparently did on the *7.30 Report*, that they would not withdraw the advertisement is to me quite reprehensible. I am happy to advise the member for Peake that I have written to the General Manager of Ampol in the following terms:

Dear Sir,

I am extremely concerned about the implications of the recent advertisement shown on TV Channel 9 and discussed by ABC radio and ABC TV on the 7 p.m. news (5 October).

The particular points I wish to bring to your attention are the apparent lack of awareness of the sprayer about the substance, the lack of use of any personal protective equipment and the lack of labelled instructions contrasted with the prominence of the trade name and the name of the manufacturer; in short, the role model established in viewers' minds is to be regretted.

You may have read in *The Australian* of 5 October 1987 that a confidential report prepared for the New South Wales Department of Agriculture has found gross breaches of Government codes in the use of pesticides and herbicides.

The key findings include the following:

Many farmers use pesticides in higher concentrations than recommended.

Most farmers were not aware of correct disposal methods.

There was a tendency not to use any personal protective equipment when mixing pesticides.

Few farmers had detailed knowledge of regulations concerning pesticides.

Many growers had little idea of their most prevalent pests and thus were likely to use general rather than specific pesticides.

Growers know of withholding periods (the period between spraying and sale of commodities—but few observed the regulations governing these periods).

A staggering 98 per cent of those surveyed obtained their information on pests from friends, relatives and experience and 60 per cent had received no advice on how to use their sprayers properly and therefore safely.

You will, no doubt, also be aware of the new Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986, which at section 24 requires manufacturers, importers and suppliers of substances to ensure that they are safe even when subjected to reasonably foreseeable forms of misuse. In addition, testing of the products should be carried out and adequate information must be provided to users at work.

In view of the above and the escalating public concern about pesticides and other such substances, it would seem most appropriate for your company to withdraw the advertisement. Should you wish to further discuss this important matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

I hope that the management of Ampol will reconsider its earlier decision not to withdraw the advertisement and that, in the interests of safety, health and welfare, not only of people who are using sprays but also of people who have to eat the products that are sprayed, and sprayed inappropriately, it will quickly withdraw that advertisement.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether you can take some action to make sure that remarks that are really ministerial statements are more appropriately given as ministerial statements instead of taking up Question Time and abusing the system, as is happening now.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order. I call the member for Morphett.

### BUS STRIKE

**Mr OSWALD:** In view of today's revelations by the union State Secretary, Mr Morgan, that the executive of the union is meeting to discuss strike action because the new ticketing system is causing the problem outlined by the Opposition, namely, the malfunctioning of equipment; abuse of passengers; stress problems, with three resignations this week; the increased possibility of fraud; and buses still running up to 20 minutes late, what action does the Minister of Transport intend to take to overcome these problems to enable the system to operate efficiently rather than in the shambles it is at the moment?

**The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question and I certainly welcome it. I have seen the front page of today's *News* and, if that is the degree of consultation that the ATMOEA wants with the Government, it is a strange standard indeed. The first that I, as Minister, knew of these things was when I read the article on the front page of the *News*. I suggest to the honourable member and his colleagues that if they read through the article they will understand what this threatened strike is all about: it has nothing to do with the Crouzet or service rationalisation but everything to do with the 4 per cent second tier, which is currently being negotiated with the ATMOEA and the Government.

Let me tell the ATMOEA through the agency of this Parliament that the Government is not going to succumb to this sort of threat about industrial negotiations. If the ATMOEA wants to achieve a reasonable 4 per cent second tier arrangement with the Government, the commission is there to enable it to do so and it can do what other unions have done in South Australia to negotiate successfully a package that the commission will accept.

Last Thursday provision was made for the ATMOEA and the STA to meet with a Commissioner who was over from Melbourne to discuss their second tier wage claim. The ATMOEA did not turn up. This week a meeting was arranged

with the ATMOEA and its Federal Secretary and the STA to further discuss the second tier wage claim. The Federal Secretary did not turn up. They have now contacted my office, and yesterday I gave the ATMOEA a commitment that the STA, the Minister of Labour and I would meet with it next week to discuss its concerns about the 4 per cent second tier.

This morning Mr Morgan said that he was demanding a meeting with the Minister. He has already been given an undertaking that a meeting will be held next week. So, before he even talks to the Government about his concerns, his comments appeared on the front page of the *News*. The ATMOEA has been doing this for some time: it has been threatening the Government and using the commuters of Adelaide as cannon fodder for its industrial claims. It is trying to achieve industrial gains by continually threatening the well-being of the STA and disadvantaging city commuters. That approach will not achieve anything—it never has in the past and it will not in the future.

I suggest to the ATMOEA, Mr Morgan and his executive that, if they want to speak to the Government, they should do so. It is not a sensible approach to industrial negotiations to use the media as a lever to try and extract industrial gains from the Government. We will go to the commission, we will abide by the guidelines and we will accept the decision, and we are asking the ATMOEA to do likewise. If it is prepared to do that, the facility is available. If it is prepared to give the productivity gains as required under the guidelines, there will be no problem. It seems to me that the ATMOEA is not confident of its case, so it is trying to threaten the Government. The ATMOEA has never taken the trouble to contact me about any of its concerns in relation to the Crouzet system or about rationalisation.

### ADELAIDE BUS STATION

**Mr DUGAN:** Can the Minister of Transport advise the House on the current state of play in the replanning, re-designing and possible relocation of the Adelaide Bus Station for the increasingly large number of people travelling to and from Adelaide, particularly on weekends? Recently I was approached by regular bus travellers who expressed considerable disquiet about the facilities—or rather, the paucity of facilities—at the Adelaide Bus Station in Franklin Street. Upon personal inspection one Friday I was able to confirm the chaos experienced by my constituent which was caused by the large number of buses leaving the station between 5.30 p.m. and 7 p.m., the lack of car parking spaces and the fact that many travellers were literally sitting in the gutter or on the footpath because there was nowhere else for them to wait.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question and I commend him for his continued interest in trying to ensure that South Australia is provided with a facility to which I believe it is entitled. Almost two years ago I was able to convene a committee chaired by an officer of the Department of Transport with representation from the industry, tourism and the Adelaide City Council to try and agree on a plan, design and strategy to build a new and relevant bus depot in Adelaide.

In more recent times, during a rather notorious business trip to Brisbane (for which I was roundly criticised), I had the privilege of looking at the Brisbane transit centre. I was impressed with the facilities provided for bus travellers and bus companies in Brisbane, although when it was first mooted the bus companies were very much opposed to it. Now you could not extract them from the transit station

with a crowbar because they understand the advantages associated with such a bus depot.

I understand that, in the short term at least, it is not likely that we can look to have such a facility in Adelaide, more is the pity, but I had expected that by now the bus companies or the industry itself would have been able to agree on a plan, a design if you wish, for the new bus station. I understand that discussions are still taking place between the interested parties and the Adelaide City Council. I also understand that some residents on the western side of Bowen Street are very anxious about the sort of extensions that should take place.

I recently had a brief discussion with the principals of the two largest bus companies in South Australia, and I was heartened from that discussion to learn that resolution might not be too far away. But the sooner the better. I urge the honourable member to keep his very high level of representation going, to ensure that not only his constituents but all the people of South Australia and all bus commuters, both those coming into and going outside South Australia as well as intrastate passengers, do have a facility that many other cities now take for granted.

#### NURRUNGAR BASE

**Mr BECKER:** Following the statement that he made about the Nurrungar base, reported in the *Advertiser* of 26 May 1984, that, 'It seemed only proper that the South Australian Government should be given information as to the functions and role of a base located in this State,' is the Premier in a position to elaborate on or clarify claims made yesterday by Senator John Coulter that a nuclear fallout shelter is being constructed at this base and that this proves that it is a No. 1 nuclear target? If not, does the Premier intend to seek any further information or will he ask the State Disaster Committee to make inquiries under the provisions of its Act which requires the committee to 'maintain contact with organisations that might usefully participate in counter-disaster operations'?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think I would need a more credible source than a statement by Dr Coulter if I was going to investigate further.

#### CYSS FINANCIAL REPORTS

**Mr FERGUSON:** I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs. Will the Minister tell the House whether it could be possible to accept financial reports from CYSS groups in South Australia in a format that is acceptable to the Federal Attorney-General? I have been approached by the Treasurer of a local CYSS group who has complained to me that because the Grange CYSS group now has a budget of more than \$100 000 it has to arrange its financial reports so as to be acceptable to both the Department of Corporate Affairs and the Federal Attorney-General. Unfortunately, both insist that the reports be presented in a different way. This causes unnecessary work for volunteer treasurers acting for CYSS groups. It has been put to me that negotiations between the State and Federal Governments might be able to overcome the wasted time and effort that is now occurring.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously, the need for duplicate reporting is due to the respective legislation at both State and Commonwealth levels. I understand that discussions are being undertaken at the moment in respect of a more

unified approach towards company law in this country. I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in the other place for due consideration.

#### RATE PAYMENTS

**Mr LEWIS:** My question is to the Premier, following on from his reply to a question asked by the Leader earlier today when he indicated his support for the 'user pays' principle: why is it now the Government's policy to no longer require people to pay the full amount of their water, sewerage and council rates, for which they wrongly claimed and were wrongly given concessions?

The latest Auditor-General's Report suggested that there may be considerable abuse of various concession schemes costing taxpayers about \$120 million a year. In answer to an Opposition question on 9 September about the Auditor-General's concerns, the Premier said that they were 'being addressed very specifically'. However, I have in my possession a letter being sent out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department which reveals that the Government has decided that people who received remissions of water, sewerage and council rates to which they were not entitled prior to 30 June 1987 will not have to repay that money.

In the last financial year alone those concessions were estimated to cost \$23.5 million, yet the letter to which I have just referred indicates that the Government is not prepared to take the action that the Auditor-General believes necessary, and to which the Premier specifically alluded, to ensure that concessions only go to people entitled to them.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I understand that these payments were made by mistake. The Government is not into harassing elderly pensioners, invalids, and so on, in this way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know whether the figures are correct, I will refer that aspect—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The punitive approach being taken by the honourable member does him and his constituents discredit; I suspect that, fortunately, his constituents would disavow such outrageous attitudes.

#### OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether there are contingency plans for Australia to host next year's Olympic Games and what role a State such as South Australia could play in the staging of an Olympiad at short notice? The House would be aware of the resurgence of rioting in recent weeks in Korea which has overshadowed recent attempts to achieve a constitutional accord. Members will be aware of continued speculation that if civil disturbance continues the Seoul Olympics may have to be cancelled and the Olympiad hosted by another nation at short notice. It has been suggested that, along with Los Angeles, Australia would be a suitable host country and that in this age of high technology in communications a bicentenary Olympics need not have a single location and each State could be responsible for staging different events.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question as concern has been expressed within the sporting community about possible disruption to the Olympic calendar in view of the difficulties occurring in Korea with regard to both internal politics and the situation between North Korea and South Korea in regard to the

hosting of various events. We have had discussions with officers of other Governments in regard to this issue and there is quite a bit of enthusiasm for the view that, if the Olympics, unfortunately, could not proceed in Korea, we could host a games of some sort linked with the bicentenary to attract the world-class athletes who would obviously be looking for a facility having built up to a peak in anticipation of the Seoul Olympics next year.

We have had discussions in that vein with a number of officers from interstate who have indicated their support. The concept would involve a sharing of events around Australia and possibly the use in each of facilities appropriate for Olympic standard events. South Australia could be in a position to accept a number of those events, for example, shooting, swimming or some athletic events. We could certainly cope with staging those events in South Australia, and I am sure that the Government would be supportive of that on the basis of our sharing a range of events for an Olympic Games. This would mean that each State and the Territory would share that major responsibility. We believe that there could be a well organised games of international standard based on relocating various major events in different States and centres if the Olympics does not proceed in Seoul.

So, a contingency plan is available. It requires much work. I assume that most people, certainly the community at large, would like to see the Seoul Olympics proceed. Certainly, we hope that the problems can be solved satisfactorily, the democratic processes being uppermost in the view of any democratic government. If there was, sadly, a collapse of arrangements for the Seoul Olympics, I should be positive and encouraging concerning the staging of events around Australia, and South Australia would be keen to support such a profile in the staging of those events.

## RURAL SITUATION

**Mr BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether there are any plans to extend the financial services and client services of the Rural Assistance Branch in an endeavour to help the many farmers who are facing extreme difficulties following the recent dry spell which could force many farmers into bankruptcy? The past four weeks of dry weather has turned what was potentially an average cropping season into what amounts to disaster for many. As each dry day passes more and more people face economic ruin. The margin between higher costs and lower returns has for many disappeared. Many people are now saying that the possible returns from crops will be minimal and some even say that they are unlikely to take the header out of the shed. The position for many can only be described as tragic. Will the Minister say what extension services are available to those people so that they can seek assistance now rather than having to wait until the end of the farming year?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure that most members would be aware of the adverse seasonal conditions facing Eyre Peninsula. It is important, therefore, to record the situation in each section of Eyre Peninsula in particular and also in other parts of the State that are suffering from the unseasonable dry period in September and the unseasonably hot weather in the last week of that month, both of which are having a major impact particularly on the crops that are coming to a head. Some of the earlier crops may have been more dramatically affected, but the later crops that may have survived will continue to survive if we receive rain in

the next few days. In order to bring the House up to date, I have a report which describes the current position.

On upper Eyre Peninsula and Eastern Eyre Peninsula, the continued lack of substantial rains following the severe hot and windy conditions in the last week of September has further reduced crop yield potential. The worst hit areas are those that had late opening rains and have had only marginal soil moisture all season, and there have been no useful recent rains to follow that up. The majority of crops have died or will not be worth harvesting. In many cases stock have now been put into many crops. That provides a serious outlook in that area.

Regarding the Upper South-East, Murray Valley, Southern Mallee, Mid South-East, Yorke Peninsula, North Murray Mallee and Lower Eyre Peninsula areas, mild weather and useful rainfall of up to between 5 mm and 15 mm during the last week has temporarily halted continuing deterioration of yield potential in the majority of these districts. Exceptions are parts of Southern Yorke Peninsula and Northern Yorke Peninsula, where conditions are becoming increasingly critical. In the Northern Murray Mallee, usually a drought-prone area, some useful rainfalls around 5 mm have consolidated generally average crops during the last few days.

In respect of the Upper, Mid and Lower North, overall the majority of these districts suffered least of the agricultural areas during September and the cool weather and falls of rain, while varying greatly, have given these areas a continuing potential for average or in some areas even above average yields. These potentials can be realised, however, only with continuing cool conditions and rain. During the last few days the Lower North has had falls of between 11 mm and 18 mm, the Mid North predominantly between 7 mm and 14 mm, and the Upper North mostly between 6 mm and 10 mm.

In the Lower South-East, Fleurieu Peninsula, Central Hills and Kangaroo Island districts, over the last several days up to 25 mm has fallen in these higher rainfall areas and, while many individual farmers are still needing rain to maintain crop potential yield and produce bulk of pasture feed particularly on hay paddocks, overall potential is for average yield—provided average October rains occur and there is a general absence of hot winds. I am sorry that this reply is so long, but this is an important issue and it is important that we highlight to the community what is happening.

Since 1 July 1987, during this financial year the Rural Assistance Branch has received 165 applications for rural assistance, and for the whole of 1987, 903 applications have now been received. Of course, we are encouraging those people who need rural assistance to continue to apply. This year we received an increase of about \$.81 million for our interest rate subsidy program in respect of rural assistance, which provides us on current rates with about \$11 million for the lending program above what we provide already for rural assistance.

As I indicated in the press, I met with the Federal Minister for Agriculture (Hon. John Kerin) last Friday. He is supportive of our position. The Director-General and I briefed him on the serious situation facing Eyre Peninsula, and we had discussions on our approach. I have had a brief discussion with the Premier and will have further discussions with him about our approach to the Federal Government. I intend to approach the Federal Government for further assistance in the rural assistance area.

On another plane, I intend to hold discussions tomorrow with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association concerning an alternative scheme that we are considering to support our current counselling and financial assistance

services. I hope that we can reach agreement on the position. I am fairly committed to a back-up counselling service and have had discussions with Mr Bruce Whitney, a representative of the Australian Bankers Association. Those discussions have been useful, because they have given us basic and important information to back up the services we now provide. Mr Whitney has also been a good sounding board on how the department and our services are perceived by the rural community. I used the information that he has provided for a paper that I presented to the United Farmers and Stockowners, and tomorrow I hope to meet with the President and General Secretary of that organisation to discuss that aspect.

I am fairly keen on the proposal as it stands, because it will offer valuable financial and counselling information services to the rural community and supplement and complement the services already offered. It will be useful to the rural community. From the evidence presented by Mr Whitney, we may find that in several places which have been discerned and determined as being non-viable by the banks we may come up with a different answer. I am not saying that just for the sake of gilding the lily but rather to put the realistic situation. A closer examination of the financial structure of the farming unit as a business could provide us with a better basis of decision making.

I am reasonably confident that, if we can build that into the rural assistance program, we can help more people and save some farms that are now under threat, as well as some farming families and managers, especially those younger farmers whom we need to survive in order to provide for our future and the future of the State's economy in that area.

I thank the honourable member for his question and I know that he is greatly concerned about this matter. I assure him that the Federal Minister and I have had these discussions and I shall be happy, as soon as I have reached conclusions as a result of discussions with the United Farmers and Stockowners, to brief him on all those points so that he can convey information to his constituents on Eyre Peninsula.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Earlier today in Question Time I asked the Premier whether he could say whom he now holds accountable for the major discrepancies between the draft and final views of the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics in respect of the Bridgewater railway. In answer to that question, the Premier suggested—and I have a record of *Hansard*—that he suspected that I might have a role in it myself, because I was flogging the issue. That is quite scandalous, Mr Speaker, and I demand an apology from the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Heysen has been given leave to make a personal explanation as to how he has been misrepresented, or believes he has been misrepresented. He cannot use that as a launching pad to make criticisms of other members nor, under the Standing Orders, can he at this late stage call for any sort of retraction or apology other than in rhetorical terms.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The fact is that the Premier has suggested that I might have had a role in doctoring the report. I deny that totally. I am quite prepared to state my interest in this matter and to indicate my strong support for the retention of that service and my concern for the constituents that I represent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** He also said that he would be interested to know whether I had made representations to the Bureau of Transport Economics. Yes, I have made representations—as it was my right to do. As the local member, I had a responsibility—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** As the local member for the district I had a responsibility to make representation and to put a submission before that study. That is exactly what I did. I have continually requested from the Minister of Transport a copy of the first report, the draft report, the final report—or whatever report—and the Minister has refused to make a copy available to me. I still do not have a copy of any of those reports, whether it be the draft or the final report, and I think that that stinks! Because I am the local member, I have a right to know. I have made—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is starting to digress from the proper content of a personal explanation. The honourable member for Heysen.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I know that there is no love lost between the Premier and the Federal Minister. We are all aware of that, and they are all trying to shelter from each other, to run away from this issue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has been given leave to make a personal explanation in order to rectify whatever misrepresentation he believes has occurred, and he must restrict himself to those aspects of the debate. The honourable member for Heysen.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Once again, I totally reject the suggestion by the Premier that I have had something to do with the doctoring of either of the reports that have been referred to on numerous occasions in this House, and I reiterate my interest in this particular subject and my support for the retention of the line. For the Premier to suggest that I have taken any action, through this House or anywhere else, which is inappropriate, is totally scandalous, in my opinion.

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I claim to be badly misrepresented by the member for Heysen. He has asked me for a copy of the BTE report: I told him I would get him a copy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The BTE report was produced by the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics. I told the honourable member that I would try to get a report from the Bureau of Transport Economics or try to get a photostat of the report I had in my office, but I pointed out to the honourable member that the copy I have has notations on it, because I have only the one copy. It has notations on it, and I did not intend to give him my copy of the report bearing my notations.

At that time I understood that his colleague the member for Bragg had a copy of the BTE report, and it was only during Question Time today that the member for Bragg told me that all he had was a copy of the conclusions. I am

not aware of where he got that copy of the conclusions, and it is no concern of mine, but the member for Heysen was told by me that I would get him a copy of the report. I will still do so, and I would thank him not to misrepresent me in this Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that the member for Mawson has just commented in this House suggesting that I should tell the truth for a change. I ask the member for Mawson to withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The language referred to by the honourable member for Heysen is not in the category of what is considered unparliamentary language, where the Chair directs an honourable member to withdraw. It is in the category of language which is obviously offensive to another member and that honourable member, in this case the member for Heysen, can through the Chair place a request for the withdrawal of the words that were used. Does the honourable member for Mawson wish to withdraw the words that were used?

**Ms LENEHAN:** No, I do not.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** In view of the past five minutes, I think that my motion might be the most important put before the House today. I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 14 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955. Read a first time.

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

The purpose of the current Act is to provide for the registration of chemicals used in agriculture and specify the approved uses and conditions of these uses including withholding periods.

It does not prevent the use of chemicals for other than those specified on the label. It provides for the control of sale but not end use.

An amendment to the Act is necessary to ensure that chemicals are not used for non-registered uses.

A further amendment is necessary to provide for the treatment or destruction of materials contaminated with

agricultural chemicals and to prevent such materials being fed to stock.

It is also necessary to update penalties for breaches of the Act in line with Government policy, and as an added deterrent to misuse.

The recent detection of violative residue levels of persistent organochlorine insecticides in meat for both local and export consumption indicates serious misuse of these chemicals.

Consumers rightly expect that the food they eat does not contain unacceptable levels of agricultural chemicals.

The Australian Agricultural Council (AAC) at its recent meeting agreed to ban all uses of DDT in agriculture and to restrict the uses of other persistent organochlorine insecticides including dieldrin.

To implement the AAC decisions and protect our agricultural produce from unacceptable contamination from these chemicals controls on their use are necessary. The most appropriate way of preventing misuse of agricultural chemicals is by making it illegal to use them for any other use than that specified on the label.

Additional powers will be required by inspectors to enable policing of end use and control and treatment of contaminated fodder.

Provision should be made however for the Minister to authorise the use of an agricultural chemical for purposes other than those specified on the label to meet certain circumstances, e.g. control of an exotic disease outbreak or research activities.

The penalties under the current Act (maximum \$200) are no longer a deterrent to potential offenders and should be updated accordingly consistent with Government policy.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act which is the interpretation provision. 'Fodder', 'premises' and 'vehicle' (which are terms used in the new section 24 of the principal Act) are defined and the definition of 'inspector' is expanded to include an inspector appointed under the Stock Diseases Act 1934.

Clauses 5 and 6 amend the penalty provisions of, respectively, sections 8 and 9 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum penalties for offences against those sections to \$20 000 where the offender is a natural person and to \$40 000 where the offender is a body corporate. In both sections the maximum was \$200. Section 8 prohibits selling an agricultural chemical except in a package that has affixed to it a copy of a registered label. Section 9 prohibits selling a substance in a package having affixed to it a copy of a registered label if in any respect the substance does not comply with the particulars stated on the label or with registered additional particulars.

Clause 7 amends section 10 of the principal Act which makes it an offence for a person in the course of business to make a false or misleading statement with respect to an agricultural chemical which is being sold. The maximum penalty is increased from \$100 to \$5 000.

Clause 8 amends section 11 of the principal Act which prohibits the selling of an agricultural chemical that does not comply with the prescribed standard applicable to that chemical.

The maximum penalty is increased from \$100 to \$20 000 where the offender is a natural person and to \$40 000 where the offender is a body corporate.

Clause 9 inserts sections 11a, 11b and 11c into the principal Act.

Section 11a (1) provides that a person who has possession of an agricultural chemical sold under a registered label must keep the chemical in a package on which a copy of a

label registered under the Act is displayed and must not remove the chemical from the package except to the extent required for an authorised purpose.

Subsection (2) sets out what an authorised purpose is.

Subsection (3) provides that the Minister may declare by notice that a particular purpose is not an authorised purpose in relation to an agricultural chemical referred to in the notice.

Section 11b (1) provides that a person must not use an agricultural chemical except for an authorised purpose and in accordance with any directions applicable to that use stated on the label or given by the Minister.

Subsection (2) provides that a person must not use an agricultural chemical in accordance with directions stated on the label if the Minister has, by notice, declared that the chemical should not be used in accordance with those directions.

Subsection (3) provides that a person who contravenes a provision of section 11b is guilty of an offence.

The maximum penalty for offences against sections 11a and 11b is \$20 000 where the offender is a natural person and \$40 000 where the offender is a body corporate.

Section 11c prohibits the removal of a copy of a label registered under the Act from a package that contains an agricultural chemical in relation to which the label was registered. The maximum penalty is \$5 000.

Clause 10 repeals sections 24 and 25 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section 24. The new section sets out provisions giving inspectors wide powers of inspection, search and seizure.

Subsection (5) provides that where in the opinion of an inspector fodder is contaminated with a prescribed agricultural chemical and the level of contamination exceeds the level prescribed in relation to that chemical, the inspector may by notice in writing direct the owner of the fodder to destroy or treat it in accordance with the inspector's directions, or not to use the fodder for a period stated in the notice.

Subsection (6) provides that if a person on whom notice is served under subsection (5) does not comply with the notice, the inspector may destroy the fodder and the cost of destruction will be a debt due by that person to the Minister.

Subsection (9) makes it an offence to (a) hinder or obstruct an inspector, or a person accompanying an inspector, in the exercise of powers conferred by the section or (b) refuse or fail to comply with a requirement made or direction given, pursuant to the section. The maximum penalty is \$5 000 or 6 months imprisonment.

Clause 11 repeals section 30 of the principal Act.

Clause 12 amends section 32 of the principal Act (the regulation making power) by increasing the maximum penalty for breach of any regulation from \$100 to \$5 000.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 27 August. Page 684.)

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports the decision in this Bill to clear up an anomaly relating to the liability of retirement villages for land tax. It ensures that the spirit of the former Liberal Government's decision to exempt all principal places of residence from

land tax will be honoured in full so far as retirement villages are concerned. This is something the Liberal Party has been seeking for the past four years.

We also recognise that this Bill is maintaining some rebate as a consideration for all property valuations having been brought up to date by the Valuer-General and the rapid escalation in the market value of some commercial and industrial properties. Nevertheless, we do ask whether the Government has gone far enough.

Land tax is proving to be a real tax windfall. Between 1981-82 and 1986-87, land tax receipts have risen by 128.9 per cent—twice the rate of inflation. It has been the highest rise of any State in land tax receipts. And if this year's budget estimates are met, the rise in receipts since this Government came to office will be almost 200 per cent.

This has placed considerable cost pressures on commercial landholders, particularly small business operators of establishments like delis and other shops, and owners of rental accommodation. Inevitably, these rises in taxes have flowed through into the higher cost of items in the shop, and for rent. We believe that, at the very least, the Government must review annually the effects of rising property values on the growth of land tax collections. The Government, patently, has failed to do this.

With this massive tax windfall, we further believe that the Government needs to look at the situation of people living in rental accommodation. Their landlords obviously would pass on to them the impact of this tax. As such, they are disadvantaged in relation to people who are able to buy their own homes and who do not pay this tax on their principal place of residence. In his reply, I call on the Premier to give an undertaking to consider this matter, and to inform the House how much this might cost the Government in revenue forgone. As it is earning so much from this tax, the Government should now look at exemptions for residential rental accommodation.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I support wholeheartedly the remarks of the Leader. Any concession that can be given to private developers or investors to ease the financial burden for those who are forced to rent would help consumers immensely. It is a suggestion that the Government should take on board seriously. The removal of land tax on individual units within retirement villages is greatly appreciated. I remind the House that on 19 March this year I moved a motion asking for the abolition of land tax on individual units and retirement villages. I believed that it was grossly unfair that these people were being taxed simply because of an oversight when the Act was amended in 1982. If it was not for the private developers coming in and establishing retirement villages, many aged persons would have experienced great difficulty in retaining their accommodation or even looking after their own residential properties. Such development has been of immense value to those people.

In my electorate the residents of the Fulham Retirement Village will benefit. They were advised recently that their land tax was going to cost \$437.70 each for the 90-odd units. This was subsequently reduced to \$394.25 per unit, a reduction of \$43.45, following an appeal made by me on their behalf to the Valuation Board. Land valuation was reduced from \$21 500 to \$19 500 per unit. This example proves that unless consumers check their valuations and are prepared to challenge them, the Government can charge, within reason, what it likes. Full credit must be given to the Fulham Retirement Village residents who supported that application for appeal.

Because we did challenge those valuations, the land tax had not been paid on time, so each unit holder was also to

be fined 5 per cent of that land tax, which was about \$21.88 per unit. Fortunately, the appeal was successful and that fine was waived. In all, last financial year the residents of Fulham Retirement Village, through my efforts, saved themselves \$65.33. This financial year they will not have to pay out the \$394.25 that they were forced to pay last year, which will be a bitter memory for them. This applies not only to Fulham Retirement Village. Many other persons in retirement estates throughout South Australia will benefit.

I was surprised when I received a letter midway through this year from a resident who is President of the Salisbury East Retirement Estate, comprising some 69 units. He sent me a copy of the letter he forwarded to the Premier on 2 May 1987. In that letter, he states:

The residents of this estate petitioned Mr Mike Rann, MP, on 16 January 1987 for abolition of this tax. Since that time no formal acknowledgment or advice has been received from him. We have received many assurances of support from Opposition members and we applaud them for their efforts.

In your statement of 20 March 1987 it was mentioned that consideration will be given to exemption after the current legislation had been cleared through Parliament. We have waited patiently for this and as we understand it has been done, in the absence of any advice from Mr Rann, we now wish to place the matter in your hands in the hope that our urgent request will be acknowledged and acted upon without any further delay.

What a shame when the constituent has to write to the Premier to complain about the inactivity of his own ALP member. The member for Henley Beach was quite critical of my move in seeking the abolition of land tax last financial year, and he claimed that developers should pay that tax. Let me remind the member for Henley Beach that correspondence from another retirement village pointed out that in their case a clause in the licence agreement requires residents to pay all telephone, electricity, gas, excess water and other charges separately rated, taxed, charged, assessed or imposed on the units.

The member for Henley Beach was totally out of order and one of his constituents at Carisfield Estate, Frederick Road, Seaton, complained to me that residents were dismayed and angered at the Government's attitude. The Premier made much of the turning of the soil when those units were first developed in 1985, just before that election, and of course that was used for cheap publicity purposes at that time. These people felt angered that they had to pay a considerable amount of land tax and were treated in that manner. At least the record is now being set and they will no longer have to pay for it. As I understand it, the Premier has at least kept to the bargain that he advised me earlier this year in correspondence that this land tax would be abolished at the first opportunity in this financial year and that that abolition, as the Act provides, will start from 1 July. Therefore, these residents do not have to pay land tax and on their behalf I thank the Government for at least giving them some consideration.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I thank members for their contributions. I do not think we need to go into this measure in great detail, because it does have support, and for good reason. I would make just one comment on the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition. As usual, of course, he fails to distinguish between rates of tax and receipts from tax. The fact that land values have increased substantially over the past few years in South Australia is overall a healthy sign indeed. If we were a stagnant or decaying economy land values would be static or reducing. The fact that we are seeing growth in these values indicates that there is investment.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes. It is very encouraging indeed to see the way in which valuations are rising in a healthy way. The Government has not increased rates of land tax; in fact, we have reduced them: in 1985 we reduced them substantially indeed; in 1986 again we rebated large sums of money—many millions of dollars—and in 1987 we are doing it again. Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition is saying, we have ensured that land tax rates have been reduced, and not increased, under this Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order for the second time, and that is specifically directed to the member for Bragg.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 15 and 16 (clause 6)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert the following subsection:

(2) The Minister will, after consulting the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated, appoint a member of the board to preside at its meetings.

No. 2. Page 4 (clause 6)—After line 12 insert new section as follows:

*Report as to efficiency.*

14. (1) Every three years the Minister will appoint a suitable person to examine the degree of efficiency with which the board carries out its functions under this Act and the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act 1973.

(2) The person appointed under subsection (1) must deliver a report to the Minister on his or her findings and the Minister must, within 12 sitting days after delivery of the report, cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

(3) The costs of the examination and the report will be met by the board from its funds.

*Amendment No. 1:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I oppose the motion. When the Bill was first discussed there were horrific problems and the Opposition agreed that this area should be looked into. The UF&S put in considerable time and effort in bringing together the egg producers and interested parties to help the Minister, and I know that he attended several meetings on this matter at UF&S headquarters. We agree with the basic principle that boards such as this should operate effectively and efficiently, we agree that producers should receive a reasonable return for their investment, and we also agree that producers with large capital investments in the industry should be protected. It stems from that that egg consumers should be able to obtain a fresh product at a reasonable price for 12 months of the year. Much of the agreement reached has occurred as a result of consultations and meetings between producers and the Minister at UF&S headquarters.

I think it is only reasonable that the Minister should consult with the UF&S before a Chairman is appointed. I am aware that a new Egg Board Chairman has already been appointed, even though this Bill has not yet passed through Parliament. I think it is important that ongoing consultation occurs. I would like to see this amendment retained or I would want a guarantee from the Minister that he would consult with the UF&S before making any appointments.



That is an important point and the Opposition puts it most strongly.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his comments. I understand the thrust behind the amendment. As I indicated earlier in debate on this issue, it is not only the UF&S which is involved in this industry; many other interested groups also play an important role. My view was that, had the wording of the amendment been altered to incorporate the word 'industry' (that is, members and representatives of the industry), I would have been happy to accept it. I think to single out a particular section of the industry—albeit a very large and important one—would be improper and in some ways lacks protocol in the consultative process.

To clarify what the member for Victoria has said, I make it clear that the appointment of a new Chairman was necessary because the previous Chairman retired. His term of office expired and it was incumbent upon me as Minister under the Act as it now stands to replace him—and I did that in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The intention was certainly not to in any way pre-empt what was before Parliament and I would never dare do or suggest such a thing with regard to the rights of Parliament. I was merely meeting the requirements of the Act as it now stands. If and when this Bill passes and it is proclaimed and becomes the law of the State, I will comply with its requirements. I make that point so that the record is clear as to my position in relation to the appointment of the new Chairman. I was in no way attempting to pre-empt Parliament or the intentions of the Bill. As Minister I must deal with the legislation as it stands at the moment—and I am doing that.

With regard to the honourable member's request on behalf of the Opposition, I make it clear that there were extensive consultations on the Bill and, in fact, negotiations commenced in February this year. We have been negotiating extensively since then to establish the proper arrangements for this Bill to go into the legislative program as a package of amendments to the existing Act. It is important to note that this aspect was not raised during the negotiations, although there were discussions about it and there was some misunderstanding about what was discussed—but it was certainly not raised by the UF&S when the Bill was released for consideration by the industry. If this matter had been raised, we could have dealt with it more efficiently at that time within the industry and we would not now have to deal with messages from another place.

I am happy to indicate to the honourable member that I accept his point about consultation: I believe it is very important in the interests of good government that there be consultation. I am certainly more than happy to put on the record that, in regard to the appointment of a Chairman of the Egg Board, I would be happy to consult with the UF&S and advise it of my position in regard to any appointment. I think that puts the record straight, as the honourable member has requested. In fact, I did that in relation to the latest appointment under the existing legislation when replacing the former Chairman. Even though it was not organised as efficiently as I would have liked, all the same we did go through that process and I will continue to do so (just as I did with the recent appointment). So I am happy to give the honourable member that undertaking. That should assist in the passage of the Bill and, in the interests of the efficiency of the industry and its economic performance, that should be a satisfactory solution to the matter now being considered by the Committee.

**Mr OSWALD:** From my reading of the speeches on this Bill in another place, I gather that it is the consultative process that the producers and the UF&S are on about to

ensure that they are consulted and that the industry, the producers and the marketers know that the person chairing the board has some knowledge of the industry. I appreciate the Minister's assurance that in the future he will consult with the industry so that it has some sort of input into the appointment of presiding officers of the board. Can the Minister tell me what is the background of the appointee and what knowledge he has of the industry?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Cabinet considered the appointment last Monday and Executive Council today confirmed that appointment; I imagine that it has been gazetted this afternoon in accordance with the decision of Cabinet and the Executive Council. Mr Feagan has an extensive background in the agricultural industry. He has been involved as either a consultant or an agricultural officer at various levels since about 1946 or 1947, when he graduated with a Masters Degree in Agricultural Science. He has practised his profession in Victoria and federally, and extensively in South Australia as Director of the Animal Services Section of the Department of Agriculture in recent years.

His responsibility in that section has been directly related to the activities of the egg industry, the chicken meat industry and various other livestock activities that the department oversees either through an advisory role, an extension role or a policing role in terms of application of various statutes relating to standards. So, he has spent many years in and has a very extensive knowledge of the agricultural industry. His background is probably next to none in terms of exposure to the industry. He certainly has an extensive knowledge of the egg industry, and that is relevant in terms of his appointment. As an individual, I think he has performed his role in the Department of Agriculture very admirably, and certainly the Director-General has a very high regard for his capacities. This aspect was part of the deliberations undertaken prior to the appointment and was certainly an aspect considered by Cabinet.

**Mr OSWALD:** Clearly, he is a well qualified academic in his field. From reading speeches made in the other place I note that the point was raised that, if the Minister always appoints a public servant to the position, perhaps that person might not have the freedom that one would expect a chairperson of a board of this type to have. Although this appointment has been made and cannot be reversed, I wonder whether the Government would consider not always appointing a public servant to the position. There might be value in throwing open the position from time to time to people working outside the Public Service, so that someone from industry might be brought in—someone who has also been involved in the active production and marketing of eggs and whose expertise could be used. In those circumstances the growers would have no complaint, if from time to time they were represented on the board.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** In fact, Mr Feagan is no longer a public servant; so we have already complied with that suggestion. I see certain value in what the member for Morphett has put forward. I think there is perhaps a sense of belonging when one is a public servant and chairman of what is, I suppose to a degree, an independent statutory board, although it is still accountable, as members opposite so frequently remind me, to Parliament and to the Minister. I think it is relevant that Mr Feagan is no longer an employee of the State Government. I think that gives him a certain freedom and flexibility. I know that he was considering other career options in terms of consultancy or activities in the agricultural industry. I am sure that many people would be interested in engaging his services. He has just returned from an overseas trip and, given what has been happening in the environment of this industry, I think it is appropriate

that the contract for the position held by the former Chairman, who was a public servant, was not renewed. We then had the opportunity to consider Mr Feagan as one of the applicants.

One of the other board members retired and in his place we appointed a Mr Geoff Davis, who is a chartered accountant with Ernst & Whinney, a partner in that firm. He has an extensive interest in management consultancy and chartered accounting and in providing information, advice and management skills to the rural community. We think that those skills will be a very valuable asset to the board in its deliberations. As the honourable member will appreciate, I think the board has been somewhat lacking in terms of the application of those skills.

I think that previous members like Mr Oliphant had those skills, but the question was whether they had the opportunity to express them in terms of the management of the organisation. Given the new environment, pending the new Bill coming in to alter the structure of the Egg Board and some of its operations, I think this is an ideal time for someone like Mr Davis, with his background, experience and management skills, to be available to offer just the sort of financial and management advice to the board to give the board perhaps a new view in playing its important role in terms of the marketing and promotion of a very important industry in this State.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The amendment provides: 'the Minister will, after consulting the UF&S, appoint a member of the board.' Will the Minister assure us that he will consult with the UF&S before appointing the Chairman of the board and that he will not just say to the UF&S that he is going to appoint Fred Bloggs as chairman? I think it is very important that the UF&S has some input into the matter of the appointment. Is that the assurance that the Minister gave the House a moment ago?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Yes, that will be done after consultation. I am happy to accept that the wording 'the Minister will, after consulting...' will stand as the *pro forma* in relation to the process.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 2:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No.2 be agreed to.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The Opposition agrees wholeheartedly with this amendment, which, of course, was put forward at the instigation of the shadow Minister. The Opposition believes that all these statutory authorities should be examined at regular intervals. We agree that for them to operate efficiently and effectively they must be examined regularly. The Opposition totally supports the amendment. On occasions, boards become totally inefficient in their operations and totally out of kilter and they should be examined. I would urge the Minister to in future look at some of these boards. Representations have been made quite recently to some members on this side of the House about the Dried Fruits Board, and I am sure that on investigation the Minister would find that it has not been operating in the interests of producers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the honourable member to order; we are not considering the matter of the Dried Fruits Board.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I am just giving an illustration of how this can occur. However, we totally support this amendment.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I acknowledge the concerns of the member for Victoria. In view of the current provision before the Committee, I am happy to accept the points that he has made. I am certainly happy to consider any infor-

mation that he has in relation to concerns about the operation of other boards.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:  
Because the amendment will make the Act unworkable.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** This afternoon I take up the issue of the proposed closure of the swimming pool at the Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and protest on behalf of my constituents and constituents in neighbouring areas at its closure. Earlier this session I presented a petition bearing 763 signatures of residents of Magill, Rostrevor, Hectorville, Teringie, Norton Summit, Tranmere, Kensington, Campbelltown, Norwood, Newton, Rosslyn Park and many other immediate and surrounding suburbs. The signatories of that petition joined with me in opposition to the closure of the Magill swimming pool.

The proposed closure of this pool is ostensibly (I believe, in the eyes of the council of management of the college) based on the need for cost containment—and none of us would disagree with that goal. However, I challenge the suggestion of cost containment by closing a swimming pool when there are so many other areas of the college which could be challenged in relation to proper and effective management of funds. I refer particularly to the internal audit conducted at the college and released showing the date 31 December 1986. It demonstrates quite clearly that payments by the college for travel, conferences and vehicles have been allowed to run out of hand; the 1985 cost for those matters was \$666 000, which in 1986 leapt to \$740 000 during a period when costs were supposed to be closely contained.

Contract and other cleaning costs leapt from \$462 000 in 1985 to \$630 000 in 1986; hire and maintenance of equipment costs leapt an extraordinary amount from \$489 000 in 1985 to \$701 000 in 1986; and administrative expenses increased from \$1.509 million in 1985 to \$1.776 million in 1986. The college council should be held accountable for allowing these costs to get out of hand and then trying to present to the local community in which one of its campuses is based a proposal to close an absolutely essential community facility on the grounds of cost containment; I do not think that any taxpayer will accept that proposition.

If what the college council and management proposes for the Magill pool goes ahead, an expensive community facility, which is badly needed in my electorate, will lie idle seven days and nights a week throughout the coming summer, yet the other matters to which I have referred have been allowed to continue uncontrolled and without apparent proper management by the college council. I would like the House to know of some of the groups that use the swimming centre and I would like members to judge for themselves whether that centre should remain open. The Education Department has school groups attending the Magill pool during the first and fourth terms of the school year. The Magill pool is an Education Department learn-to-swim centre during the school summer holidays, and is known as being very active in top level Royal Lifesaving Rescue Awards. More young people register for these classes each year, and we are talking about a group of people who are on the other side of town from the coast and the beaches and for whom this pool is an absolutely essential part of their training for lifesaving work.

Outside the vacation learn-to-swim campaign, the Magill pool is home and training ground to the Magill Royal Life Saving Centre. Many children and adolescents train together for the annual RLSSA carnival, from which they have come away with the majority of the trophies for the last few years. Water polo clubs train as well as play matches at the pool, senior citizens use it through community centre organised swim classes, and individual senior citizens find the pool helpful for pleasure, therapeutic uses and general well-being and fitness.

The 'over 40-50' age swimming classes are arranged by the community centre, giving older people (I suppose I would have to put myself in that 40-50 group—I have just realised with a start that I come into that category) the opportunity to learn to swim and to attempt to achieve some of the RLSSA life saving awards, or to strive for personal best swimming achievements. Members would know about the Aussie swim clubs—that is, adult and senior swimmers—which have an approximately 200 to 300 strong membership. They train at the Magill pool several times a week. Several competitive swim clubs use the pool for training; 'Life. Be In It' has a program of water activities based at the pool; Morialta High School has physical education lessons and training at this pool; and church groups, Brownies, Guides, Cubs and Scouts use this pool. All these groups are additional to the local primary schools such as Magill, Stradbroke, Thorndon and others beyond my electorate which use the pool.

It would be a maddening and frustrating waste of taxpayers' money if this pool was closed and all these people were forced to either cancel their activities or spend considerable sums of money, and considerable time, going further afield to pools which are undoubtedly already fully used. I refer particularly to the Burnside pool, and I suppose the nearest other pools would be at Tea Tree Gully, St Peters and Dernancourt, and the North Adelaide Swimming Centre. It is impossible for me to foresee that pool being closed. I believe that it is essential that the Minister of Employment and Further Education step in and use his good offices with the college council and, if necessary, to come to whatever financial arrangements are necessary with other Government user bodies, namely, the Department of Education and the Department of Recreation and Sport, to ensure that some kind of cost is borne by those departments to enable the college to keep the pool open.

I do not suggest for a minute that a tertiary education institution should bear sole responsibility for maintaining a community facility that is used by a large number of bodies. However, I suggest that when a tertiary institution is not able to sustain a pool for its own students and use when that pool has been built with taxpayers' money for the benefit of the community generally, then the State Government has an obligation to step in to ensure that an absolutely disastrous waste of community resources does not occur.

I urge the Minister of Employment and Further Education, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who at the moment happens to be sitting on the front bench, to put their heads together and do whatever is necessary to come up with a cost-effective solution to keep this pool open. It is imperative that it be kept open because, apart from its being an outstanding recreational resource for the local community, it is literally a lifesaver for those people who need it for health purposes and for lifesaving training.

**Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward):** In this House on 9 September the member for Hanson made an horrendous attack on

self-help groups, especially Self Help Adult Unemployed Norwood (SHAUN), Port Unemployed Self Help (PUSH) both of which are adult unemployed support groups. I have received a number of letters from groups decrying that attack and I wish to place on the official record one such letter.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mrs APPLEBY:** I can give the honourable member a whole host of letters if he wants them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Hayward.

**Mrs APPLEBY:** The letter states:

It has been brought to my notice the letter read and speech made to Parliament by Mr Heini Becker concerning his disapproval of PUSH Transport Service competing with the 'legitimate private sector furniture removalists'. Mr Becker makes very strong assertions and makes good use of a letter to add authority to his speech in the House. These fall into two main categories:

- (i) that it is morally wrong for the Government to fund people or groups in the community to compete with the 'tax-paying, legitimate' private sector [who don't get any help].
- (ii) that unemployed self help groups that have developed furniture removals services do not have the skills required, use of second-hand vans, do not pay correct wages, benefits or whatever, and do not abide by industry regulation, and so on.

Mr Becker has not given much thought to the substance nor validity of the assertions used by him in his strong attack against the Bannon Labor Government as a member of the Opposition. Port Unemployed Self Help Inc. owns a registered business enterprise named PUSH Transport Service. This service was developed because of our preparedness to give a service to people in need, that is a target population that was not being adequately serviced by the commercial sector. Our growth and development has been based on the quality and nature of our service and assistance to a neglected section of the community with whom we have developed our market. Our impact on the overall industry market was minuscule; we extended the market, not poached it.

Like thousands of self-employed and family-based businesses we make management decisions about the nature of our goals and rewards and our personal commitment to service delivery and customer satisfaction. PUSH Transport Service has not grown to be a successful commercial enterprise by ignoring and avoiding the issues of safety, necessary insurance, vehicles and equipment, accountability to customers, support and training for workers nor business management skills. Mr Becker's incorrect assertions of the second category are quite outrageous and insulting. Our removals service was developed by mature-aged unemployed men who had many years experience and the required skills in the industry. It has also provided a positive training and work-experience program for many younger, unemployed people including business administration. PUSH raised the necessary finance to purchase its first vehicle. Today the vehicles used for service delivery are owned by independent owner-drivers each of whom have invested some \$40 000 to \$50 000 to obtain modern, fully equipped pantechonicon removal vans, with all equipment and materials necessary and including the required insurances. PUSH Transport Services operates within the commercial conventions and business practices of the transport industry where one party owns the corporate name and goodwill and its delivery function is contracted out to independent, self-employed vehicle owners. Where does Mr Becker get off incorrectly claiming that we are not toeing the line in relation to the regulations that legitimate industry must abide by. Our cost-effectiveness is primarily due to being a legitimate small business with lower overheads and in subscribing to non-profit, community service goals.

As an incorporated body and owners of a business enterprise we determine the charges conveyed to our customers in order to cover all costs, invest for future economic and social development, and meet corporate goals. We survive in the market place by virtue of our performance in services and assistance provided, customer satisfaction and accountability, and damn hard work. Certainly not by Government handouts to avoid proper commercial development. Which brings us to Mr Becker's first category of concern and his obvious lack of understanding of a broad range of industry development and assistance program by State, Federal and Local Governments. Many existing businesses, large and small, individuals and partnerships receive public funds [taxes] by direct and indirect means. Until very recently the entire hospitality industry was massively subsidised by tax-paying wage

earners. BHP Australia received \$5 000 million from a Federal Labor Government in order to restructure and modernise and become more competitive. Industry training councils, export incentives, tax and custom rebates, salary subsidies, employment development grants, subsidised loan repayments, loan interest tax exemptions, the provision of major infrastructure to facilitate major economic development, and many other Government initiatives are accepted by the 'legitimate private sector.'

Governments also directly fund many unemployed people, declining rural towns and wasted manufacturing industry-based areas to develop employment and business growth opportunities. Even so, PUSH Transport Services is not directly funded by the South Australian Government in the manner described by the member for Hanson and the South Australian Road Transport Associations letter [as read out]. Small business, self-management, self-determination, our ownership and corporate purpose our market population are the major factors in determining our ability to remain competitive in our market niche, and to charge a lower fee for disadvantaged, poorer people and a higher fee to others. In the end we are an incorporated body, similar to other small businesses and we are subject to Acts of legislations [State, Federal and local] and their regulations that would normally apply to any others. On the politics of non-private ownership of business enterprises we ask you to kindly remind the member for Hanson that Australia enjoys a mixed economy and a heavily Government sponsored one at that—to all sectors, not just us. Thanking you for your representation.

I consider that I need add nothing to what has been put forward by the organisation and I thank it for asking me to support its point of view.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I am delighted that the member for Hayward at long last has made a contribution to the grievance debate in this session (I think it might be the first—certainly the first for many months) and has had incorporated in *Hansard* the correspondence she has received from PUSH. It will give me great pleasure to transmit that to the person and the organisation which contacted me, and I will make sure they receive it so that they can check the facts and figures as stated, and look at the cost of the furniture removal vans (\$40 000 to \$50 000) and how they can operate on such a low fee structure. As a great supporter of the private enterprise system, I say that anyone who can reduce fees and operate effectively and efficiently paying union wages, meeting all the Government costs and charges and insurance, and keep fees down or reduce fees will get my support.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** And still pay for the truck.

**Mr BECKER:** It all has to be legitimate, and they have to pay for the truck, as the member for Mount Gambier says. If it is under a bank loan, on hire purchase or whatever, they have to meet all the charges, and insurance associated with that is pretty expensive. Good luck to them! I hope that they can do it legitimately in competition with well established private enterprise businesses.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Mount Gambier reminds me, we would like to know their formula for success and make sure that it is passed on to the small business community. It is good to hear that some people get off their behinds and show some initiative, and we would like to see the encouragement of these organisations—provided that it is all legitimate and that they can maintain the standard of that organisation. They will have the opportunity to have that information checked out.

I support the member for Coles concerning the proposed closure of the Magill College of Advanced Education campus swimming pool, and I understand that the Sturt campus swimming pool is also earmarked for closure. That is an absolute tragedy, and I hope that the Minister at the table, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, will take on the plea of the member for Coles and also my plea on behalf of the Henley Amateur Swimming Club. As you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, that club lost the benefit of the facilities of a salt

water swimming pool, the only one we had in South Australia (and, I think, one of only three in the Southern Hemisphere). The salt water swimming pool at Henley Beach was a wonderful facility but, through decisions of council and Government, that is gone for ever. That is history. So, the Henley Amateur Swimming Club is looking for a permanent home. In the meantime, I think the Sturt campus pool would be of immense benefit to them.

Information I have received indicates that these swimming pools under the care and control of the South Australian College of Advanced Education are used for about 1½ hours a week, and the fees that need to be collected from persons using the facilities would have to be about \$12 a visit to make the pools viable. Swimming pools are very expensive, particularly heated pools, but I think it would be an absolute tragedy to see these two pools closed. I believe that the maintenance charges of the two pools are about \$30 000 per annum, so even if they are closed the colleges will be up for that amount of money.

So, let us throw them open to the public. Let us throw them open to the Amateur Swimming Association and say, 'Come on: here is the opportunity to use these pools,' and ask the Minister of Recreation and Sport to coordinate the various amateur swimming clubs within his department to use these pools.

I, like the member for Hayward, have a very long letter to read in the grievance debate this afternoon, on a matter of principle. A friend of mine, Frank Franklin, well known in motor cycling circles, is also a great conservationist, and someone who has been promising to look into an issue that I think is dear to the hearts of most South Australians, and that is tourism and the benefits of tourism. I think Mr Franklin's letter speaks for itself. It states:

As promised, I took a trip out to Lake Eyre in early April to check on tourist information in the area. The findings are brief—NIL. Over the last decade I have indulged my desires for travel, and study of the history of the country in the Far North of our State. In the course of this, I have met many of the local people and heard at first hand the stories of the hardships, and joys, of living in one of the harshest environments in the world.

In the midst of this area lies our largest physical tourist attraction, and at the same time the smallest in terms of Government recognition—Lake Eyre. I am the first to agree that there is nothing there to see, but it is in this huge area of nothingness that its unique attraction lies. It is also the place where the late Donald Campbell broke the world Land Speed Record. Because of its isolation, it is potentially dangerous for lone travellers, and I feel it is only a matter of time before a fatality occurs. This potential situation was aggravated by two films on the Outback shown by Channel 10 in its *Goodings Collection* late last year.

The inference drawn from those films was that the Outback is so opened up you can jump in a conventional car, wearing only shorts and thongs, and travel at 100 km/h virtually anywhere you want to go. Verification of this was given me when, in January of this year, on a day of 43 degrees temperature, I came across three tourists stranded out at the lake. Not only were they hopelessly bogged in loose sand, but they had also flattened the battery of their conventional two-wheel drive car. And yes, you've guessed it, they were wearing only shorts and thongs.

Such was the heat out at the lake that day—far in excess of the 43 degrees registered back at Marree—that they could not step outside their vehicle because of the intense heat on their feet. Had they been able to walk, they were still faced with a 40 km trek with no water or shade, and then a further 10 km of patchy shade before reaching water and habitation. As one of them was bleeding freely from the nose, I would not have bet on him surviving the walk.

**Mr Lewis:** That's on the assumption that he knew in which direction he was going.

**Mr BECKER:** That is dead right. The letter continues:

Nowhere is there any sign warning travellers of the dangers to be encountered in this most inhospitable region. The situation is further aggravated by the fact that no road exists. A rough two-wheeled track which becomes obliterated after wind and dust storms is all that users can expect when travelling the last 25-30 km to North Lake Eyre. Quest Tours of Adelaide could speak

authoritatively on this, for it must have cost them thousands of dollars in repairs when they bogged down trying to take two buses out to the lake when it last had an appreciable amount of water in it. The only access to the lake is through Muloorina Station, which is owned by the Mitchell family, who are most sympathetic to tourists wishing to visit the lake.

However, as Mrs Colleen Mitchell pointed out to me, it is unfair to expect them to build and maintain a road for the use of tourists as well as take a lot of the responsibility for their safety. At the moment, every vehicle that visits the lake passes through Muloorina Station housing complex, and during the cooler months and when there is water in the lake, this can amount to a lot of vehicles. I wonder if the Minister of Tourism would like her backyard used as a main road, and her house an information centre? I think not. Bear in mind also, that Colleen, in addition to her normal household duties, has to perform the role of school-teacher for her children during normal school hours and any interruptions break the children's concentration as well as her own.

As I mentioned earlier, this places a lot of responsibility on her and her family, for in addition to being an information bureau, they are also expected to drag out bogged or broken down vehicles and make their station equipment available to effect repairs. All these things they really do not mind if only the Government would show a little bit of interest and consideration for both landowners and tourists. Looking at it logically, the Minister has to either bar tourists from the area altogether and prominently display signs to that effect, or upgrade and maintain an all weather road from Marree to Lake Eyre—

and that would be pretty expensive, I would assume—

If the Government is going to permit tourists to the lake they must also accept responsibility for the road, for this is the station's only means of access to its nearest town, Marree. Muloorina does not expect a bitumen road, but they do expect something tourist resistant, for they, like the Highways Department, know only too well the damage inexperienced and unthinking drivers can do to a weak surface.

In my opening remarks I stated no information about Lake Eyre existed in the area. This is not strictly correct, for the Mitchells, at their own expense, have painted a sign on a station gate saying it is the track to Lake Eyre. They have also erected another below the station buildings showing the way to the lake, and also to the camping area they have set aside for the use of tourists. It is a real oasis in the desert, and visitors can swim in the pool fed by water from an artesian bore as well as make use of the barbecues and rubbish bins provided at Muloorina's expense. As I stated earlier, the Mitchells are most sympathetic towards the tourist but feel the responsibility is the Government's and not theirs.

I therefore call on the Minister of Tourism to now provide the necessary signposting.

Motion carried.

At 4.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 October at 2 p.m.