

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 October 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY ATTENDANTS

The **SPEAKER**: I wish to advise honourable members that after consultation with staff and the Public Service Association representative it has been decided to change the title of staff currently referred to as 'Messengers'. In future these staff members will be referred to as 'Parliamentary Attendants'.

Two main considerations have led to this decision. First, very few Parliaments in the Westminster system, and in particular in Australia, continue the use of the word 'Messenger'. This title is an archaic one and in some senses has an undesirable connotation. In any event it does not accurately portray the work that is done by the staff in question. Secondly, staff members themselves prefer the new title as being a more accurate description and more in line with modern usage.

Finally, I wish to advise honourable members that following the retirement of Mr Gordon Ellis, Mr Arnold Noack has been appointed Head Parliamentary Attendant, Mr Ray Blain has been appointed Chamber Attendant, and I also have pleasure in announcing that Ms Marjorie Stead has been appointed Parliamentary Attendant to fill the vacancy created.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

- Correctional Services Act Amendment,
- Fences Act Amendment,
- Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment,
- Justices Act Amendment,
- Licensing Act Amendment,
- Parole Orders (Transfer),
- Police Offences Act Amendment,
- Prisons Act Amendment,
- Stamp Duties Act Amendment.

PETITIONS: MARIHUANA

Petitions signed by 257 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that would legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana were presented by Messrs Ashenden and Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ADULT VIDEO CASSETTES

A petition signed by nine residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to clarify and standardise the laws on the sale and hire of adult video cassettes was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: TIME CLOCK

A petition signed by 46 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to relocate the State Transport Authority's time clock located at bus stop 27A on Diagonal Road, Warradale, was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: ADVERTISING OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 679 residents of South Australia praying that the House not support restrictions on the advertising of tobacco products was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the following schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions on the Notice Paper except Nos 33, 61, 64, 66, 72, 75, 77, 91, 99, 124 to 126, 132, 139, 142, 152, 157, 162 to 166, 168 to 171, 173, 175 to 177, 182 and 183; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

PETTY CRIME RECORDS

In reply to **Mr FERGUSON** (4 August).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: The question of expunction of criminal records has been considered by several bodies since the 1973 Law Reform Committee report. In particular, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has been seeking to find a solution to the difficult practical problems involved so that uniform laws can be enacted throughout Australia.

Under a previous Labor Government a report was prepared on the implementation of procedures for the expunction of criminal records. The Government supports in principle some form of expunction procedure. However, lack of resources at present do not enable work to commence at this stage. As soon as resources become available further attention will be given to the issue.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

In reply to **Mr OSWALD** (30 August).

The **Hon. R.G. PAYNE**: Only one company has withdrawn from uranium exploration in South Australia citing the Government's policy on uranium development as the reason. The unfulfilled commitment totalled \$45 000. Expenditure by eight other companies related to what might be attributed as purely uranium search is in abeyance pending examination of their requests for relief from commitments to exploration. They have been advised that such relief will be afforded until 31 December 1983 in accordance with the conditions outlined in my recent Ministerial statement on this matter. Their commitments approximate \$1.5 million.

FIRE SAFE

In reply to **Mr MAYES** (31 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has contacted Mr T. Tullis, the Executive Director of the Australian distributor, Fire Safe Pty Ltd, for comment with regard to the product called 'Fire Safe'. Mr Tullis has stated that the product was developed in the United States of America for treating natural, porous fibres and has been passed by the Underwriters Laboratory as being an effective flame retardant. A report from the Experimental Building Station, Department of Housing and Construction, in New South Wales, has been studied. The report states that tests on 100 per cent cotton drapery fabric which had been treated with 'Fire Safe' indicated that treated materials have substantially lower early fire hazard indices than those of similar untreated materials. Furthermore, the New South Wales Department of Health has advised that the product does not contain substances which would require it to be labelled as a poison. The distributor has indicated that the chlorination levels of Australian reticulated water supplies could affect the treatment to a degree (dry cleaning is recommended for any treated article), but that some flame retarding properties are retained after one laundering. An undertaking has been given to provide further test results as they become available.

SECONDMENT OF GOVERNMENT TRAINEE PERSONNEL

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (11 August).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Under the previous Government, the Department of Technical and Further Education was generally instructed to appoint lecturing staff on a temporary basis, and priority was to be given to persons already employed in the public sector. A number of officers were recruited on a temporary basis from other Government departments for varying periods, and requests were made for them to be given leave without pay for the period in question.

With the increase in transition education programmes the number of people recruited from other Government departments increased significantly. Again requests were made for leave without pay for the period, usually for only one year. As you are aware, the transition education programmes are funded on an annual basis and this, combined with the uncertainty of future demand and changes in emphasis, makes it impractical to offer permanent appointments. It is only when funding levels and student enrolments are known that steps can be taken to offer lecturers an extension of their temporary employment. Although every effort is made to assess future programmes as early as possible, at times there are lengthy delays. It is conceded that it is unsettling for individuals and for some Government departments.

There are two forces which must be taken into account when assessing the need to extend the temporary employment of persons from other Government departments. First, the demand for and continuation of some transition education programmes and, secondly, the general economic climate and hence recruitment of apprentices. A decline in one or both of these areas will have a consequential fall in demand for lecturers in particular areas; those who have permanent tenure must be gainfully employed and hence are redeployed to the transition education programmes. This action may mean that some officers recruited from other Government departments would have to return to their substantive positions.

A number of officers recruited from other Government departments have been successful in securing permanent employment as TAFE lecturers. Where a vacancy has occurred this has been advertised in the internal staff notice and those officers who had only temporary employment were invited to apply. This has also been used as an incentive for country service and a number of vacancies have been advertised in country colleges for permanent appointment. However, the number of appointments made is dependent upon resignations and retirements coupled with a steady or growing demand.

Given that the majority of persons recruited from other Government departments are in either the metal fabrication or fitting and machining areas, the number of additional appointments or extensions in 1984 may be very small. Nonetheless, the Government is concerned for both the individuals and departments involved and will therefore take steps to reassess the situation from time to time in case the circumstances change.

LAND TITLE DEEDS

In reply to **Mr MEIER** (15 September).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have had the policy of the destruction of cancelled duplicate certificates of title investigated. The basis for this is contained in the Real Property Act, which provides for the destruction, with the approval of the Libraries Board, of public documents such as cancelled duplicate titles. The requirements of the Libraries Act also place severe restrictions on the sale, destruction or other disposal of public documents. Ownership of Torrens title land is evidenced by registration on both an original and duplicate certificate of title. The original title is preserved in the Lands Titles Registration Office and the duplicate certificate of title is for the use of the proprietor of the land represented by that title while he is registered. The owner of the land can deposit that title for a loan and thus create an equitable mortgage. Generally speaking the duplicate certificate of title is essential to secure the registration of dealings in land, the duplicate being produced with the documents lodged for registration. Mortgagees who are registered on a title insist on holding the duplicate certificate of title of mortgaged land as part of their security.

Emphasis is laid on the importance of the duplicate title in the registration system by the formal procedures laid down by the Real Property Act which provide for the issue of a substituted duplicate title in the event of such current duplicate being lost, mislaid or destroyed. The duplicate certificate of title is specified in the Real Property Act as being evidence of particulars therein set forth regarding a person's title to land. Thus there is an expectancy that a duplicate certificate of title is representative of ownership of the land therein described. It is for good reason, therefore, that the Real Property Act specifically provides that the Registrar-General shall retain every cancelled or partially cancelled certificate of title. There is an inherent danger in allowing duplicate certificates of title, though they be clearly cancelled, to be returned to an owner of land who is in receipt of a new duplicate certificate of title issued in lieu of the cancelled one. In the event the legislation as it stands at present, as pointed out, prevents the return of cancelled duplicate titles.

In 1960 the Registrar-General initiated steps which eventually led in 1964 to the current procedures for destruction of cancelled duplicate certificates of title. This involved close consultation with the Law Society of South Australia and the Associated Banks and also required the approval

of the Attorney-General and the Libraries Board of South Australia. The question of destruction of the cancelled duplicates was carefully considered at that time and was reaffirmed by the Libraries Board in May of this year. There would, therefore, appear to be no valid reason for reversing that decision to continue the destruction of what is, after all, a duplicate record which, for reasons expressed above, is inappropriate for return to the landowner, who receives a new duplicate title on cancellation of the previous one.

There is no question of destruction of the cancelled original certificates of title as these are preserved in the custody of the Registrar-General. Photocopies of such titles are available upon application to the Registrar-General and would, of course, disclose the historical features of the land ownership. Where, as in the present case, the grant of an easement to the Electricity Trust required the cancellation of the certificate of title for the land over which the easement was created, a new certificate of title is issued depicting the current situation.

STAMP DUTIES

In reply to the Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (31 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The last variation to stamp duties in respect of the annual licence provisions was enacted in Act No. 90 of 1974 when the general insurance rate was increased from \$5 per \$100 or part thereof of premiums paid, to \$6 per \$100 or part thereof. The life insurance rate was increased from \$1 per \$100 or part thereof of premiums paid, to \$1.50 per \$100 or part thereof. The increased licence fee operated from the 1975 licence.

The reference to 'receipts from stamp duty of South Australian insurance and assurance companies' and a rate of '1 cent for every \$10 or part of \$10 of the amount of the receipt' probably relates to receipts duty which was introduced at that rate in 1968 and applied to all receipts, not specifically those relating to insurance. Receipts duty was subsequently ruled by the High Court to be beyond the powers of the States and was discontinued from 30 September 1970.

STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report and accounts of the State Bank of South Australia, 1982-83.

Ordered that that report be printed.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) ACT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare) laid on the table the statement from the Registrar of Members' Interests.

Ordered that that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971—Regulations—Employer Deductions.
- ii. Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report of Auditor-General, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1968—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Dangerous Substances Act, 1979—Regulations—Fees.
- iii. Explosives Act, 1936—Regulations—Fees.
- Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972—Regulations—
- iv. Commercial Safety Code—Fees.
- v. Industrial Safety Code—Fees.
- vi. Construction Safety—Fees.
- vii. Lifts and Cranes Act, 1960—Regulations—Fees.
- viii. Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—

- i. Land Division at Barmera to Create a Refuse Reserve.
- ii. Erection of a Shelter Shed at Thorndon Park Primary School.
- iii. Land Division, Hundred of Louth.
- iv. Land Division by Engineering and Water Supply Department at Maitland.
- v. Division of Land, Cobdogla Irrigation Area.
- vi. Land Division, Hundred of Louth.
- vii. Land Division, Hundred of Louth.
- viii. Land Division at Hallett Cove.
- ix. Erection of a Shelter Tank at Seaview Downs.
- x. Opening of Borrow Pit, Hundred of Comaum.
- xi. Toilet for Disabled Persons at Tantanoola Caves Conservation Park.
- xii. South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1983.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Advances to Settlers Act, 1930-1972—Report and Balance Sheet, 1982-83.
- ii. Crown Lands Act, 1929—Regulations—Survey Fees.
- iii. Supply and Tender Board—Report, 1982-83.
- iv. Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—Fees.
- v. Valuation of Land Act, 1971—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act, 1973—Regulations—Fee for Log Book.
- ii. Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Boating Act, 1974—Regulations—Lake Bonney (South East).

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955-1975—Regulations—Registration Fees.
- ii. Country Fires Act, 1976—Regulations—Compensation for C.F.S. Volunteers.
- iii. Education, Director-General of—Report, 1982.
- Fisheries Act, 1971—Regulations—
- iv. Lobster Pot Fees.
- v. Prawn Licence Fees (Zone D).
- vi. Prawn Licence Fees (Zone E).
- Forestry Act, 1950—Proclamations—
- vii. Hundred of Riddoch—Portion of Mount Burr Forest Reserve Resumed.
- viii. Part of Myora Forest Reserve Resumed.
- ix. Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1983.
- x. Marketing of Eggs—Report of the Auditor-General on, Report 1982-83.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, October 1982-June 1983.
- ii. Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—Revocation of a Marine Dealer's Licence.
- iii. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Variation of Regulations—Various.
- iv. Health Act, 1935—Regulations—Private Hospitals, Nursing and Rest Homes.
- v. Lyell McEwin Community Health Service—General By-laws.

- vi. Marine Stores Act, 1898—Regulations—Dealer's Licence Fee.
- vii. Police Pensions Fund—Report, 1982-83.
- viii. Second-hand Dealers Act, 1919—Regulations—Licence Fees.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Gas Act, 1924—Regulations—Fees for Certificates of Competency Examination.
- ii. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report of Auditor-General on, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979—Regulations—Appearance Form (Amendment).
- ii. Justices Act, 1921—Rules—Summary Adjudications and Non-indictable Offences Fees.
- iii. Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—Regulations—Local Court Fees.
- iv. Supreme Court Act, 1935—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Housing (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Housing Trust—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. West Beach Trust—Report of Auditor-General, 1982-83.
- ii. South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1983.
- iii. South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1982-83.
- iv. City of Mitcham—By-law No. 5—Traffic.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SANTOS LIMITED

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In late July, Bridge Oil Limited purchased from Ansett Transport Industries that company's 14.86 per cent shareholding in Santos Limited. This transaction led to speculation that a breach of section 4 of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act, 1979, might exist. Section 4 of the Act reads:

No shareholder and no group of associated shareholders of the company is entitled to hold more than 15 per cent of the shares of the company.

The media speculation revolved around the position of Mr John Elliott, who is the Chief Executive of Elders IXL Limited and a Director of both the National Mutual Life Association and Bridge Oil Limited. In addition to the Bridge Oil interest in Santos already mentioned, National Mutual Life has a 13.07 per cent interest in Santos, and Elders IXL Limited holds a 20 per cent interest in Bridge Oil Limited.

Accordingly, on 28 July I referred the matter to the Attorney-General for an opinion on whether the apparent links between Bridge Oil, Elders IXL and National Mutual constituted a group of associated shareholders as defined in section 3 of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act. Since then the situation has been examined both by Crown Law officers and officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission. This investigation has revealed that there are no facts to substantiate a claim of association as set out in the Act, nor is there any information to substantiate a claim that the three companies mentioned are likely to act in concert with a view to taking control of Santos or otherwise against

the public interest. On the basis of this advice, the Government believes there is no need for further action on this matter.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DISCLOSURE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS' INTERESTS

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I wish to advise the House that the Attorney-General has made the following Ministerial statement in the Legislative Council today:

The Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983, came into effect in June 1983. It required all members of Parliament to submit a primary return to the appropriate Registrar by 30 September 1983. It is the clear intention of the Act that members of Parliament should disclose the interests of themselves and the members of their family in the primary return. In the second reading speech, when introducing the Bill in the Legislative Council, I said:

The Bill provides for a member to make a declaration in relation to the interests of himself, his spouse (and putative spouse) and children under 18 living at home.

The reason for having a register of interests is well known—the public is entitled to be assured that its elected representatives are discharging their public duties in a proper manner without regard to any private interests. A member could be actuated just as much by the private interests of the members of his family of which he is aware, as by his own interests, so the Act provides that the interests of the family should also be disclosed. If the interests of the family were not required to be disclosed, the artificial transfer of assets and income from the member to the family would provide an easy method for evading the registration requirements.

It was evident during debate on the Act earlier this year that there was cross-Party support for the principle of public disclosure of interests. It was the clear intention of the Parliament that legislation in the form put forward by the Government should be endorsed. The Bill passed the third reading in the Legislative Council with no division, and the division on the third reading in the House of Assembly resulted in only six votes against the Bill. At no stage were amendments moved to delete the fundamental requirements that disclosure should be both public, and by the member for himself and his family. In the Legislative Council the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. M.B. Cameron, stated (in relation to the disclosure of the interests of a member's family):

I have no hesitation in disclosing any interests that they may have . . .

The only reservation from the Hon. Mr Cameron was that, in disclosing the interests of a member's family, no distinction need be made in the return between the interests of a member and his family. The honourable member stated:

For that reason I believe that the indication by the Hon. K.T. Griffin that he has an amendment to ensure that a member can disclose the interests of his wife and family under his own name would get rid of that problem for me.

The Government accepted the validity of the privacy considerations in this Opposition suggestion and I moved an amendment in the Committee stages to give effect to it. I have reiterated these facts to emphasise to the Council that careful consideration was given to this question by the Parliament and that in the final analysis the overwhelming majority of members accepted it.

Although at the third reading in the House of Assembly six members voted against the Bill, the fact is that a member of Parliament is not free to flout the laws of this State simply because that member voted against a measure during the course of its passage through Parliament.

In view of the overwhelming Parliamentary acceptance of the Act and the repeated public demand for disclosure, it is hoped that all members will abide by the spirit of the Act. I have written to those members of this Parliament who have made public comments concerning the information which they have supplied, and which raise doubts as to whether they have complied with the legislation to fulfil the requirements of the Act. I have given them the opportunity to take such steps as they may be advised to ensure that their returns comply with the Act and the clearly expressed intention of the Parliament of this State before further investigation is instigated.

The Solicitor-General (Mr M.F. Gray, Q.C.) has advised me that the Act requires information to be given by the member

concerning the affairs of the member's family where that information is known to the member. As Attorney-General, I have a responsibility to ensure that the law is upheld and, if investigations become necessary and reveal that a breach of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983, has occurred, then prosecutions under the Act will have to be instituted. The Act provides a penalty not exceeding \$5 000 for failure to comply with the provisions of the Act. I have a responsibility to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that the intention of Parliament is complied with.

As far as the Government is concerned, it is absolutely firm in its resolve that the clearly expressed intention of the Parliament should not be avoided. This will extend if necessary to amending the legislation to place a direct obligation on a member's spouse to provide the information required by the Act. Clearly, this will not be necessary if all members comply by disclosing the interests of their family which are known to them. Obviously it is only those interests which are known to them which could influence their decision making. However, any suggestion that members are avoiding the Act by implying that their spouse will not inform them of their interests, when clearly at least some of those interests would be known to the member, will be met if necessary by placing a direct obligation of disclosure on a member's spouse. It would be unfortunate if this were found to be necessary because of the failure of a small number of members to comply with the Act. I trust that those members will reconsider their position and ensure compliance with the Act.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I wish to make a statement to the House about the quality of water being received by many residents in various areas of metropolitan Adelaide. Recently, there have been a fair number of complaints about discoloured water being supplied to householders. I am sure that members from both sides of the House would also have received some inquiries on this subject from their constituents. Generally, this discolouration of water happens at about this time every year. The reason is that, as soon as the warm weather begins, water consumption increases. More water is used by home-owners for their lawns, by sporting organisations for their playing fields, and State and local government organisations for their parks and gardens. This sudden increase in water demand stirs up the sediment that has settled in storage tanks and water mains. In other words, the discolouration of water is a between-seasons event that occurs on a regular basis. Sometimes it is also caused by flow reversals in the pipeline network, and at other times when a different source of water is used.

To rectify the situation, the Engineering and Water Supply Department adopts a process of flushing water mains so that the dislodged sediment can be allowed to escape through fire plugs. Occasionally, the mains are swabbed with what is known as a 'plastic pig'. This is drawn through the main to release the sediment build-up which, once again, can be flushed out through fire plugs. Every time a water main is about to be flushed or a new source of supply introduced, the Department places advertisements in the print media informing those residents likely to be affected. An assurance is also given that any inconvenience would be minimised.

The flushing of mains is an ongoing programme, simply because there are thousands of kilometres that need to be cleaned. The Department attends first to those mains in areas of greatest need, and has to set priorities because of limitations in the recurrent budget. Nevertheless, South Australians must realise that discoloured water will be a regular occurrence because of the sudden increase in seasonal demand. This situation applies not only to those areas of metropolitan Adelaide where the water is not filtered but to all major South Australian towns with reticulated water

supplies. This is especially the case in our Northern towns which are receiving highly turbid water direct from the Murray River through the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. The long-term solution to this problem is filtration.

Already there are three filtration plants in operation—Hope Valley, Anstey Hill and Barossa, which serve the northern, north-eastern and south-eastern suburbs down to the foothills in Burnside. The Little Para water filtration plant will be completed next financial year, while work is progressing well on the \$60 million Happy Valley plant, which will serve 40 per cent of metropolitan Adelaide when it is completed in 1989. Last week I announced a \$5.8 million contract for work on the Morgan plant which will serve Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Mid-North towns after it is commissioned at the end of 1986. The Stockwell plant, which is in the concept design stage, is planned to provide filtered water to the Barossa Valley area and Yorke Peninsula.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move: That Question Time be extended until 3.27 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier table the heads of agreement which he has signed for the proposed Adelaide railway station redevelopment, and will he give the House an assurance that an indenture will be submitted to this House to ratify the agreement? Let me say that I welcome the Premier's announcement of an agreement on this project which, of course, is based on plans originally set down by the former Government, and principally the member for Torrens, as the Minister of Transport. The Premier was quoted in the *News* on 4 October as saying that the project could involve a State subsidy of \$1 million a year in its early stages. As public property is involved in this project and taxpayers' funds may be needed to subsidise it, will the Premier table the heads of agreement so that Parliament can further consider the funding arrangements at an early date?

The former Government was proceeding with the project on the basis that an indenture eventually would be submitted to Parliament to ratify the final agreement of the development consortium. The Pak-Poy Report addresses this matter and specifies various heads of agreement which the consortium believes should be covered by an indenture, including the period of lease of the site and leasing and subleasing of various components of the project. There are also precedents for indenture legislation to ratify agreements between the Government of the day and major commercial developers, such as Roxby Downs, Stony Point, Cooper Basin, West Lakes and Port Stanvac projects, to mention but a few.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will consider tabling the heads of agreement document. I would have to speak to the parties involved. There are, of course, as in any of these agreements, commercial considerations relating to agreements as between the investors and the joint parties which it may not be desirable and, indeed, proper commercial practice to release. It may be that an indenture will be necessary. The Government has undertaken to take all necessary steps to enable the project to go ahead, and an indenture may be the appropriate way to do that. At this stage, however, we are not in a position to decide whether that will be so. It is worth bearing in mind that the land in question is owned by and is under the control of the State

Transport Authority. It is a different situation, for instance, from the Hilton Hotel arrangement, where the land was owned in different parcels and a number of other considerations were involved (rate remissions, and so on) which were covered by indenture agreement. If it proves necessary, certainly we will proceed with an indenture.

It is appropriate that Parliament be informed of the Government's commitment and what the Government is doing in relation to the project and, of course, any financial subventions that will have to be made to the project will have to be approved by Parliament as well, in terms of budgetary considerations, etc. The amount referred to is the possible estimated cost of maintaining the convention centre. As members will know, the Festival Centre Trust—the Festival Theatre—involves us in an allocation of moneys from our general revenue resources year by year. It was always anticipated that that would be so, and that will probably continue despite the commercial and entrepreneurial activities carried out by the Trust. It is a public facility and requires public subsidy. It may be, and some scenarios suggest it will be, necessary for a similar grant or assistance to be made in the case of a convention centre, perhaps in the initial stages, but again that will depend a lot on the success of the overall venture. If such is required, obviously Parliament will be apprised of it.

In relation to the project itself, I would certainly congratulate the previous Government on the initiatives it took in attempting to progress the project and the previous Minister of Transport for the work he did on it, bearing in mind that this project has been in contemplation from about 1973 or 1974 and detailed work has been done over a period of time. When the question of the Hilton Hotel project was under negotiation and development, clearly a project such as this could not be got under way. At one stage, things were not looking hopeful for this project, and it is pleasing indeed that we have been able to find an investor and joint developer to ensure that something happens. Equally, I might add, I was a little surprised as State Treasurer to find some of the concessions being offered by the previous Government. I can assure the House that the extent of exposure by the State Government and State Treasury with the arrangements we have made on this occasion does not go to anywhere like the same extent as the exposure that the previous Government had agreed. That is worth bearing in mind.

WATER QUALITY

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Water Resources any information on the salinity levels of bore water in the Adelaide metropolitan area? Several months ago the Minister issued a caution to consumers who were thinking of sinking bores in the metropolitan area. One of the cautions was that the water quality might be poor and highly saline. Can the Minister now provide any specific details on the salinity levels of underground water in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member is quite right: I did issue a caution to consumers who were considering sinking bores in metropolitan Adelaide. Since that time, the State Water Laboratories of my Department have provided an analytical service (although it has been available for the public for some time, we have accelerated it) for the testing of bores in the metropolitan area. That particular testing includes bores and rainwater tanks, provided the information required is for domestic purposes. Between January and early September of this year 40 samples were submitted to the laboratories for analysis.

Salinity results varied from 580 mg/l for a bore in Peterhead to one of 5 700 mg/l in Newton. I have a complete

list of the results of the 40 bore samples analysed and, as it is of a purely statistical nature, I seek leave to have the table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

METROPOLITAN AREA PRIVATE BORES—SUBMITTED FOR ANALYSIS JANUARY-SEPTEMBER 1983

Location	Date	mg/l
Plympton	10.1.83	1 900
Ethelton	13.1.83	1 700
Glenalta	13.1.83	650
Semaphore Park	17.1.83	1 200
Blackwood	17.1.83	1 400
Beverley	24.1.83	2 600
Newton	26.1.83	5 700
Salisbury	27.1.83	1 100
Croydon	27.1.83	2 700
Norwood	28.1.83	810
Somerton Park	7.2.83	670
Findon	10.2.83	3 800
Dover Gardens	14.2.83	1 900
Seaton	14.2.83	4 100
Dover Gardens	17.2.83	920
Athelstone	23.2.83	850
Underdale	1.3.83	1 200
Glenalta	8.3.83	1 200
Semaphore	21.3.83	900
Payneham South	24.3.83	1 800
Taperoo	7.4.83	1 600
Birkenhead	13.4.83	5 300
Peterhead	13.4.83	580
Edwardstown	14.4.83	1 500
Cumberland	14.4.83	1 600
North Haven	5.5.83	1 400
Torrensville	26.5.83	2 200
Croydon	27.5.83	2 900
Glandore	31.5.83	2 300
Kidman Park	16.6.83	2 400
Queenstown	21.6.83	1 500
Croydon Park	27.6.83	2 900
Torrensville	29.6.83	2 400
Cumberland Park	13.7.83	1 000
Mansfield Park	26.7.83	5 500
Prospect	15.8.83	3 000
Marden	18.8.83	3 300
Kilkenny	25.8.83	2 000
Kilkenny	25.8.83	2 600
Prospect	6.9.83	2 800

The Hon. J. W. SLATER: The results obtained generally indicate water quality consistent with other data on groundwater in the metropolitan area, although details of the bores analysed are not available. In future property owners will be asked to provide more information on their particular bore when submitting samples for analysis. In the 40 samples listed in the table, I understand that most of the water was drawn from shallow aquifers, although it is not known whether the samples were from newly drilled or existing bores. In view of the large variations in salinity levels of bore water and also the variations in depth at which water may be found and the cost involved, I repeat my earlier warning that consumers in the metropolitan area should approach the matter of sinking bores for domestic purposes with some caution.

CASINO

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I address my question to the Premier. In its submission to the Casino Supervising Authority, does the Government intend to advocate that the casino should be included as part of the proposed redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station and, if it does not, what will the Government's submission advocate? During the Estimates Committee debate, the Premier indicated that his Government intended to make a submission to the Authority. In a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 10 October, Mr Pat Pak-Poy, who heads the company which was given approval by the former Government to develop

a proposal for the railway station site and to seek the necessary finance, said the casino should be located in the great marble hall at the railway station. As the deadline for submission to the Authority expires on 28 October (in 10 days), I seek an indication from the Premier of the Government's intentions.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government has not finally determined the nature of its submission to the Authority. Work is being done on that at departmental level, and I am awaiting a formal presentation of recommendations so that Cabinet can discuss them and the Government make a decision. It is open to any group in the community that believes it has a good case to make that case before the Authority, and Mr Pak-Poy, in making his statement, is joining other groups that have made public their intention to seek a licence. Further, regarding the location of the casino, the agreement between Mr Pak-Poy, Kumagai Gumi and the Government does not involve the establishment of a casino. In other words, there is no guarantee that that group will receive the casino licence, although it will definitely be bidding for such a licence. The Government's position will be determined, it is hoped, within the next week or so.

RAPE LETTER

Mrs APPLEBY: Has the Premier, since his return to Adelaide, been made aware of the controversy surrounding a letter sent by the Chairperson of the Rape Services Liaison Committee to the Attorney-General which raised certain issues resulting from a recent highly controversial and publicised rape case and, if he has, can he say whether this matter has now been resolved?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly do not wish to canvass any matters involved in any legal case, but on my return the Attorney-General supplied me with correspondence that was originally sent to me as Premier from the Chief Justice while I was away, and his reply to that. As the matter involves the question of relations between the Executive and the Judiciary, I thank the honourable member for her question. I understand that a letter was sent to the Chief Justice over the signature of the Women's Adviser to the Premier in her capacity as Chairperson of the Rape Services Liaison Committee.

This committee, which has been established for many years, was formed at a time when various referral centres and other establishments were being put into hospitals, and it involves representatives of medical, counselling, social work, women's issues, legal and police fields. It is not an executive body, but it is able to make recommendations to Government. The original letter to the Chief Justice was sent under the letterhead of the Women's Adviser to the Premier. The Chief Justice responded to it by writing to me as Premier and expressing his concern at not only the content of the letter but the fact that such a communication should be sent to the Judiciary. The reply given to him (and I understand that this correspondence also has been made public) by my colleague the Attorney-General, who was Acting Premier at that stage, made it quite clear that the Rape Services Liaison Committee was an advisory body and did not speak on behalf of the Government or of departments within the Government. In fact, the reply went on to say:

The correspondence forwarded to you conveyed the views of the committee on a matter of concern to it and did not represent the views of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet or of the Government. I am able to assure you that the Premier was not aware of the correspondence.

So, in part, the problem arose from the way in which the communication took place, and the letter from the Attorney-

General, as Acting Premier at the time, sets out the situation very precisely. I have since been advised that the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has given to the Chief Justice a full explanation and has formally communicated to him the administrative way in which this occurred, and the Chief Justice has now written to the Director stating that he regards the matter as being satisfactorily resolved concerning the Government, the Department and the court. I think it is important to put firmly on the record that, in relation to the Judiciary and its operations and the Government as the executive arm of the community, one must be careful that the Government is not attempting to influence or direct the Judiciary in any way. That was certainly not involved, in this case, and that has been fully explained to the Chief Justice.

CONTAINER SHIPPING SERVICES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: During his recent visit to Japan, what discussions did the Premier have with Japanese representatives of the Australia North/South Shipping Conference, and in particular with Mr Shibyama, concerning direct container shipping services between Japan/Korea and the Port of Adelaide, and what were the results of those discussions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I did have discussions with members of the North/South-bound Shipping Conference. Members will recall that towards the end of 1982 an agreement was on the point of being reached with that Conference to establish a direct shipping service to the Port of Adelaide. A short time after the change of Government my colleague the Minister of Marine went to Japan to finalise that agreement which had been set in train and negotiated by his predecessor, the member for Torrens. In the negotiations on that occasion the conference said that it was reconsidering the matter, that the economic recession and the fact that one or two ships had to be laid up meant that it could not commence the service as planned; however, further negotiations and discussions would take place.

In the event, the conference has advised that it was not willing to discuss or negotiate the matter again until the middle of 1984. That, of course, is a matter which has caused some concern on the part of the Government. It has been taken up by my colleague directly with the conference, and by myself as Premier. I took advantage of the visit to Japan to meet directly with the conference members. At this stage their views have not changed. They stressed again that the general level of shipping in the current recession was not such in their view as to justify the implementation of the service, but they appreciated the fact that, particularly with rural recovery and general recovery in the U.S. economy, traffic could be available in the not too distant future.

At the same time, of course, shipping is continuing through the port of Melbourne and we are aware of certain special conditions which were offered by that port to try to maintain the shipping that it had. It is not the view of this Government that we should get involved with an auction with the port of Melbourne, an auction that in the end we all lose out on, because the overall benefit of that would simply be for the North Bound Shipping Conference and not to the ports or communities that it services. Certainly, that would not be in the long-term interests of South Australia.

However, my colleague is examining the particular terms and conditions of such a service, and I was able to get agreement from the conference members that discussions would resume early in the new year. They would not wait until the end of June, as originally proposed, and those discussions can commence with a view to getting that service instituted as from the end of June. A full report is being

prepared on that meeting and on the conclusions, which the Minister of Marine will study. He will be taking up further negotiations.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr KLUNDER: Has the Premier seen statements in the press by the Chamber of Commerce on prospects for the South Australian economy, and would he like to comment on the economic outlook for this State?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think we have all been made aware recently of the change of statements concerning the outcome of the latest survey of industry in South Australia. I think we all should welcome the renewed optimism that is evident in the business community about future levels of consumer demand, employment and capital investment. However, I do not think we should follow the practice of the previous Liberal Government in attempting to beat up every bit of good news and suggest that we are onward and upward and have turned the corner or, I think in the immortal words of my predecessor, 'there is unmistakable proof that our policies are working.'

It is certainly a cause for pleasure to see this confidence returning. There do seem to be some very strong underlying trends in the economy, on which I hope we will be able to capitalise. The employment estimates released late last week by the A.B.S. showed that, after allowing for seasonal factors, the rise in employment, that is the number of people in jobs, in South Australia during September was 4 700. That is a very encouraging increase. It was the second month in a row that we experienced a strong rise in employment.

Also, in seasonally adjusted terms, unemployment in South Australia fell by .1 percentage points to 10.4 per cent during September. That level remains far too high but the situation is showing some slight improvement. But here I would like to sound a note of caution. We cannot confidently expect a major reduction in the levels of unemployment over the next few months no matter what happens on the employment side. While it is a source of considerable gratification that the number of persons employed, that is, the number of jobs, is expanding in our economy (and I hope and am confident that they will continue to do so) at the same time that is having the effect of bringing back to the labour market persons who had dropped out of it, the so-called hidden unemployed, people who were not participating. In fact, the national figures show that during the last month the participation rate rose quite sharply. That means that despite the increases in employment, unemployment remained high, because rather than mopping up the unemployment, that is having a real impact on it, more were being attracted to re-entering the labour market to register themselves for work.

This, of course, shows up in the figures. So, in examining the figures, we should recognise that fact, that we do have a major and continuing problem with unemployment which we have to tackle, and tackle very hard indeed. Certainly, in another area of the economy—and this is obviously one of the keys to recovery—the latest A.B.S. estimates reveal a strong approvals rate for new dwellings in South Australia: the sixth consecutive month of good approvals, and although the figures lag some time behind, the translation of those approvals into commencement is continuing at quite a high rate. In fact, in South Australia's case, it is above the national average. In relation to the approvals, the total is almost 65 per cent above August 1982, and in the three months to August 1983 it was about 46 per cent above the corresponding total a year earlier. That is without the impact of the latest budgetary provisions, both State and Federal, which only now are beginning to flow into the system. In

other words, that strengthening was very much related to a number of the measures set in train by this Government (by my colleague the Minister of Housing) in the last financial year.

A highlight of the August 1983 approval results is the very strong private sector component. The seasonally adjusted private approvals totalled 765 units, which is the best monthly result for six years. So, those signs are very encouraging indeed, but let me again say that we are not yet out of our recession. However encouraging the signs, we must not let a false confidence seep into our economy. We must ensure that we maintain a steady development and growth, and that we do not get into the problems which created, I believe, a distinct loss of business confidence under the previous Government of suggesting that, because a few of the indicators are good in particular months, everything has turned out for the best and that we can dispel all thoughts of recession. We are still faced with major problems in sectors of our economy, and we must work to try and do something about them over the ensuing months.

COBDOGLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government will reconsider its decision not to allow the Cobdogla Primary School Council to proceed with the upgrading of that school in favour of the Public Buildings Department, and does this represent Government policy? I am in receipt of a letter from the Chairman of the Cobdogla Primary School Council and, following receipt of that letter, I contacted the Minister's office on two occasions last week in an endeavour to discuss this matter with him. I think that he is aware of the problem to which I refer. I will read the letter for the benefit of the House. It states:

Following my conversation with you I now write to express my concern about the delay in commencing work on the upgrading of the Cobdogla Primary School, of which Council I am the Chairman, and the provision of urgently needed additional accommodation. The badly needed upgrade of the school has been on the Region's priority list now for three years. Plans for the development of the project have been available for three years and were updated this year so that work could commence immediately funds became available. The money to commence and complete the project became available as from the beginning of the new financial year.

It was the original intention of the school council to become the main contractor for the project. The school council has the necessary expertise within its membership. Had this been allowed, then by now the project would have been completed. However, the Operational Services Branch of the P.B.D. opted to take up the opportunity to do the work. This was on the understanding that work would commence at the beginning of October. It was for this reason that the cyclical painting of the school was deferred.

Not only has work not commenced at this date, but the principal has informed me that as yet the P.B.D. have not priced the project. The whole episode is most annoying and of great inconvenience, particularly in view of the fact that the P.B.D. opted to do the work and in fact take the project out of the hands of the School Council. I therefore seek your urgent assistance in trying to establish an immediate commencement date for this project. In fact if the responsibility for the project were to be handed back to the School Council, we feel that not only would the upgrade be completed more quickly, but that we would also be more cost efficient.

As I mentioned earlier in my letter, the school is also urgently in need of additional accommodation. At the present time the administration area is used as a classroom. The bookroom is used as an administration area and the art room as a staff room.

A room has been available and has been allocated to this school from the Loxton North School. This room has been free to be relocated since the completion of that school (about May).

The enrolment of the school is at present 84, is estimated that this will be 94 next year. This virtually means that the enrolment has doubled in four years.

It is quite clear that the school council is prepared to undertake this work and I believe that the figure which the school

council put forward to upgrade was some \$25 000. The original estimate of the Public Buildings Department was some \$37 000 to do this work, and the Operational Services Branch currently estimates something like \$55 000. I am reliably informed that the present all-up cost of the P.B.D. to undertake this work is about \$68 500 in total, and that is out of a total minor works programme for the Riverland region of only \$143 000. Therefore, I ask the Minister, does the action of not allowing the school council to proceed with this work at a price in the vicinity of \$25 000 in favour of the Public Buildings Department at \$68 500 represent Government policy, and will the Government reconsider its decision?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wish to make a few comments. The first is that the honourable member is correct: the Cobdogla project has been around for a few years, and I think that people may be interested to know exactly how it came to be on the 1983-84 project list. The situation is that its needs have been identified previously and it was given some degree of priority in 1981-82 and 1982-83. Interestingly enough, in 1982-83 it had a very high priority on the list of work to be done, but, because the funds were so insufficient for any work to be done on minor works in that region, there was \$7 000 left in the region for new minor works projects. All the other money was committed to undertaking building projects that were still on the previous year's programme (1981-82). Therefore, even though it was given high priority in 1982-83, insufficient funds were provided by the Government of the day to even countenance its provision and, as a result, it was then held over to the 1983-84 financial year.

As has already been identified implicitly by the honourable member, it has priority in that period and indeed funds were available in that period, so the work will be completed in 1983-84. This year we do not have the situation whereby projects that have been in a previous year's allocation end up eating up most of the following year's allocation: that will not be happening in the 1983-84 financial year. I put to honourable members that that is a significant improvement on last year's situation.

With regard to the redevelopment project which has been put, it is Government policy that in fact all such projects be offered to the Operational Services Branch to determine whether or not it feels that it can satisfactorily perform the work for that particular project. In the case of the Cobdogla minor works redevelopment, that was done and the Operational Services Branch felt that it was able to undertake that work quite satisfactorily. In fact, it proposed to have the internal work completed at the school by February 1984 and the external work will take perhaps some time longer than that.

The suggestion has been made by the honourable member that there is perhaps a wide disparity in the cost figures between the Operational Services Branch and what the school community could do it for. I certainly will want to pursue this matter further because I am aware that the honourable member contacted my office last week and I received advice only today on this matter. I will pursue further the matter as to the apparent disparity in price.

I make the point that the school, in offering the figure that is suggested, has not done so on the current documentation. It may well be that that is an explanation for the wide variation in the figures. I also indicate that, if variation is ultimately made in how the work is to be done, there will be considerable doubt that the work will be ready by February 1984. The other point that needs to be mentioned is that I understand that the school council indicated it could have the work completed by October. I think that is what the honourable member said.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thought the member was saying that the school council claims it could finish the work by October. I stand corrected on that point. The other point that should be made about the extra classroom is that the Public Buildings Department was advised that an extra classroom was needed in September of this year. Everything possible is being done to make sure that the classroom arrives there as soon as possible and it will be available for the beginning of the next school year. It is expected to be ready by January 1984.

One of the problems we have with the movement of classrooms involves the concurrence of local government and certain other transport arrangements that have to be made, and the member for Torrens, as a former Minister of Transport, will be aware of the difficulties that have to be overcome in that regard. Everything is being done to ensure that the classroom is delivered by the time it is required. Since the request was received only in September it has not been possible to speed that up any further. I will have further discussions with the Department on the apparent price disparity between the two figures and, if there is something that should be followed up, I will be happy to advise the member further. I do repeat the points I have made already in this regard; it is the intention of the operational services to complete the internal work by February 1984.

BUILDING DEMOLITION

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning urgently investigate the possibility of introducing an amendment to the Planning and Development Act to provide for consent decisions by local authorities regarding the demolition of all buildings? An article on page 3 of the *Community Courier* of 12 October under the headline, 'Residents in bid to save old house at Hyde Park', states:

Hyde Park residents fear the character of their suburb may be destroyed through the 'indiscriminate demolition' of old houses.

Also in the article a residents spokesperson, Mr Williamson, is reported as having stated:

... residents feared that the destruction of one old house could be the thin edge of the wedge in the destruction of Hyde Park's heritage.

Mr Williamson said that the Walford Girls Grammar School is involved in the demolition of an old house to provide a car park for the extension of the school. The article also states:

Walford Girls Grammar School Principal, Miss Helen Reid, claims the school is doing local residents a favour by bulldozing the Fashoda Street home. 'I thought they (the residents) would be quite pleased,' she said. Miss Reid said a car park would look better there. 'We are doing them a service by knocking it (Fashoda Street home) down,' she said.

When questioned, the council planning officer is quoted in the *Courier* as saying that councils are powerless to stop the demolition and have no power to prevent historic homes from being destroyed. He said the council was obliged, under the Building Act, to grant developers approval to knock down homes in the area. Mr Sarin, the planning officer, said that Walford school could demolish the home in Fashoda Street and three homes in Woodlyn Avenue without council approval. The report in the *Courier* continues:

He said, however, it could not go ahead with car park plans or any development plans without council approval. He said council could only determine land use. Council would have to have strong grounds not to let bulldozing of any historic home in Unley go ahead. Only if a home was named on the Heritage List, or became a part of the National Trust, could it escape demolition.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First, I am not in a position to comment on the heritage significance of the building or

buildings to which the honourable member was referring because I know no more than he has just reported to the House. In relation to the basic proposition which he places before us, I guess it depends really on whether he is suggesting that this power be something which we would require as a Parliament should be exercised by a local government (that is, it should be mandatory), or whether it should be a power which resides in the Act and which they can elect to operate or they can petition the Minister to allow them to operate.

I think there is probably an argument. I will check the legislation, but if the honourable member is referring to the latter then in fact the power is already there. Certainly, in the City of Adelaide Development Act there is a power akin to this which is operated by the City of Adelaide, and it may well be that, though the regulations may not be in place, it would not be necessary to get an amendment from this place in order for a council to be able to operate in a way the honourable member sees as desirable. As to the desirability of it, that is a matter on which I think I should consult with my colleagues in Government and bring down a report for the honourable member and the House.

m.v. TROUBRIDGE

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport confirm that the State-owned m.v. *Troubridge* has been released from Port Melbourne today, and, if not, can he indicate when it will be released from those port facilities? For five days the m.v. *Troubridge* has been the victim of a strike in Port Melbourne by the pilots and tugboat seamen who are refusing to take that ship from the slipway and allow her to return to service Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln in South Australia. Last Friday she was due to depart Melbourne and return to Kangaroo Island to resume the pick-up services from that area. I indicate the importance to the Kangaroo Island community of that rescheduled trip, as we are already into the tourist season and we are right in the middle of the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is really outlining a second reading debate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: There is an enormous amount of wool on Kangaroo Island, because it is the middle of the shearing season.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member is not flouting the ruling I have just given.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: On Friday we received a message from Mr Abraham, of the Minister's Department, indicating that he thought she would be back plying between the ports in South Australia at least by Sunday. On Saturday we received a message that she was still involved in a dispute in Melbourne. By Sunday food was running out and hopes were dashed—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: The tide went out on you, Ted!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister of Water Resources to order.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question and inform him that, prior to coming to Parliament House today, I received advice from my officers that the m.v. *Troubridge* would be freed this afternoon from the dispute in which she was involved in Melbourne. The *Troubridge* was taken to Melbourne for the normal dry-docking service and unfortunately became involved in the dock dispute that existed in the Port of Melbourne. Yesterday afternoon I took the opportunity of contacting the Secretary of the Seamen's Union to see whether he was prepared to talk to his counterparts in the branch in Victoria to see whether we could get special dispensation for the release of

the *Troubridge*. He advised me that he had made his members aware of the difficulties and the costs involved in operating the *Troubridge* from Port Adelaide to Kingscote, but indicated to me that his members had taken a stand on the matter and he would not be successful in having her freed. Just before coming to the House today, I was told that the *Troubridge* would be freed this afternoon. In fact, the Highways Department has flown several seamen from Port Adelaide over there to bring the vessel home.

ENERGY LABELLING

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a progress report on the proposed national energy labelling scheme for domestic appliances, to which he has previously referred? It is clear that energy conservation is becoming an increasingly important means by which consumers can offset the rising real cost of power. The energy labelling scheme promises for the first time to give consumers really reliable information about the energy consumption characteristics of appliances before they buy, and for this reason it deserves strong support.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for his question and his support for the importance of energy conservation as a means of coping with the rising costs of energy. The energy labelling scheme is an excellent example of that philosophy. The Commonwealth and State Governments are on schedule in the plan to introduce energy labels on refrigerators and freezers in 1984. The labelling scheme, which is to be voluntary initially, was agreed to at the June meeting of the Australian Minerals and Energy Council in Brisbane. The benefit of energy labels is that they provide the consumer with a guide as to how much electricity the refrigerator or freezer will use, and therefore what it will cost to operate. The consumer then is easily able to determine which units have a lower operating cost and can consider both operating cost and initial capital cost in selecting which unit to purchase.

Studies carried out for AMEC have shown that the selection of a refrigerator with the lowest electricity consumption, rather than the average, could save the buyer \$280 over the lifetime of the unit. The studies also suggest that labelling will encourage appliance manufacturers to produce more energy-efficient units. Although the labelling scheme originally will be confined to refrigerators and freezers, there are plans to extend the programme to such other appliances as water heaters, air-conditioners, space heaters and dish-washers. It should be noted that the energy labelling programme is an integral part of the national energy conservation programme and has the potential to achieve significant national fuel savings. The South Australian Government is contributing \$22 000 towards the implementation of the programme this financial year, with pro rata contributions from the other States and a major contribution from the Commonwealth Government. Consumers interested in learning more about the energy labelling scheme and how it will help achieve fuel and dollar savings should contact the Government's Energy Information Centre, at 175 North Terrace, where a series of consolidated papers on energy labelling is available.

SCHOOL MAINTENANCE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Has the Minister of Public Works yet examined the figures discussed during the Estimates Committees on funds available during 1983-84 for maintenance of schools and other Government buildings,

and can he now explain why the Government decided to reduce funds for maintenance by 17 per cent in real terms? During the Estimates Committees debate it has been revealed that real funds for maintenance are reduced by 17 per cent in the 1983-84 Budget, compared to last year. An examination of school buildings reveals an urgent need for maintenance work. A recent letter from the Glengowrie High School Council to the Minister of Education highlights the problem caused by the lack of funds. That letter, signed by R. Dally (Hon. Secretary, Glengowrie High School Council), states:

Dear Sir,

The members of council have during recent months been discussing the current and projected level of funding available from the Government for general maintenance of school property and replacement of furniture.

Whilst there is no immediate problem, apart from minor matters which need to be addressed at Glengowrie High School, we are aware that other schools are facing major problems, and we are writing on a matter of principle. The minor matters at our school include leaking taps and damaged (fair wear and tear) floor coverings, etc., but are not being repaired by P.B.D. due to 'lack of funds'.

We are concerned that if a leaking tap is left for some months, what will happen when more major work is required such as repainting, wear and tear damage to walls, roofing, etc., or if paving needs repair. Due also to the lack of funds we only just have enough desks and chairs for the students let alone replacing staff room furniture or the typists chair used by the Principal because he will not permit scarce funds to be used to replace it with a decent office chair.

The council is aware that the State is facing a financial crisis but are also concerned that the old proverb 'a stitch in time saves nine' is being ignored and this move will cost the State dearly in the future, not to mention the potential for accidents caused by lack of preventive maintenance.

We therefore urge you to use your best endeavours to obtain more meaningful budget amounts for school maintenance to ensure that all State schools retain their pleasant environment as areas in which to work and study.

That letter was written on 15 August, before the introduction of the Budget, yet maintenance funds in respect of schools and other Government buildings have been reduced in the recent Budget by 17 per cent in real terms.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: True, the honourable member raised his figures in the recent Estimates Committees debate. I am having those figures examined to see whether or not they stand up to the assertions made by the honourable member. Personally, neither I nor my officers think that they do. My officers could not come to terms with them either on the evening of the Estimates Committees debate or at any time since then. I commend the honourable member for wanting more maintenance work done in schools. Since returning to office, I have noted the neglect that occurred during his term as Minister of Public Works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In fact, the member is reputed to have been the worst Minister of Public Works in the history of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That kind of statement simply provokes disorder. If the honourable Deputy Premier wishes to continue in that vein, let him face the consequences that he will face. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In deference to you, Mr Speaker, I point out that Speakers in the past have allowed Ministers to answer questions in the way they desire.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will resume his seat. There was no suggestion on my part, nor has there ever been, that any Minister could not answer questions in the way he saw fit. My point was that, by answering a question in a certain way—

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: How about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the honourable member for Torrens or of any other member, for that matter. Provocation is caused and disorderly scenes erupt, as a result of which everyone becomes unhappy. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The last thing I would want to be would be provocative, especially to the member for Davenport. He and I have been provocative to one another for the past 10 years, so I do not see what has changed very much. More seriously, neither I nor my officers have been able to come to terms with the figures quoted by the honourable member during the Committee debate, and I am having those figures analysed. Without being provocative, I point out that information given by the member for Davenport has never been considered accurate in this place, so one takes what he says with a fair amount of salt. In those circumstances, I am having the matter examined very seriously. The reports that I have been receiving since I have been back in office indicate that the honourable member has nothing to be proud of regarding the maintenance undertaken during his term as Minister.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy have discussions with the Electricity Trust about the electricity tariffs that currently apply to permanent occupiers of caravans in South Australian caravan parks? Recently I was approached by residents of a large caravan park in my electorate who are concerned that they are paying more for electricity than ordinary domestic consumers are paying. As members of the House would be well aware, a growing number of Australians live in caravans because they cannot obtain or cannot afford rental housing or home purchase, or because they simply choose to live in a caravan park. It seems unreasonable that long-term caravan dwellers cannot obtain electricity at the same price as ordinary domestic consumers.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I congratulate the honourable member on the question that she has raised with me, because on the face of it there does seem to be what one might describe as an anomaly in that people who make their homes in caravans on a permanent type of basis are somewhat disadvantaged in respect of the price they may pay for electricity compared to that paid by residents who may live in houses nearby. I understand that the tariff that currently applies is described in the Electricity Trust tariff schedule as a general purpose tariff.

As the honourable member was kind enough to tell me a day or two ago that she wanted to pursue this matter with me, I have done at least some elementary calculations which show that the facts that she has put forward tend to support an increase in the domestic tariff based on a consumption of 1 500 kilowatt hours for a quarter, involving payment of \$107.63. Power is supplied to the type of caravan park outlined by the honourable member on the general purpose tariff and under what might be termed bulk conditions. Assuming that a caravan park is occupied by 100 caravans, as might well be the case in a larger caravan park, and allowing the same average consumption per quarter, an individual caravan owner could be paying \$122.73. At least on that calculation it would appear that the occupiers of caravans in the circumstances described by the honourable member are paying more. I undertake to discuss this matter with the Electricity Trust. There may be other reasons why this kind of tariff applies.

I understand that this matter has caused problems in the Northern Territory, where the cost of housing is high and the availability of housing is somewhat limited. In the

Northern Territory there is considerable use of caravans for living quarters. In an endeavour to resolve the electricity tariff problem, I understand that the Northern Territory Electricity Commission undertook to provide individual Commission meters for each caravan user, provided that the proprietor of a caravan park was prepared to accept responsibility for the meters. However, I understand that only one caravan park proprietor in the Northern Territory was prepared to accept such responsibility. As I said, I will have discussions with the Trust about this apparent anomaly in tariffs.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether it is the Government's intention to delegate development control once again to the district councils whose areas fall within the boundary of the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed? If so, when, and, if not, why not? Following representations from councils within the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed area, I made the decision as Minister, and advised those councils accordingly, that such delegation would be provided to them to enable them to consider applications, including those in relation to motels, residential flats, and caravan parks. A recent decision from the Planning Appeal Tribunal resulted in the delegated powers being declared invalid. This means that such applications from those within that watershed area must now be determined by the Planning Commission. Most of the councils involved employ fully qualified planning staff and have developed policies and principles that are now contained in their development plans. The whole thrust of the new Planning Act was to give more responsibility to councils to enable them to make decisions.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: While this matter is being resolved it is my intention that the delegation should not proceed outside the boundaries of the specific townships in the areas to which the honourable member has referred. However, the matter has not been completely resolved, and I will keep the honourable member and the House informed.

At 3.25 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Licensing Act, 1967, by imposing a moratorium on the further grant of late night permits pursuant to section 66b of the Act. That section allows holders of full publican's, limited publican's (that is, motel), and restaurant licences to apply to the Licensing Court for a late night permit to authorise the sale of liquor between 9 p.m. and 3 o'clock the following morning (except on Sunday nights to Monday mornings, Good Friday and Christmas Day) without necessarily providing a meal to the patron. If no late night permit is in force, motel and restaurant licensees can only supply liquor at any time to the public with or ancillary to a *bona fide* meal, and the same rule applies to hotels between midnight and 5 a.m.

To obtain a late night permit the licensee must have premises of a high standard, must provide entertainment,

and must show that the permit will be of benefit to patrons. Meals must be provided only if requested by patrons. As of recently, 28 such permits have been granted by the court, being 11 to restaurants and 17 to hotels. A further 20 applications are before the court. The previous Government introduced this provision in 1982 and it was intended to apply only to high class establishments having piano bars and discotheques. The Superintendent of Licensed Premises was given power to apply to the court for revocation of a permit if on the balance of probabilities it was being abused. It was said at the time that the permits would be hard to get and easy to lose. This has not proven to be the case.

The Government is concerned at the proliferation of these permits and the abuses of some conditions by some licensees. It appears that permits are being granted in respect of some premises that are of a lower standard than was intended. Furthermore, it seems that meals are often not available for patrons during permitted hours, overcrowding occasionally occurs and appropriate entertainment is sometimes not available. Resources are not available for after hours inspections to gain evidence for revocation proceedings. The reason that restrictions were placed on the grant of these permits was to prevent a reduction of the standards under which liquor was being consumed late at night. A proliferation of these permits does not help achieve this aim.

The Government established a review of the Licensing Act earlier this year and it is obliged to consider the effect of these late night permits on the industry and the community. The review may recommend another method of catering for the demand for liquor with entertainment until the early hours of the morning and such a recommendation may be difficult to implement if the proliferation continues. Accordingly, the Government considers that the best course is to impose a moratorium on the future grant of these permits. This would not affect those licensees who already have the permits but would prevent the court from granting any new permits pending the outcome of the review of the Act. The moratorium will be deemed to have come into effect on 31 August 1983, being the day on which the Bill was introduced in another place. The purpose in adopting this date for the commencement of the measure is to prevent an influx of applications to the court.

Because of the nature of this proposal it has not been possible to consult with the industry. However, the Australian Hotels Association, the industry body most affected by the proliferation of these permits, has already made its concerns on this issue known to the Government. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that amendments made by the Bill will operate from 31 August 1983. Clause 3 inserts two new subsections in section 66b of the principal Act. New subsection (10) is a general prohibition against the granting of new permits. So that the holders of existing permits will not be detrimentally affected by this amendment subsection (11) will allow new permits to be granted in respect of premises to which late night permits already relate. Late night permits remain in force for one year only and this subsection will allow the holder of a permit or a person to whom a business conducted under the authority of a permit has been transferred to obtain the necessary permit.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act results from the 68th Report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia relating to Inherited Imperial Law on Gaming and Wagering. The committee canvassed a series of Imperial enactments ranging from the year 1541 to the year 1836 concerning gaming and wagering. The committee found that many of the enactments are totally obsolete and ought to be repealed outright, as has been done by the English legislature itself. The committee also identified the enactments that still have a residual role to play, and recommended that these be repealed and the substance of the provisions be continued in the Lottery and Gaming Act. The committee also recommended that the Acts known as the Sir John Barnard's Acts dealing with the illegal practice of 'stock jobbing' (that is, the unscrupulous speculation in shares and securities) be repealed because the Commonwealth securities legislation, as applied in South Australia by the Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act, adequately covers this matter. This legislation implements these recommendations of the committee. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts in section 3 a new subsection providing for the repeal of the Acts of the Imperial Parliament in the second schedule. Clause 3 inserts an additional section in Part V of the Act, relating to unlawful gaming. An Act of the Imperial Parliament (9 Anne c. 14) provides that agreements made in relation to gaming transactions are voidable. (Section 50 of the principal Act has the same effect.) However, a later Imperial Act provided that securities given in relation to void gaming agreements were to be treated as given for illegal consideration, instead of being void, thus affording innocent third parties the opportunity to enforce the securities. The proposed new section deals with this issue. Clause 4 provides a schedule of the imperial Acts that are to be repealed.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Hon. H. ALLISON

Mr EVANS (Fisher): By leave, I move:

That two weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Mount Gambier on account of Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr MAX BROWN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr WHITTEN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

In moving that motion, I do not intend to speak at length. I believe that the proceedings of the Committees adequately canvassed issues which I, as Treasurer, or any of my colleagues as Ministers, wished to be canvassed, and I believe that the debate on the reports of those two Estimates Committees should be allowed to proceed without at this stage any general statement from me. Naturally, of course, I will be exercising a right of reply at the appropriate time.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): At this stage in last year's Budget debate, the now Premier complained about the lack of information provided to the Estimates Committees, and it was a familiar complaint. He made it repeatedly during the last Parliament. But, when the record is examined, it can be seen that the last Parliament was provided with much more information during Estimates Committee debates than has been the case in this Parliament. Indeed, the performance of Ministers during the fortnight of the two Estimates Committees has only fueled what one may call lobby and media discussion about the future (or, rather, lack of it) of a number of Ministers. The betting is gathering some momentum. The odds are shortening about who will go first and at what time.

But, first, I remind the Premier that the Opposition's response to the Estimates Committee debates was at all times to seek information in an objective and responsible manner. We did not take constant points of order. We did not move motions against Ministers *ad nauseam*, as the Premier and his colleagues did when they were on this side of the House. We were given far more reason to do so, I might add, but we approached these Committees with the view that they represent an opportunity for the Parliament—for all members—to obtain information in a constructive, non-partisan way and in a calm atmosphere.

I invite the Premier to contrast our approach with his when the Estimates Committees first sat in 1980. On that occasion the Labor Opposition moved six motions at different stages during the Committee debates and staged one walk-out led by, of all people, the present Minister of Local Government. Government members while in Opposition were far more interested in making cheap political points and perpetrating patently obvious stunts than in using these Estimates Committees properly and responsibly as indeed we have done over the recent two weeks.

On the question of provision of information, it was made obvious to the Opposition during the Estimates Committees debates that few Ministers have any grasp of their portfolios, none more so than the Minister of Local Government. He even needed his Public Service advisers to explain Government policy for him. I refer, for example, to the following response by the Minister to a question about the Government's policy on awarding tenders to local government. The Minister replied:

The Government has a set policy on the public tendering system and private contractors. I thought the honourable member would be well aware of that. I ask Dr McPhail to provide further details. That is the Director of the Department. The Government's 'set policy' was handed over to Dr McPhail to enlarge upon. I know that the Minister has a memory problem: he even forgot he had a house for the purposes of filling his pecuniary interests return, despite the fact that he is Minister of Housing—and that should have jogged his memory. But to forget or simply not be able to explain Government policy cannot be justified in any circumstances. This was not the first time the Minister had called on Dr McPhail to rescue him. The Minister's sheer incompetence has already forced the Director of Local Government to resign as Chairman of the Local Government Grants Commission. The Minister must soon run out of props and scapegoats. There is a limit beyond which even this Minister's incompetence can no longer be tolerated or indeed justified.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They're laughing about it.

Mr OLSEN: I can understand their embarrassment. Obviously, the only way out is to laugh it off. The Premier himself was decidedly reluctant to give information to the Committee on a number of questions, particularly those relating to the location of the casino and to uranium. Of course, the Deputy Premier gave us another great helping of fudge. During his appearance before the Estimates Committees, he made reference to the Government's attitude to the A.C.T.U. job protection case, saying:

There has been no evidence given by any officer of my Department or any other officer of any other Department in this particular case.

That is fairly unequivocal on the part of the Deputy Premier, but a press statement on 8 June stated:

Evidence to be given to the Arbitration Commission in Melbourne today by the State Government points up the need for better job protection measures, according to Labour Minister, Jack Wright.

In other words, on 8 June the Deputy Premier said that on that very day the Government would be giving evidence in support of the A.C.T.U. job protection case but, when questioned about this during the Estimates Committee debate, there was an absolute denial that any such evidence had been given. I know that the Deputy Premier has perhaps had his mind on other places remote from this House at various times, but not even that can excuse such a fundamental contradiction. The Deputy cannot even say—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr OLSEN: The Deputy cannot even say in his defence that he was answering an implication or complaint about a telephone tap. The contradiction is in his own words on the public record. His answer to this Parliament yet again was at total variance with the previous statement that he had made. He will go down in history as having the shortest memory of any person to have sat in this Parliament. So, we can go down the front bench about the performance of this Government after almost a year in office. It is an interesting exercise to look at the front bench.

The Minister of Environment and Planning cannot make up his mind on what to do about the sacred sites at Roxby Downs. He sought one report but of course now he has called for a report on the report. The Chief Secretary took off for an interstate holiday when he knew that the tension in the prisons was mounting again, and when he knew that the Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services was also absent on holidays. There was no-one in control when the latest sit-ins occurred at Adelaide and Yatala Gaols: that is almost common practice. We have

had the Minister's press secretary handling the situation on one occasion when he was absent from the State. In Opposition the Chief Secretary promised that he had all the answers to prison problems.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If the member for Unley waits a moment, I will come to the tremendous full-page advertisement in the *Herald* featuring his wife's signature as one of those wanting to stop the Roxby Downs project. In Opposition the Chief Secretary said that he had all the answers to the prison problems, but these latest sit-ins demonstrate yet again that there has been a complete breakdown of communication between the Government and the prison authorities and inmates since the last election.

Of course, we have seen the Minister of Mines and Energy already close down two uranium mines and may yet be forced to take further similar action. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has let down all sporting bodies in attempting to twist and turn his way out of the dilemma his colleague, the Minister of Health, had with the tobacco advertising legislation. There is a Minister if ever you saw one, the Minister of Health! He is a law unto himself. After his celebrated confrontations with a doctor at Port Augusta and the Mayor at Port Pirie, I would suggest that he has worked out by now that one does not take on lightly Bill Jones at Port Pirie. The Premier, if he had any control over his Ministers, should have pulled the Minister into line, but the Minister has been brawling in public yet again. He has been arrogant, he has been rude, he has intended to intimidate his critics.

Mr Lewis: He says that he's the best Health Minister that South Australia has ever had.

Mr OLSEN: That's his ego getting in the way again.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: He's a very modest man.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: There are only three good Ministers in the Ministry, Jack, according to him, and you're not one of them!

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is not in the Minister's nature to admit that he is wrong.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Who were those three Ministers?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Sumner, Bannon and himself.

Mr OLSEN: Obviously the Deputy Premier is a heavyweight in that sense.

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

Mr OLSEN: I can understand that the interjections indeed strike a chord with some honourable members. When the facts demonstrated that the doctor in this latest incident had more right on his side, the Minister then turned his attentions to the Board of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and to the typical socialist solution: put more control on the hospital. The Minister's colleague in another place, the Minister of Fisheries, indeed has had the wrath of the fishing industry descend upon him by his crude attempt to interfere with what is a well-managed fisheries policy in this State.

The performance of the Government has not been a creditable or indeed a commendable one, and after less than 12 months in office one Minister has already gone, the Deputy Premier should have resigned or been sacked, and there is open speculation about several others. I have no doubt that the Premier would like to purge his Cabinet so that the next two years of his Government might avoid some of the problems and embarrassment—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Where would he get the replacements?

Mr OLSEN: I am sure that there are at least more substantive replacements on the back benches than there

are on the front benches. However, given the Premier's propensity to walk away from difficult decisions, it is possible that some Ministers who no longer deserve to hold office on the front bench might continue to do so. After all, can the Premier be expected to take a tough line with his Ministry when he will not even take on a back-bencher who has broken Caucus solidarity? The decision of the member for Elizabeth openly and strongly to support a campaign to stop Roxby Downs is something a stronger man than the Premier would not have ignored. If we are to believe the Premier's repeated statements that it is A.L.P. policy that Roxby Downs will proceed, then he obviously should have disciplined the member for Elizabeth for a breach of Party policy and Caucus solidarity. When he signed an advertisement in the *Labor Herald* calling on the Federal Government to stop Roxby Downs, I bet that the Premier was incensed when he returned from overseas to see that full-page advertisement in the A.L.P. *Herald*. The member for Elizabeth has defied the Premier because before the last election, the honourable member said that he would abide by A.L.P. policy on Roxby Downs.

The member for Unley's wife is a signatory and contributor to the cost of that advertisement as indeed are other members supporting that policy. There must be something sensitive in this. I am pleased that Bob Hawke got his cold today, or whatever it was, so that the Federal A.L.P. Caucus could not make its decision on uranium. Obviously, the numbers are not quite there and they have to stall for a bit more time, at least until after the election in Queensland, before proceeding. The recent manoeuvres over this matter within the Labor Party suggest these assurances may have been dubious and even outright dishonest. I understand that the A.L.P. has had a policy committee on this matter for some three years. It would be interesting to see what the honourable member for Elizabeth's influence is over policy development of the Australian Labor Party over the next few years.

South Australia continues to face difficult economic times and we need the best of available ability to deal with those difficulties at a State level. Certainly, I think it is fair to say that within the membership of the Australian Labor Party, particularly the Parliamentary section, and obviously the member for Coles joins with me, not the best available ability is represented in the Ministry at present. It is time that the Premier did something about it, not only in the interests of himself and the Party, but in the interests of South Australia. Put simply, it is time for the Premier significantly to reshuffle his Ministry. I know that he would like to do so but his system is a bit different from that on this side of the House; he cannot make those arbitrary decisions.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In saying that we are continuing to face difficult economic times, I make clear to the House and to the Premier, before he again tries to assert that the Opposition has nothing constructive to say, that I have every confidence in South Australia's long-term economic future. My contribution to the *Advertiser* supplement published this morning in fact demonstrates that. In that supplement, I have referred to developments in our resource related industries, in high technology and in tourism, which have the potential to attract new investment to our State and to create many new jobs. I have also made the point that this potential has not developed overnight, or since the last election, as the Premier would like all South Australians in fact to believe. It is the result of hard work and initiative over a long period by many people, supported where appropriate and necessary by Government. I give the credit where it is due, unlike the Premier. The Premier has talked long and loud about consensus, but his notion of consensus is that it requires us all to agree with everything his Government says and does,

and to give him the credit for everything of a positive nature which occurs to boost our economy.

We received some warning of this just after the last election, when the Premier was given the privilege of opening the Stony Point pipeline. At no stage in his speech did the Premier acknowledge the efforts of the former Government to facilitate that development or the work of my colleague the Deputy Leader, as then Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, to ensure the negotiation and agreement of a complex indenture to allow the development of this project to proceed in record time, yet it is this Government that will reap the rewards of that indenture.

More recently the Premier went out to Technology Park to announce that the British Aerospace Company would be moving its operations to that site. All of the key negotiations for this move were undertaken by the former Government. At the time of the last election the member for Davenport was meeting with members of the company's parent board who came here from Britain to give their agreement to key aspects of the decision. Again, there was no acknowledgement of this by the Premier. During his visit to Japan the Premier announced an agreement for the railway station development, and I welcomed that announcement. However, as he well knows, the deal which he has signed is based on a proposal initiated by the former Government in conjunction with the State Transport Authority. However, I was pleased at last that the Premier was prepared to acknowledge the work of the former Minister of Transport and the former Government in bringing that project on stream.

On his return from his overseas visit, at the weekend, the Premier went further in his efforts to play up his own performance at the expense of others. He suggested that overseas visits by his predecessor, Mr Tonkin, had produced no tangible results. In fact, he said, 'I do not want to make invidious comparisons.' Of course, it has always been the practice of the Premier to take a completely jaundiced view of everything done by the former Government. When Mr Tonkin went overseas in September 1980 to sort out the petro-chemical project, the Premier called that trip a stunt: that was the description that was put on it. However, as a result of that trip the interest of the Asahi Chemical Company in the project was secured by the former Premier, and the present Premier well knows that now. This has led to the first convincing approach to the Japanese E.D.C. market, whereas petro-chemical projects in the past mooted by Mr Dunstan had foundered on the difficulties of finding markets for E.D.C.

Indeed, it ill behoved the Premier to talk about stunts in relation to petro-chemical projects, when the Party he now leads has been re-cycling petro-chemical stunts ever since 1973 when Mr Dunstan made an election promise that such a project would be developed, and then had to send a senior public servant overseas in a bid to secure a piece of paper to give credibility to the project. I understand that that was the present Ombudsman, who was given the task to go to Japan quickly and bring back a piece of paper to give credibility to this petro-chemical project.

While he was in Japan the Premier was also able to talk about the potential for increased sales of South Australian food and wine. This potential has developed following the former Premier's visit to Japan early last year, when arrangements were finalised for promotions by the South Australian Wine and Food Promotion Committee (Sapro). I heard the Premier on radio following his return say that he had been the first South Australian Leader to meet a Japanese Prime Minister. In fact, his press secretary kept pushing this out all the way along the line. Again, he was seeking to take credit away from his predecessor because, as he well knows, Mr Tonkin met the late Mr Ohira in 1980, and I can understand perhaps why the Premier has been concerned to

boost himself in this way. According to a report in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 8 October, his visit to Japan received scant attention in the Japanese press compared with the visit earlier this year by his Western Australian counterpart, Mr Burke. The *Advertiser* report also stated that the Premier's meeting with Mr Nakasone had not earned any mention in the Japanese press and that even Mr Wran, in Japan at the same time, had succeeded in upstaging the Premier with an offer of koalas to a zoo in Nagoya. What did the Premier have to do? He had been upstaged by the New South Wales Premier about two koalas, so we are now sending two wombats.

I am glad that Mr Wran gave him the idea of exchanging animals between the zoos. Of course, that is the false facade of this Premier and his deception which we saw during the last State election campaign, when he said that this Government would not introduce or increase taxes for the life of this Parliament. Yet, we have had 68 new charges put up since the change of Government and six new taxes at the last count, although I have not checked this week: it most probably has gone up again. The Premier made much of the claim that he travels business class. This Premier sits in the middle of the plane. However, it is interesting to note that, when going to Japan, on leaving Adelaide Airport he did not sit in the middle of the plane at all: he was sitting in the front row of the plane in first class. Therefore, this Premier who talks about going business class likes sitting in the front seat after all! It is rather hypocritical to put out to the media that he is a cost-saving Premier who sits in the middle of the plane, yet when he gets there he seeks to get in the front seat.

I raise these matters not to downgrade or belittle overseas trips by Premiers, because I believe that it is important for State Leaders to travel overseas, to make contact with potential investors, and to maintain contact with organisations with interests already in South Australia and, indeed, I said so during the Estimates Committee prior to the Premier's departure overseas and I have not seen fit (and I hope that the Premier has acknowledged it or at least taken it on board) to denigrate or belittle the trip that he undertook which, I believe, is the right thing for a Leader of Government to do from time to time.

However, I do criticise the Premier in his increasing propensity to strut the stage as though he is giving a solo performance. He persistently claims personal credit for everything that is good but does not wish to claim responsibility, of course, for the problems. Whenever he is faced with a difficult decision he blames the circumstances or someone else. Rather than confront Mr Wran, the Premier has tried to blame the current disparity in gas prices between New South Wales and South Australia on an agreement negotiated by the former Government. However, in the circumstances in which that agreement on South Australian gas prices was made with the Cooper Basin producers late last year, it protected South Australia's interests to the maximum extent possible.

Rather grudgingly, the Minister of Mines and Energy finally admitted this in his appearance before the Estimates Committee. It is now the Premier's responsibility to ensure that South Australia's interests are further protected through the removal of disparity with the New South Wales price. The Premier tried to blame the Opposition for the recent demonstrations at Roxby Downs, when it was Young Labor, not Young Liberals, helping to disrupt the work up there, and the member for Elizabeth put his name to a campaign to stop the project. In his Budget, the Premier has asked the House to accept that taxes must rise because of the Budgetary situation he inherited, rather than because his Government has to increase spending to meet its election promises.

I have already demonstrated the falseness of the Premier's case and the deceptions inherent in his original commitment not to increase existing rates of taxes or to introduce new taxes during the term of this Parliament. The Premier's handling of the State's finances has, in fact, amounted to one deception after another. His financial policy as originally conceived before the last election was adulterine and, as the Treasurer, now, he has passed its offspring on to all South Australians in the form of higher taxes and charges. However, the counterfeiting did not stop with the higher taxes announced in this Budget.

As a result of the national wage decision brought down on 23 September the Premier has short changed South Australians yet again. Honourable members will recall that, in this House on 16 March, the Premier gave an unequivocal commitment that no State taxes would be increased while the wage pause was operating in South Australia. The result of the national wage decision is that the 4.3 per cent increase applies to the first pay period after 6 October. Yet, before that date, South Australians were already paying higher prices for petrol and cigarettes as a direct result of tax increases in this Budget—increases applying before the end of the wage pause. So much for the Premier's assurance to this House on 16 March: it was not worth the *Hansard* paper it was written on.

Indeed, the Premier's whole financial strategy, with significant increases in a wide range of Government charges, as well as the tax increases, since the beginning of this financial year, has been based on a six-month wage pause, whereas the effect of the decision on 23 September by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission was to extend the pause to nine months. The outcome of this strategy can only be to fuel demands for further wage increases in the future. This will put into grave jeopardy the so-called prices and incomes accord, as the impact of these increases is felt at the petrol pump, the corner deli and the local hotel, forcing the economy into another inflation-wages push cycle. Individuals, families and companies have had to show restraint during the wage pause, while Labor Governments have ignored the need to. It has been the old maxim: private enterprise is the sector of our economy controlled by the Government; the public sector is the one no-one controls.

This Budget has done nothing to improve the climate for business in South Australia—the only sector of our economy which produces the wealth necessary to generate jobs. The Premier will say that, individually, the impact of tax and charge increases is small, but cumulatively they add up to a major impost on business—a significant barrier to economic recovery. Every additional million dollars the Government takes in taxes and charges makes more businesses marginal or unprofitable and destroys more jobs. Every additional million dollars the Government takes means more Government competition with the private sector.

Under this Government, the balance is shifting, increasingly the private sector sees itself under attack, and the Premier knows this. He has received submissions from professional organisations to this effect. While the Premier preaches about a partnership with the private sector, his Government increasingly practises competition in areas that are already served by the private sector. The building industry, in particular, is concerned that the practice of the former Government to allocate as much work as possible to the private sector is being reversed.

The present Government has the attitude that the public sector should be involved to a significant extent just because the Government has buildings to be put up. The economic irrationality of this argument was exposed again only yesterday in Chris Milne's article in the *Advertiser* about our Public Service when he referred to the mistakes of the past in areas such as the Meat Corporation, the Frozen Food

Factory, the Health Commission and the State Transport Authority. They were the legacies of the Dunstan era, but it appears this Government has not learned the lesson. It is building up public sector employment levels again; it is competing; it is interfering.

As well as the building and construction industry, in land development the Urban Land Trust is to take a more active role. In petroleum exploration, the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated during the Estimates Committee debates that he wants the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation to explore in the North-West of the State if problems with the Pitjantjatjara community can be resolved. However, there is already significant private sector interest in this very prospective area. The Deputy Premier has promised major new industrial legislation which could increase the costs of the private sector in addition to the Government's recent workers compensation legislation.

The Government has given its full support to the spread of compulsory unionism throughout the home building and construction industry, which will add significantly to the cost of buying a home. The Government has allowed S.G.I.C. to sell insurance through post offices, placing private insurers at a distinct disadvantage. There are other examples of actions and policies of this Government which are not in the economic interests of economic development.

Behind the Premier's bland introductory comment to his Budget that its strategy seeks to provide the opportunity for the State to take on new directions is the stark reality that the public sector is again spreading its tentacles across business in South Australia to interfere, to direct, and, in some cases, such as the Beverley and Honeymoon mines, to strangle. As I said in the *Advertiser* this morning, there are some welcome signs of economic recovery. The latest survey of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry has also referred to this. The Treasury paper tabled with this Budget points to some of those signs, particularly in resource-related developments.

When this Government acts in a way which maximises South Australia's opportunity to achieve and to benefit from these developments, it will receive the support of the Opposition. However, when the Premier attempts to hide the deceptions and the imposts in this Budget behind the veil of a call for consensus, the Opposition will not resile from its responsibility to propose alternatives. In the Budget debate, I highlighted the extent to which the Government was increasing spending this financial year. I put forward alternatives which would have avoided any tax increases. The Premier has not seriously challenged my proposals because he cannot. Predictably, he resorted to the tired, emotional stance of how many public servants would I sack? I anticipated and answered that in my Budget speech—not one. My Budget strategy would ensure that more South Australians are employed overall than will be the case with this Budget, which takes from all South Australians and gives back to very few.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate and point out that because I rise at this point it is in no way a reflection of the view of the Opposition as to the importance of the remarks that I make. It is by pure chance that I happen to be here and acknowledge nonetheless that I have a considerable task ahead of me if I am to match the eloquence of my Leader in the way in which he demonstrated the ineptitude of Ministers in the course of his remarks: ineptitude in the way in which they have handled their portfolios and the way in which they conducted themselves in answering questions put to them during the course of the Estimates Committees, the reports of which we are now examining.

Of course, if I were to be completely cynical, I would have to say that I thought the performance of the Ministers was very good and if they keep it up there is nothing more certain than that my Leader will be the Premier and will win with a landslide at the next election. That kind of incompetence, however well it is covered up by smart alec press releases and all the glosses that are put on them (whether at taxpayers' expense or anything else), will inevitably and invariably sooner or later filter through to the general public and they will feel the same lack of confidence in this Government that we do. It is a pity, because South Australia has to suffer for the next three years.

I believe that the Premier might have done well to have included in the lines of his Department a new line for research into political myxamatosis. One thing he really needs is a fairly potent kind of disease to get rid of the rabbits in his Party. The kind of things which have been referred to by my Leader need to be underlined. There is no unanimity of purposes in this Government or the Party of which it is comprised, and the Premier is powerless to do anything about it. The future security of this State's economy is at risk because of that disunity and directly opposite approach that would be taken by different members of the Party in relation to projects of vital importance to South Australia.

The classic example, of course, is the Roxby Downs project at Olympic Dam, where the joint venturers, whilst they have been assured officially by the Government that their project will be allowed to proceed in the event that they choose to proceed with it (and I am fairly certain that will be so), nonetheless find that a very determined and plausible effort is being made by members of the Parliamentary Party in South Australia to white-ant that position and to destroy the prospects of the joint venturers developing their mine there. What a tragedy it will be for South Australia if people such as the member for Elizabeth and his cohorts succeed. No doubt, the Premier would agree that the member for Elizabeth is a political rabbit, though he cannot say so. There does not happen to be any disease around at present that is likely to solve the Premier's problem, but I hope that the high levels of the mosquito population in my district will spread that disease through the enormous numbers of the rodents which have exploded in recent weeks in response to the tremendous quantity of food material available to them. No Government intervention may therefore be needed to check that population.

I now turn not so much to exotic animal species but to native animals and native vegetation, and I wish members to consider the performance of another Minister from whom I sought information, the Minister for Environment and Planning. That Minister was especially helpful in agreeing to obtain information for me, although it is now over a fortnight since he gave me, as a member of the Estimates Committee, an undertaking to attend to many inquiries from my constituents on certain matters, but neither I nor my constituents have as yet received a response.

I refer especially to a question asked by Mr S.C. Evans, of Galga, who, having lodged an appeal and being distressed by the lack of response from the Department, wrote to me again on 10 October, saying:

I lodged an appeal with the Department of Environment and Planning on 4 July 1983 [referring to the decision in respect of the native vegetation on his property]. Hoping this will help you with inquiries on my behalf.

Yours sincerely, S.C. Evans, Galga.

Mr Evans is perplexed and distressed that nothing is being done to resolve the uncertainty relating to the woodcutters who have traditionally worked on his property and to decide whether he can continue with the clearing programme that

he had in train at that time. Why on earth the Department cannot be a little more compassionate and responsive to the needs of people who are affected so adversely by the departmental action I do not know.

By asking the question and by raising this matter, I do not imply, nor have I ever held the view, that it is inappropriate to try to save as much of the residual native vegetation as is left in South Australia. Indeed, I support the need to do that and the view expressed by my colleague the member for Murray. However, the honourable member, the member for Eyre, I, and all other members on this side agree (indeed, any fair-minded member must agree) that it is not fair to dispossess people of their capacity to earn a living and not answer their request for consideration as to the extent to which they will be dispossessed.

I tried to explain to the Minister, during the examination of the vote for the Department of Environment and Planning, how those people felt. He, however, chose to interpret the analogy to which I referred as a comparison between technology on the one hand and the necessity to retain our native vegetation on the other when, in fact, that begged the question and deliberately misinterpreted the point I was trying to illustrate. I put to the House now, as I tried to put to the Estimates Committee, this explanation: it is not fair for an individual citizen working in Adelaide to forgo one day's pay a week, or its equivalent, to ensure that for the benefit of posterity the skill of that person is kept operative and living.

I do not suggest that that is what the Department is trying to do, but the analogous situation arises where the Department requires people who happen to have native vegetation on their properties to retain it at their personal expense and to their continuing disadvantage so that they must forgo their income for the sake of posterity, and reduce the viability of their private enterprise for the sake of posterity, because all Ministers and other members know that land is an essential part of the production cycle in that locality and in that fashion.

It is not simply dry land above sea level occupied as a site on which to erect a factory or other industrial premises in which people can work. It is literally essential, unit area by unit area, to produce unit income from grazing animals or growing commercial crops, and to remove it from the prospective area of a holding is to destroy, for all time, the capacity of the residual part of the holding to support a family to the extent that might otherwise have been possible prior to the introduction of the restriction.

Therefore, it is not fair for the individual private citizen who paid for and must continue to pay for land that happens to have uncleared native vegetation on it to do so for the benefit of the rest of us, with no compensation whatever, with the burden of the expense of controlling vermin on that land, and the burden of the expense of controlling pest plants on that land. Otherwise, it becomes a weed and rabbit infested remnant which is destroyed in its own right for all time. That is not an unreasonable proposition. We do not expect any other member of our community to forgo his capacity to earn income for the benefit of the rest of us by introducing laws and regulations that make outside the law what is otherwise lawful and what is otherwise still permitted in every other instance to be denied in this instance. It is just not reasonable.

I thank the House for its attention to that matter and I turn now to another matter of equal concern to me, which illustrates in some part the attitude that I have to the question of retaining remnant ecological stands for native flora and fauna. I refer to the matter of the multiple use philosophy of the Murray River. For the 40 years that it has been in existence (though more effectively, I believe, in recent times), the Murray Valley League has advocated the

necessity for a multiple use management plan to be drawn up. It is simply not good enough to preoccupy the people developing that proposal and management plan with the constraints relevant only to the need to provide irrigation water and potable water for over 80 per cent of South Australia's population. That is not the only reason why we need to be concerned about the Murray River. There are many other reasons, including its recreational potential, as well as conservation aspects.

For it to be useful in recreational terms people with an expert appreciation of how it can best be developed compatibly in that fashion with the other uses to which it is put at present need to be involved. I believe that Ministers responsible for the various activities ought to be included in a panel, a committee, including the Ministers of Water Resources, Agriculture, Environment and Planning and Tourism, as well as the Premier, so that their expertise and that of their various departments can be brought to bear in the committee's deliberations in the development of a plan. Until that is done we will always be flirting with disaster in regard to that one great river. The Government must not continue to ignore the propositions put by the Murray Valley League, and it must accept that sensibly that is the way to proceed. I carry no brief from the Murray Valley League to express that view. I am a member of it and an ardent supporter of its goal simply thereby believing that, since it is not Party political and committed to the development of an overall management strategy its views ought to be taken into account. Every member in this place would know that, if South Australia sets an example in the way in which it treats that river, by doing as the League has suggested, such an example will be more easily advocated and taken up by the other States and the Commonwealth in ways that will ensure the continued survival of the river and its capacity to be a multiple use resource. I thank the House for its attention to that matter.

I now wish to turn to a concern that arose during the course of my questioning of two Ministers. I questioned the Minister for Environment and Planning, who makes a small sum available to the South Australian Nature Conservation Society, and a further matter was raised on the same topic with the Minister of Mines and Energy. Of course, it is legitimate for the Conservation Council of South Australia and the other bodies under the umbrella of the Minister to get hand-outs. It is equally legitimate for me to ask the Minister whether he understands that the Conservation Council of South Australia is affiliated with an organisation called CANE (Campaign Against Nuclear Energy). The Minister for Environment and Planning happily acknowledged that. I then pointed out to the Minister that it is just possible, indeed probable, that public funds made available through his Department are financing the advocated civil disobedience which we saw at the Olympic Dam site earlier this year.

In dollar terms the amount of money which CANE is obtaining from this source may not be great, but the fact remains that by supporting that organisation we find that it has cost the South Australian taxpayer an additional \$600 000 to \$700 000 to send police to the Olympic Dam site to ensure that the people organised by CANE to demonstrate there did not come to any harm or cause any damage or injury to anyone whom they sought to confront. Members of CANE were amongst those people who advocated not the non-violent demonstration but the violent approach to putting their point across. It was deliberate, mischievous and deceitful misleading of the police and the joint venturers and management company, Roxby Management Services, in regard to their intentions. Contrary to what the Minister told me, \$600 000 to \$700 000 is not a paltry sum.

I believe that that amount could have been better spent in many other ways.

For instance, it could have gone a long way towards making a start on the Finger Point effluent treatment works to ensure that raw sewage from Mount Gambier no longer has to pour into the sea. We should be ashamed of ourselves. If raw sewage were pouring into the sea off the Patawalonga, or off Port Adelaide, West Lakes, or Bolivar, members opposite and on this side of the House, as well as all members from the other place, would be raising their voices calling 'Shame' and 'Horror', saying that it was irresponsible, revolting and insensitive. Yet, because the Finger Point site is out of view, because it is not adjacent to any Labor-held electorate, and because it does not smell in the nostrils of the people in metropolitan Adelaide, it is considered legitimate to leave that untreated mess, which is washed up on beaches, floating in the sea.

Is it? Certainly, from my point of view it is not, but the Government obviously believes that it is. When questions have been raised as to the risk this poses to public health via the medium of fish which may be caught in the immediate vicinity, the Government's solution to that problem is to say, 'There is not a problem; we have banned the taking of fish for one or two kilometres from that site.' How ridiculous! That is like saying that you may not eat something which you have caught and which is contaminated because it at some time or other was in an area subject to that contamination and you did not even know it. Fish do not respect imaginary lines drawn on the water. There is no other barrier there restraining them. They do not understand Government regulations. They cannot read. They do not know that, by eating that raw sewage or any of the zoo plankton which have lived upon it, which may be carrying some of the disease organisms, the viruses, from human waste, that they then cannot go and take the bait off a hook somewhere.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that sharks travel for hundreds of miles (in 'new money', hundreds of kilometres). Abalone which have been caught several kilometres from Finger Point have had quite demonstrably on their flesh the effects of the pollutants contained in that raw effluent. So, also, have the rock lobsters. They are no more intelligent than any of the sharks to which I have referred, nor are they any more capable of reading Government regulations and directions. So, I put it to the Minister, the Government and this House that, as the reports that came out of Committee are before us again, we should require urgent attention for this problem. It is not as though it is just raw sewage and just disease of people. There are also the industrial wastes contained in that effluent; for instance, the washings from the yard of the treatment plant where *pinus radiata* is treated with copper, chromium and arsenic salts. They are deadly poisons.

They may not be poisonous to some of the species which consume them but they certainly could end up causing considerable problems for some hapless individual who consumes a fish taken from the water that has an accumulation of them in its flesh. God knows, we have had a big enough scare with mercurial pollution of shark and the effect that that had on our Government and our industry in relation to restrictions imposed by the Victorian Government on its sale and consumption in that State to know that it is flirting with disaster to allow these pollutants to continue to enter the sea through the pipeline in their raw state.

I found great difficulty on Committee A in that first week in making myself understood in so many ways. The main reason was the apparent inconsistency in the way in which many of the matters I chose to raise and about which I was seeking information were dealt with. I was dealt with fairly

summarily by the Chairman of the Committee early on the day of 27 September and again on 28 September in relation to my attempts to obtain information arising from ambiguities in what is simply referred to as the 'yellow book'. No such line of questioning, unrelated to a particular line in the Estimates of Expenditure, the so-called 'white book' was to be permitted.

Yet, on 28 September, when the Acting Chairman (the member for Henley Beach) took the Chair and the member for Hartley asked questions directly related to what we know as the 'yellow book', I raised the question with the Acting Chairman who ruled my point quite out of order. I was astonished because, whereas I had sought information, I could not ask—

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): This is our opportunity to take up issues that were raised during the Estimates Committees and, certainly, to take up those issues where we received unsatisfactory answers from Ministers; it is also an opportunity to highlight to the House (and I believe we are obligated to do that as members of the Estimates Committees) those areas where Ministers are plainly and obviously falling down in their duties. I will refer to several matters. The first matter relates to the maintenance of both school buildings and other Government buildings, and I also raised this matter in Question Time today. I found the response of the Minister of Public Works predictable, to say the least. The present Minister of Public Works always likes to get to his feet and say that I have the record of being both the worst Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works that this State has ever experienced.

Mr Lewis: He might just be the worst judge of Ministers.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That could well be the case. I always find the Minister's subtlety very interesting and very predictable. I point out that today the Minister failed to answer the point that funds for the maintenance of school buildings and other Government buildings have been reduced by 17 per cent in real terms. Whether or not I happened to be the worst Minister of Public Works, which is what the Minister accused me of today, I will not dispute and argue at the moment. However, I point out that, if I did not provide enough funds for school maintenance, therefore being branded as the worst Minister of Public Works ever in this State, when those funds are reduced by a further 17 per cent, I wonder where it places the present Minister of Public Works in this State: it must put him at the very bottom and even below me and, according to the Minister, I was the very worst.

I am greatly concerned that the standard of maintenance in Government schools in particular is in a deplorable state. I recognised the situation in 1980 and in 1981. In 1980, because of the deplorable state of maintenance, I established the visiting tradesmens scheme. The scheme was widely acknowledged as an excellent way of pouring literally millions of dollars extra into school maintenance. Under the scheme, surplus tradesmen within the Public Buildings Department were allocated to schools to carry out essential maintenance; as the maintenance was completed, they carried out less essential but, nonetheless, very important maintenance work. As I have said, between \$4 million and \$5 million a year was being poured into that area. In addition, in early 1982, because of the deplorable state of maintenance that still existed because of the extent to which it had been run down in the 1970s (when the now Minister of Environment and Planning happened to be Minister of Education), the Liberal Government decided to allocate special emergency funding of \$4 million to lift the level of maintenance work in Government schools; some of that funding was also spent

on other Government buildings. The Liberal Government recognised the problem and allocated resources. However, I would not say that we allocated sufficient resources to wipe out the problem entirely, because that was certainly not the case. At least we came to grips with the problem and significantly increased funds for school maintenance.

It saddens me to see the Minister and the Government turn around and take the short-sighted approach and to decide that the first area to cut when there is a tight restriction on funds is school maintenance. That is the very point that the Secretary of the School Council of the Glengowrie High School has taken up in the letter. The school council is worried that, although it does not have a crisis on its hands at this stage, things such as dripping taps, inadequate and broken furniture in the staff room, broken chairs or an insufficient number of chairs and desks for students and, mind you, the question of a typist's desk for the principal's office at that school are causing problems. These items have not been replaced because insufficient funds have been allocated. That was the position when this letter was written on 15 August 1983. I wonder what the reaction of that school council and other school councils will be when they find that there has been a real cut in funds of 17 per cent since then. As I understand the workings of the allocation of funds to regional areas for such maintenance, that means that only absolutely essential break-down maintenances will be carried out. So, some temporary school buildings, in which timbers were replaced and painted with a coat of pink primer seven years ago, still have not received the top coat of paint.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am glad that the member for Brighton is concerned that pink primer was applied seven years ago and that no further coats of paint have been applied because the schools cannot afford it. In some cases, where broken timber was replaced, no coat of paint whatever has been applied; in other cases the existing coat of paint has peeled off and bare timber is exposed. It is incredibly short-sighted not to take action in those areas, because before long the existing bare timber will rot, and instead of having to pay mere dollars to paint the timber work, the Government will be up for hundreds or thousands of dollars to replace it. That is the crisis that exists in schools at present. I am very, very disappointed, and I wonder what the situation will be at the end of this financial year when we find out the effects of the reduction of those funds.

The Minister says that he cannot understand my figures. I explained them carefully and read through them. I dispute the figures in the attachment to the Premier's speech because, in trying to draw a comparison between this year and last, the Premier excluded from the figures the \$4 million special allocation that our Government made. We realised that there was a problem and we made a special allocation of \$4 million: why should that sum be excluded from the figures for last year when in fact it was actually expended last year? I know what the Minister's response will be. He has had three weeks to consider my figures and if he had any doubts he should have sent one of his staff members to see me. I would be only too willing to go through the figures with him. I know what his response will be. He will dispute the figures and claim that they are fabricated and that more funds are being spent, but that is not the case. I challenge the Minister. I cited figures on maintenance funds in the second reading debate on the Budget. The Minister has not bothered to look at or challenge those figures, and I challenge him to point out where my figures are wrong, if he thinks they are wrong. I warn individual members that they will have the wrath of school councils on their heads due to the lack of money for school maintenance.

Another point arising from the Estimates Committees was the subject of the north-south transport corridor. It is an issue that certainly affects your constituents, Madam Acting Speaker, and I hope that your constituents' wrath, some of which I have heard myself, and their attitude to your Government's decision to scrap the north-south transport corridor have been passed on to you. Madam Acting Speaker, I know that the councils in your area representing your constituents and 12 or 13 local government districts, particularly in the southern, western and some northern suburbs of Adelaide, are fuming about the Government's decision to scrap that freeway and, furthermore, are very irate indeed that they were not consulted on that decision. I do not know whether you, Madam Acting Speaker, have since talked to the councils or taken up their side of the case with the Minister of Transport and Cabinet.

The Premier still boasts that it is the best decision that his Government has ever made. I do not know whether you, Madam Acting Speaker, believe that it is the best decision also. You should indicate in this House whether or not you believe it is the best decision that the Government has made. So far, you have been strangely silent on the matter, and it is time that you broke your silence so that your constituents know where you stand on an issue which directly affects them.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): The honourable member may like to come back to the topic under discussion.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am directing my remarks to the Chair, as is required under Standing Orders, and the topic under discussion is the Estimates Committees and the north-south transport corridor. I take up the point specifically as I know it affects you, Madam Acting Speaker, and other members in this House, including the Minister on the front bench, in the light of what the Minister revealed in the Estimates Committee. You, Madam Acting Speaker, may recall that I have raised this subject in the House in a private member's motion and that I have quoted some population projections. The southern suburbs, part of which you represent, will increase their population by 46 per cent in the 10 years from 1981 to 1991.

I found out, during the Estimates Committees, that the projection and population figures based on 1982 data were those used by the Minister for his calculations. The Minister has never been willing to debate in this House the facts concerning traffic congestion and population growth as well as the need for the north-south transport corridor. Even during the Estimates Committee he was not prepared to debate those issues. That is why I draw the matter to your attention, Madam Acting Speaker, as you represent the area. If no one else can get through to the Minister, perhaps you, as a member of Caucus, on behalf of your councils and constituents, could take up the strongest possible case.

The Minister also revealed that, based on the population projections which I used (and which he was willing to accept as being the accurate or likely figures based on March 1982 data), the Darlington intersection traffic will be at the point of absolute chaos by 1990-91. One finds that, if one transects the Adelaide metropolitan area to where South Road meets Anzac Highway and one covers all the main roads such as Brighton, Morphett, Marion, South, Unley and Goodwood roads, by 1993 those major roads will be at the point of absolute traffic congestion. They are not my figures but rather figures released by the Highways Department of this State, for which the Minister is responsible. Those projections are based on all the current planned upgradings that would take place on any of those roads. That congestion will occur much sooner if those planned upgradings of South Road, Emerson crossing and Darlington intersection do not occur by 1991 and 1993 respectively.

I believe that the situation is serious. It was even more serious when I found that the Director-General of Transport, Dr Scrafton, in arguing the case for the Minister, indicated that, if we provided a north-south transport corridor, we would be encouraging people in the southern area to come to the Adelaide western or northern suburbs for their employment. That would be wrong, as we should be creating jobs in the south. I do not disagree with his point that we should be creating jobs in the south. The point is that one will not create jobs in the southern suburbs until one has a major efficient transport system that can cope with the industrial development that might take place. I argue that from experience, having been Minister of Industrial Affairs for three years and having tried with all the incentives we could offer to get companies to go to places like Lonsdale. They constantly said, 'Until work is started on the north-south transport corridor, we will not give a commitment to develop in the southern suburbs.'

Therefore, Madam Acting Speaker, it is your constituents who will suffer either above average unemployment, as they are now (and it will get worse rather than better: do not be worried about that), or who will face long tiring journeys to and from their job opportunities in the western or northern suburbs of Adelaide—trips of at least one hour or 1½ hours to and from work each day. Madam Acting Speaker, that is the scenario that your constituents face, and I think that it is time you took up that issue with the Minister and the Premier and challenged particularly the Premier's statement that this was the best decision that his Government had made so far. If it is the best decision that his Government has made, it is a sad reflection on the standard of decision making by his Government.

Mr Evans: He didn't even keep his options open.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: He did not keep his options open: that is the next point to which I am coming. It is one thing to scrap the transport corridor. It is an absolute disgrace, though, to then go off and sell 20 years worth of land purchases simply to help overcome the financial problems of his Government. It was revealed during the Estimates Committees that the Highways Department, having implied when the decision was announced that the money obtained from the purchase of this land would be used to build roads and improve the transport system to the south, including the widening of South Road, would have money returned from the sale of that land only on an historical cost basis. In other words, if a block of land is valued at \$100 000 today but was purchased 20 years ago at a value of, say, \$5 000 (which would be a comparative figure), the only money that the Highways Department will get is the historical cost of \$5 000, not the \$100 000 which it will cost today.

That is worse because the roadworks that will have to be carried out will not be done on an historical basis: they will be carried out on an inflated basis of what it might cost in the next three or four years. We find that now only a fraction of the funds from the sale of that land will go to help overcome the transport problems. One thing that I found interesting (and I think that the Minister at present in the House ought to inform the House in this respect), is that a slush fund of \$5 million will be established under the Minister for Environment and Planning, and it will be spent at his will apparently in the western suburbs of Adelaide. That will not be spent on housing: the Minister of Transport gave that assurance. If it will not be spent on housing, on what will it be spent—not on transport or housing, but apparently for some other purpose? Madam Acting Speaker, I am delighted to have had your speakership of the House during this portion of the debate because I think it is a matter that relates closely to your area, as it does to that of the member for Fisher. He represents Aberfoyle Park and his constituents will suffer the same problems.

I know that that honourable member will consider the Estimates Committees and some of the answers given by the Minister regarding when certain roads will be developed, because I found the information disturbing, and I am sure that his constituents at Aberfoyle Park, the member for Brighton's constituents at Flagstaff Hill and other surrounding areas, the constituents of the Minister for Environment and Planning, and the member for Mawson's constituents will find the facts given by the Minister very disturbing.

I now refer to the Minister of Education, who is also the Minister for Technology. I had the opportunity of questioning the Minister for Technology on a number of matters, including (as he is the Minister for Technology) computer training of young people coming through the schooling system. This matter concerns me greatly. Some weeks ago I talked to a person involved in the computer industry and asked him what impact he saw the personal computer and the micro chip having on our society over the next 20 years. He invited me to look back to the year 1900 when the internal combustion engine was invented and to the effect it has had on our society in the 80 years since then. It has dictated the planning of urban areas. It has dictated our lifestyle, how we spend our consumer dollar and how our social welfare system has operated. It has also dictated many of the mores and values that we hold as a society. His prediction is (and it is one based on some knowledge) that the computer and the silicon chip will have a similar effect on our society over the next 20 years. If that is the case then it highlights the need for young people going through the school system to receive adequate training in the computer area.

I raised several points about this matter during the Estimates Committees hearings. I was critical of the way in which the Education Department went about purchasing computers for schools and of how it turned about and tried to teach students something about those computers. My comments received some publicity at the time (publicity for which I was grateful) in the *Advertiser* and on the A.B.C. news. I was amazed at the response I received following those comments, particularly those reported in the *Advertiser*, and at how many schools telephoned my office saying that they agreed with me entirely and asking whether I could advise them on what sorts of computers their schools should purchase, when they should purchase them and on what basis they should purchase them. I had to reply that I was not in a position to do that. I found on doing some research that there is no general recommendation or advice available to schools about what sorts of computers they should purchase. That matter is still being looked at by a committee of the Australian Schools Commission. That information will not be available until November of this year.

The next point that came through from the schools was that most computers are being purchased out of school funds and not with Education Department funds. Those school funds have been raised through the hard work of school councils. In other words, this whole matter is an attachment to the education system and is not a fundamental part of it. That is the next point I make: even when computers are purchased using funds raised by parents, most of the training appears to be done on an *ad hoc* basis for a few interested people rather than being built into the fundamental fabric of the curriculum and into the education system. We cannot afford to let another year's students leave our secondary schools without some appreciation or awareness of computers and how to operate them. If we do so, we will have a computer illiterate group of people in our society.

We are already two or three years behind other countries such as Great Britain in this matter and seem to be slipping further and further behind because of the slowness and inaction that seems to be occurring in some sections of the Education Department and, from what I can see, because

of a lack of leadership by the Minister of Education. I make the plea that funds be provided by the Education Department to enable schools to purchase computers. I received an answer from the Minister of Education today about how many computers there are in Government schools throughout the State. I find that, in a system comprising 78 000 secondary students, there are 600 to 700 computers in the entire system covering the whole State. I do not know how many secondary schools there are in South Australia, but perhaps the former Minister of Education can tell me. I think that there are about 350.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: There are not that many.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If there are between 250 and 300 secondary schools in the State that means that there are about two or three computers in each school, which is less than one computer for each 100 secondary school students. I also asked how many students were receiving what I would describe as the absolutely minimal computer training such as a computer awareness course, and the Minister said that only 16 000 students in our secondary school system are receiving such training. That means that only 16 000 students out of 78 000 students in our secondary schools are receiving the training in the use of computers that I believe they should be receiving. It is no wonder that there is what I could only describe as being a fear amongst parents that the school system is not providing the computer training it should be providing.

I now wish to refer to the Vehicle Inspection Station at Regency Park. This was discussed briefly during the Estimates Committee proceedings but I had an interesting one-hour evening talk-back programme under Trevor Ford's guidance on 5 October following the Estimates Committee in which Trevor Ford asked his listeners to phone in with specific complaints about the Vehicle Inspection Station at Regency Park. Trevor Ford introduced that programme by saying:

Over the past few months I've received about 20 complaints—two of them from police officers—regarding the Department of Transport's Vehicle Inspection Station at Regency Park. All of the complaints have followed much the same line.

A vehicle, particularly one driven by a teenager, is defected by police. The problem is rectified, an appointment made at Regency Park, and . . . following payment of a \$20 fee, the defect notice is removed.

End of problem? No, not at all. An officer at Regency Park might check, say, the handbrake, find it unsatisfactory and thus on goes another defect notice. The car is taken away, the problem fixed, another appointment made, a \$15 fee paid, and off comes the defect notice. End of problem? Not necessarily.

Now the footbrake might be checked, found wanting and yet another defect issued . . . and so it goes on and on with cars being effectively put off the road for months on end. I've heard of one case where, after going through the system several times, a driver found himself at the end of it all with his car being virtually written off because of rust in the chassis. By this time, he'd spent a lot of money and effort in correcting the earlier faults.

I also know of a case—and this involved the son of a police officer—where the exhaust was defected, and the lad was asked to remove it, but get this, it was a production line Torana. On that basis, every car that came off the production line should have been defected.

I believe somebody should be taking a very close look at the Vehicle Inspection Station at Regency Park . . . and to that end, my special guest this evening is the shadow Minister of Transport . . . Dean Brown.

During the next hour on that radio talk-back programme I listened to complaint after complaint. Since then I have received complaints by telephone about the same thing. There is no doubt that the administration of that inspection station is totally unsatisfactory.

If a vehicle is defected it should be defected there and then for all of the legitimate complaints so that the owner of the vehicle can take it away and have them all fixed before taking the vehicle to the inspection station. Then, provided all the complaints have been satisfactorily repaired,

the owner should expect to be able to drive the vehicle away with satisfaction. It is totally unsatisfactory to defect one thing, for the person to have it fixed, to go back and find another complaint, and in some cases to go back three or four times.

Last Saturday evening I met members of the Country Carriers Association and they backed up the information that I had received on that radio talk-back programme. However, they had a further complaint relating to vehicles that are defected in country areas. At the moment, the owners of these vehicles are required to drive to the Regency Park inspection station from wherever they are in the State—even Mount Gambier or Ceduna—to get the vehicle inspected and the defect notice removed.

I put to the Minister: why does he not allow a qualified mechanic in the country town to inspect that vehicle and to remove the defect notice? I ask the Minister to look at the administration of the inspection station at Regency Park; it obviously has some major deficiencies at present in the way in which it is administered, and it is time that the Minister did something about it. We have warned him; I have warned him today; he was warned on the Trevor Ford programme; it is time that he took action. I will ask the Minister in a week or two what action he has taken to make sure that the administration is improved.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to deal with matters which came to our attention during the fortnight of examination of the details of the State Budget in the Estimates Committees. The two Ministers to whom I want to refer are the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister of Labour made some statements and some admissions which are cause for some concern. I have raised the question of on-costs associated with employment in South Australia and the impact that these on-costs are having on our employment base and our opportunity for employing more people. In this basket, we include things like long service leave, penalty rates, site allowances, workers compensation, and sick leave; a whole range of matters is lumped into this basket of on-costs, which have been escalating quite dramatically and alarmingly since 1973.

When we talk about pay claims and pay rises awarded by courts, we tend to overlook the effect that these on-costs have on the cost of employment and the impact that this has on the ability to employ. One of these that I mentioned—a new area being discussed by the Government—is the question of redundancy payments. During the Estimates debates, what I thought was some fairly alarming information was given to the Committee by the Minister in relation to the support of the South Australian Government for the claims before the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in relation to redundancy payments on two counts.

The first point that the Minister made was that the South Australian Government supported in full the A.C.T.U. claim, and the second was that he had done no calculation whatsoever—nor had his officers—in relation to the economic impact that this claim would have. The Liberal Party would be the last to disagree with the contention that redundancy has an enormous social impact on people who are retrenched. No-one denies that for a minute, and anything that can be done to ameliorate that situation must be done, but it is a completely irresponsible stance to institute a measure of this nature without having done a calculation of the economic impact of the proposal, because that will simply increase unemployment.

I am incapable of getting this point across to the Minister. He obviously does not talk to people who are employers. In one case an employer who employs 17 men previously

employed 50 (and even more at an earlier time) in a manufacturing industry. He said, 'If this redundancy payment scheme as envisaged is instituted I will close my premises.' He was not kidding. He said, 'I will have to make a provision which I am incapable of doing. I will withdraw capital from the project and close the business.' Such action would put another 17 people on the unemployment queue. However, the Minister told the Committee that neither he nor his officers had done any calculations on the claim.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions was claiming the following before the Arbitration Commission: three months notice of termination payment or payment in lieu thereof; four weeks pay for each year of service; one week's pay for each completed year of service when the employee is aged 35 years or over; an additional two weeks pay for each completed year of service in excess of 10 years service if the employee is aged 45 years or over; the full value of accrued sick leave, long service leave and annual leave with loading; maintenance of income payments for a period of 12 months after termination; any relocation expense; and the cost of training or retraining.

Even the uninitiated would recognise that that was a substantial log of claims in respect of redundancy payments. It has been put to me by a spokesman that this is an ambit claim and that the A.C.T.U. did not expect to succeed in achieving all these claims. However, the current Minister of Labour has made no bones about it: his Government supported the claim in full. What concerns me even more, however, is that neither he nor his officers had costed these proposals and that they did not realise the impact that they would have on the ability of employers to keep their workers in employment. I submitted to the Committee, as I now submit to the House, that the social cost would be far greater than that which the community is bearing at present.

Over the years the Leader of the Opposition has made public statements on the attitude of the Opposition on this matter: that, although no-one can argue with the basic proposition that we should ameliorate to our utmost the impact of retrenchment, to launch into a series of claims such as these without doing any homework is entirely irresponsible. I refer to some calculations which I believe to be accurate. An employee who has worked for a company for five years, who is under 35 years of age and who is given two weeks notice must be paid \$10 763.60 by the company. An employee who is 37 years of age, has given 10 years service and is given two weeks notice, is entitled to \$17 061.20. An employee who is over 47 years of age, and has given 20 years service, would be entitled to \$38 649.60.

No-one argues that, if these payments could be made, it would be fine. However, the impact of enacting such provisions would result in an enormous number of retrenchments being made immediately because employers, especially middle-sized and small employers, could not bear these added-on costs in addition to the basket of on-costs to which I referred earlier, and the move would obviously be counter-productive. It is similar to the situation that has emerged in relation to workers compensation and Government superannuation benefits. We well remember those pace-setting years of the 1970s when the then Premier (Hon. Donald Dunstan), who in my view and in the view of others presided over the economic demise of this State with his successive Budgets (in fair-weather times he could ride them out without much thought for the future), and promised at election after election all sorts of benefits. However, all of those benefits represented merely added-on costs to the employer, and the State Government, as a major employer, must meet those on-costs, one of which concerns workers compensation.

No-one denies the social impact of people injured at work or the absolute necessity of minimising industrial and work

place accidents, but to suggest, as was suggested then at election time, that we will have the best and most generous schemes in Australia (indeed, we did), has led to the current situation where the present Minister of Labour recognises that there is a major problem and so he is trying to turn back the clock.

Workers compensation premiums have reached the stage where they are inhibiting employment, acting as a real disincentive to employers to take on extra staff. They are an on-cost which the Minister now admits is too heavy for employers (and the State Government is a major employer) to bear. The Minister admits this and is now hell-bent on trying to turn back the clock. If the Dunstan Government had looked down the track and had had longer vision in regard to economic matters, and if it could have seen the impact of its proposals on succeeding Governments and thus on succeeding generations of taxpayers, it would not have been quite so ready to buy votes at succeeding elections. Now we have the Minister treading the same path in regard to redundancy payments. He has given no thought whatever to the impact of this action on employment and the ability of people to employ. I was astounded when the Minister told the Estimates Committee that he had made no calculations at all on the impact of the A.C.T.U. proposals which the present Government is supporting to the full.

Of course, every social impact has an economic cost. The social impact is not denied for a moment, but there is an economic cost associated with every attempt to ameliorate a social problem of this type and, in my sure judgment, I believe that the Government's proposal will not ameliorate that social impact but will make it much worse. It is the height of irresponsibility to get on the same treadmill as we were on in the '70s, when we were pacesetting without taking any account of the consequences of that legislation. The same thing is happening in regard to the Government's Superannuation Fund, about which there are some proposals, and it will be interesting to see the true picture in true course.

The other matter of some interest that came up in the Estimates Committee with the Minister of Labour was, as I mentioned, in regard to workers compensation. The Minister is now trying to turn back the clock as a result of the profligacy of the former Premier and Treasurer of this State. The Minister admits that it will not be an easy job to turn it back. Indeed, there was precious little demonstration of a real willingness to do that when amendments were promoted in this House and supported by the Government, some of which got through by the grace of the Australian Democrats in the Upper House; but there was precious little evidence there of a willingness to push the clock back.

Those amendments were simply to give effect to some industrial electoral promises which the Government made along with a whole basket of other election promises at the State election when it bought its way into government, as is the wont of Labor Governments, and then had to back down on a series of promises, particularly taxation promises, but the ones that it has kept are those that it made to the trade union movement and to workers in industry. That is why those amendments saw the light of day: they simply exacerbated the problems which the Minister claims he is trying to solve in regard to workers compensation.

The other area with which I want to deal in the remaining half of my available time concerns the performance of the Minister of Mines and Energy before the Estimates Committee. At least the Minister of Labour, the Deputy Premier, was forthcoming. I was alarmed at some of the things that he said, but at least he was forthright. However, the Minister of Mines and Energy gave an appalling performance before the Committee. He is the Minister for inaction and indecision. On a whole range of matters he believes that he does

not have to have an opinion, particularly in regard to matters involving difficult decisions.

Mr Gunn: Controversial matters.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If matters are controversial or difficult, the Minister considers that he is not required to have a view. The Minister of Mines and Energy is charged with overseeing enormous resource developments in South Australia, although he is a junior Minister, and well down the front benches: that is the importance that the Government attaches to his responsibilities. He is well down in the pecking order. Time and time again he dithered around, squirmed and changed ground. Time and again he said that he did not need to have a view. I shall give some examples.

The Minister gave an interesting performance to the Committee in relation to the Government's decisions to close down the Honeymoon and Beverley mines. The Honeymoon venture, he said, was a dead horse. He asked why the Opposition was raising this matter when it was a dead horse. The Opposition reminded the Minister of the reasons that had been given for closing the mine (none of which would stand up). In reply, the Minister said that no technical reason had been advanced to refute what he had said. He finished up hanging his hat on the fact that he believed that underground solution mining had not been proved up. So we asked the Minister whether he disbelieved the evidence contained in the e.i.s., which addressed the underground water question in some detail. He did not answer that question. The Minister did not want to say that he disbelieved the Department of Environment and Planning or the Federal Department which made the assessment. Then, it transpired that a special committee was set up to look at the matter of underground water. That committee recommended to the Government that no real problem existed in relation to underground water. The Minister and the Government chose to disregard that; in fact, the Minister was contradicted. The officers of the Department of Mines had a very difficult job, but they were loyal to their Minister: they tried to soft pedal their evidence. However, Mr Boucaut, the underground water expert from the Department of Mines and Energy, in his evidence completely contradicted what the Minister is saying in relation to effects on underground water. Mr Boucaut made quite clear to the Committee that there was no problem in relation to pollution of underground water from solution mining, and he stated to the Committee:

As previously mentioned, the risk of pollution in the aquifer systems at Honeymoon would be related to movement of pollutants into the aquifer system. The Underground Waters Technical Advisory Committee believes that that potential was low, particularly as the gradient in the water table in the various aquifer systems was very low. The movement of water naturally is very slow and any excursion from the *in situ* leaching process would consequently also be very slow. So, we felt that there would be ample opportunity should an excursion occur to trace and by well known techniques, which have been proven, stop that excursion and retain the pollutants.

That completely contradicts statements made by the Minister. Mr Boucaut was giving scientific evidence. That evidence completely explodes the Minister's statement that the Government turned down Honeymoon because of a problem with underground water and the pollution of aquifers from solution mining. The Minister was less than forthcoming on a whole range of other matters. Referring still to the Honeymoon project, a series of questions was asked in regard to unemployment generated by the Government's decision. The Minister was not very forthcoming in his reply. The member for Todd, in particular, questioned the Minister of Mines and Energy, because he had had representations from two of his constituents who had lost their jobs as a result of the Government's decision.

The present Government came to office promising to create employment, but it has closed down ventures where proponents were prepared to go ahead and where they are currently creating jobs. People were employed, but the Government has tipped them out of their jobs through its completely irrational decision. The Opposition explored that area at some length during the Estimates Committees because we believed that it was important to point up the Government's absolute hypocritical and irrational stance in relation to uranium mining.

The Government will allow Roxby Downs to proceed and to produce enormous quantities of yellowcake, yet it has closed down small operations on the pretext that they are unsafe. As I have said, the evidence of the Government officer, in this case, Mr Boucaut, completely refuted what the Minister was saying. A number of other matters also caused considerable concern in relation to the Minister's equivocation: for example, the Minister was not prepared to accept any responsibility whatsoever on a number of matters relating to the Canegrass Swamp dispute at Roxby Downs. The member for Eyre questioned the Minister on a number of matters in this area because, as members will know, the area is within his district.

The member for Eyre, for example, asked the Minister for his view in relation to a land rights claim that is being made by an Aboriginal spokesman. The Minister replied that he did not need to have a view, and the transcript shows that fact. The Minister of Mines and Energy is in charge of one of the biggest projects that this State has ever seen, he was challenged by an Aboriginal group with an interstate spokesman who said that there is a land rights claim in regard to Canegrass Swamp that is similar to the Pitjantjatjara land rights issue, and yet the Minister says that he does not need to have a view. What a cop out!

The Minister was also questioned about a series of anthropological reports that the Government has initiated and, blow me down, another one was initiated last week. All members of the Committee pursued this matter with the Minister. The Minister said that he had not even read the Hagen Report, on which the Government will base its decision. The Minister said that that was not his province; he said that it was in the lap of the Minister for Environment and Planning. The Minister of Mines and Energy, who is charged with the responsibility of the Roxby Downs project, has not even looked at matters that could affect the project. Surely that is the Minister's responsibility, yet he believes that he does not need to have a view and, in fact, he is handing over responsibility.

We also questioned the Minister about his attitude in relation to export licences. It took some time to extract from the Minister the fact that he would use his influence within the Labor Party to try and secure export licences for Roxby Downs. The Minister said that it really was not a matter for him and that the question of exporting uranium was of no concern to him. The Minister of Mines and Energy, who is in charge of enormous developments in this State, believed that it was not a matter for him but that it was a matter for the Federal Government! We then asked the Minister whether he would use his influence in Labor Party councils to change the Party's policy in relation to uranium mining (he would not do that); and whether he would use his influence to see that export contracts were written for yellowcake from Roxby Downs. After hedging for a long time, the Minister said that he would do that.

The Minister was also asked whether he would use his influence within the Labor Party to see whether export contracts could be written for other uranium developments in South Australia. After providing an answer that we did not understand, the Minister, when pressed, said that he would not do that. That is a completely untenable position

for the Minister of Mines and Energy in this State to hold. I refer to the Minister's attitude to the Roxby Downs development before the Labor Party's sudden change of heart. During the Estimates Committees the Minister was asked:

Last year when the Roxby Downs Indenture Select Committee was making its inquiries, two Opposition members (now both Government Ministers) on that Committee chose to write a dissenting report on the details of the indenture—a most unusual procedure. I am advised—and in that report the following statement appeared. It was signed by those two Opposition members (this is as recently as May or June last year on behalf of the Labor Party before it had its change of heart on the venture). They stated:

If Roxby Downs is to proceed, it will produce up to 400 million pounds of yellowcake during its life. In the present world scene some of this must find its way into bombs, because existing international safeguard arrangements are ineffective and unenforceable.

That is what the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister for Environment and Planning said in the dissenting report on the Roxby Downs indenture. When questioned in the Committee in relation to that statement, the Minister of Mines and Energy said in response, 'Oh, but we now have a Federal Labor Government. We can competently change our mind now in relation to my statement that this uranium from Roxby would find its way into bombs.' That answer would not stand up either, because the Minister was then questioned in regard to the fact that there was not a Federal Labor Government until March this year, and that the Labor Party changed its mind in relation to Roxby Downs within a few months after that statement was made in the dissenting Select Committee report.

So, the Minister changed his stance yet again, and this time he said, 'Yes, but the world scene is changing.' In May and June last year, the Minister stated that uranium from Roxby would find its way into bombs, but now the situation has changed and the Minister says, 'We are all for Roxby but not for anything else.' By some stretch of his imagination, obviously the Minister thought that uranium mined elsewhere in South Australia could find its way into bombs, whereas the uranium from Roxby would not, although in June last year he thought it would. These examples which I give to the House simply indicate the prevarication and—I do not think it is too strong to say—the dishonesty of the Minister, and his complete lack of ability to grasp the difficulties of his portfolio, to grapple with them and to make decisions. It was nothing less than a complete cop-out.

In relation to gas supplies, the Minister was waxing at his most optimistic. He was quite happy that we have gas supplies to satisfy the Sydney contracts and to supply South Australia well into the next century. It was my view that that optimism did not allow for the sort of decision that needs to be made in the immediate future in relation to our gas supplies. I received an answer to a Question on Notice as late as today that contradicts the information the Minister gave the Committee. As I say, during the Committee stages of the debate the Minister was very optimistic indeed about gas supplies. He stated that the reserves that one could expect from the fracking process, which has not yet been proved up (this is the freeing up of what is called tight gas in some of the aquifers), would run into many hundreds of b.c.f. (billion cubic feet). At page 29 of the *Hansard* report of the Estimates Committee the Minister stated:

The problem is whether those reserves are deliverable. Recent work is encouraging, but it is in the early stages. Of course, it will be expensive gas.

This is the tight gas. He further stated:

We place a very conservative estimate of 730 b.c.f. on those categories.

This is the answer that I received today to precisely the same question that I had on notice, and it states:

The increase in sales gas reserves from the Patchawarra formation is estimated at 227 b.c.f.

This is the fracking gas. The answer continues:

This estimate cannot be considered highly reliable as it is based on the assessment of only one frac and is unsupported by long-term production history.

It is clearly irresponsible of the Minister to give the Committee that sort of information. Even if we did the sums on the information that the Minister gave the Committee, the picture was nowhere near as optimistic as he was painting it. However, even as late as today, I received another answer which indicates that we still have a very long way to go to ensure that our gas supplies are satisfied.

The other interesting information which came up during the Committee was that neither the Minister nor the Premier had had any meaningful discussions at all to further the negotiations by the former Liberal Government in regard to rationalising those contracts. We were well advanced in those negotiations to ensure the energy future of this State. This Government, which has been in office for almost a year, has initiated no discussions at all in relation to that vital question. I was very disappointed and disturbed at the performance of the Minister of Mines and Energy. He sought to evade on every occasion. He has, on every occasion, failed to make real decisions which will further develop the enormous resources we have in this State. We know that he is in a bind. The Labor Party cannot sort itself out in regard to the resources of this State—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trainer): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): My contribution to the debate is intended to concentrate around the discussions held in Estimates Committee B on 6 October, when I and a number of my colleagues on this side of the House were granted the opportunity to question the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests (Hon. Frank Blevins) about certain aspects of his Budget detail for the year 1983-84. During that Committee's questioning I was somewhat alarmed to learn from the Minister that he proposes, whilst in Government, to substantially expand the State's involvement in overseas projects. In asking the Minister for more detail about his attitude in this direction, he indicated to that Committee in clear terms that it was the intention of the present Government to trade in connection with projects and expertise in South Australia wherever that opportunity may arise anywhere in any country around the world. I challenge the Minister's somewhat open approach to the subject on the basis that, in my view, he did not have the experience or understanding of the subject to support those intentions.

When we were in Government, and after I had taken over the portfolio from my predecessor (Hon. Mr Chatterton), the matter of overseas projects and our State's involvement in such projects was one of high priority. We were aware of the attitude that had been expressed and applied by the previous Government in relation to its contractual involvement in Libya, Tunisia and one or two other places in the Middle East region on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. We were further aware of the attitude of the Minister of the day and his style and approach to providing South Australian expertise, equipment and facilities to the countries I have identified and, indeed, to other places proposed for consideration by the Government of the day.

We were concerned about the attitude to which I have referred because we believed that the style adopted by the Government prior to 1979 was not, either directly or indirectly, in the interests of South Australia. We were providing a service; indeed, we were acting in a charity climate to

those recipient countries and not approaching the overseas project ventures with the sort of businesslike attitude that we believe should be applicable. On coming to office in 1979, the subject of South Australia's overall involvement outside the country was a matter of high priority.

With the support of Cabinet we adopted a policy in Government of being extremely cautious about those with whom we entered into contractual arrangements. In fact, at the conclusion in June 1980 of the Libyan contract inherited from the previous Government we decided on the basis of information available to us at that time that it would not be prudent or indeed in the short or long-term interests of the South Australian community to continue to be involved in a contractual sense with that country. We advised the Libyan Government via its representatives to that effect. We proceeded with a contract of arrangements inherited in Algeria. We proceeded to uphold our contractual obligations with respect to work that was already up and running in Tunisia.

We investigated and decided to pursue and ultimately obtained a very valuable contract in Iraq. However, other than in those identified regions of the Middle East I repeat that, as a Government, we adopted a very cautious and businesslike approach to other inquiries that were made of us. The present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) appeared to have scant regard for that cautious and businesslike approach when he made the remarks that he made during the Committee session on the afternoon of 6 October. After some questioning of the Minister by my colleagues and me on this subject, he withdrew, to a degree, from his open-ticket approach to trading with allcomers or at least selling South Australian expertise and having South Australian personnel involved in countries in the allcomer bracket. That withdrawal, to the degree that it existed, was most welcome.

However, this matter has concerned me, and on reading the Minister's remarks in *Hansard* I believe that it would be in the Government's and indeed the Premier's interests to have a chat with his Minister and have the matter aired in open discussion with his colleagues in Cabinet for the purpose of ensuring that this Government whilst in office adopts an approach to its South Australian involvement overseas similar to that adopted by the Tonkin Government. My expression of caution is simply a repetition of the policy that we adopted, and it is one that I would hope prevails without Party political connotation and division between members of this Parliament. It is a policy that we should continue to cultivate (albeit cautiously in those other countries that are prepared to buy our expertise) with a wholehearted and bipartisan approach from this end.

It is in the interests of South Australian secondary and primary industry generally for us to be involved in the upgrading of practices in the field of agricultural pursuits in those regions where they need the expertise and, in particular, where they are able to obtain the funds to pay for such expertise. In other words, consistent with our former and present overseas projects policy, each enterprise undertaken and each contractual arrangement entered into should be on a cost recovery basis for South Australia. Accordingly, the South Australian community is not then subsidising ventures of the kind that I have described.

The other matter I want to raise during this debate relates also to the Estimates Committee session of 6 October 1983. I refer to the report recently circulated in Adelaide following an inquiry into the activities and efficiency of our agricultural research centres throughout the State. I am satisfied from inquiries made so far that there is great concern felt in the communities of Minnipa, Parndana, Lenswood, in the Adelaide Hills, and Kybybolite, in the South-East about the recommendation to close their research facilities. It is rec-

ommended that all of these facilities and the land on which they stand be sold. The members of the working party, because of their positions within the private sector, may be competent people and I do not cast reflections upon their competency. However, this report fails miserably to support or justify the closure and sale of these facilities. My colleagues and I have appealed to the Minister of Agriculture to consider the views of local communities involved with this matter seriously before taking any step to implement any part of the recommendations contained in the research centre report. The Minister has given an undertaking to that effect and I am pleased to report that following disclosures by the Minister I am satisfied that he was fair dinkum in giving that undertaking.

It would be a great disappointment to me and of great concern to people in the South-East, the Hills, Minnipa, and on Kangaroo Island in particular if that undertaking was eroded in any way. I do not believe, having received reports from those regions, that there will at any stage in the foreseeable future be justification for closing these research centres. They are located in areas which have great need for agricultural research facilities and services. Relocating the Kybybolite centre at Struan would involve shifting a research centre to a community whose needs are different from those prevailing at Kybybolite. I think that the general upset and disruption to the communities involved and to their schools, stores and post offices is unnecessary and would bring no credit to the Government if it seriously pursued the recommendations contained in this report.

I believe that the people on Kangaroo Island deserve the Parndana research centre, which is located in the centre of the island and which has provided an essential service to agriculturalists in that region for the past 30 years. The region it services is a young agricultural one but a highly productive one. One does not have to make many comparisons to see that this is an important primary production area. For example, there are approximately 14 million sheep in South Australia, more than 1 million of them being on Kangaroo Island. In that context it is an important primary producing region of South Australia. I believe that a region so geographically isolated from the mainland deserves the continuation and maintenance, if not the advancement, of its agricultural research service.

There are about 450 farmers in the region, many of whom depend very heavily upon that service and will continue to do so, not simply for the testing of grain but also for the testing of fine seed and grain varieties, clover and grasses and other pasture varieties. We need to be ready and to have a facility in that highly productive area to cope with diseases should an outbreak occur, whether they be stock, pasture or cereal grain diseases. It is essential that testing facilities and research facilities are readily available in that area—by that I mean physically as well as technically readily available in the area. To suggest that that country or those rural people should rely on a facility located at Inman Valley or somewhere else in the Fleurieu Peninsula region, as proposed, is an insult to the intelligence and the activities of those people in that rural practice.

I want to raise another subject, given this opportunity, which relates to the Minister's comments on that same day (6 October 1983) when questioned on the future of the Port Lincoln abattoir. I am aware that our colleague, the member for Flinders, has expressed some concern about the future of that facility, as he did when we were in Government between 1979 and 1982. I might say with some pride that after careful investigation of the subject we adopted a policy and a course of action in relation to the Samcor facilities at Gepps Cross; that previously acknowledged service works was placed on a competitive basis with similar trades within the community and was required to face up to its respon-

sibilities and to meet its obligations; accordingly, its financial affairs were restructured to allow that to occur.

During the whole period in which we were in Government that objective was achieved, and again it was achieved last year. I am not so sure that its future in the immediate season will be quite so glorious, but, be that as it may, the guidelines are set. The role of the Samcor Board and its obligations to the State have been laid down clearly. I believe that they are understood, and I believe that at board level and administrative level at Gepps Cross, and at shop floor level on the chain and throughout the works, the employees know which direction they are taking and have a pride of achievement in mind when approaching their work. The Port Lincoln works was then and is now clearly a service works—an arm of the Samcor operation in South Australia—designed and installed to provide a service to a very isolated community of this State, albeit a very important grain growing and meat and wool growing community of this State—that of Eyre Peninsula.

That service works does not mean by title that it should necessarily run at a loss, but, circumstances as they are, costs of functioning an abattoir operation and the absence of adequate stock numbers available to these works clearly mean that there will be a loss factor incurred, despite enormous efforts to apply good management at all levels of those works. The situation has been, as I have said, and will continue to be, one of ensuring a service works to that community. It is, further, the responsibility of Government to minimise the losses in that or like service situations wherever they may be situated around the State. I hope that the present Government and Minister adopt the same approach to that service operation as we did when in Government during the period that I have mentioned.

I would be extremely disappointed if we were to take seriously the implied comments of the Minister of Agriculture during the Estimates Committee debate on 6 October for, without quoting him in specific detail, but certainly in import, he expressed the view, for example, that those works if under private enterprise would have closed down years ago. That is not a matter of fair comparison or fair comment in these circumstances.

I believe that the Minister of Agriculture should hasten to Port Lincoln and appreciate on site the service that the works provides. He should appreciate the employment that it provides, both directly and indirectly around the service structure and infra-structure of Port Lincoln and take on board the responsibilities that he clearly has as Minister to ensure that he makes every effort to maintain that facility. Indeed, the Minister should assist that works by investment from time to time when it is justified in order to maximise its attractiveness to the rural community and thus encourage, where possible, the maximum number of livestock in those works, whether they be pigs, sheep, cattle, goats or any other livestock that might become available to the board of management for processing purposes in the works.

The concern which I have expressed here today is shared by many people in the meat industry, certainly among my rural colleagues in the Liberal Party. Certainly, this is a matter of concern to the local member, the member for Flinders, and to a wide section of the community in Port Lincoln. It is against that background and the understanding of the requirements of that service and its continued maintenance in Port Lincoln that we as the Liberal Party in Government made a commitment to maintain a service facility on the West Coast for the period that we were in Government.

Certainly, I have no doubt that on the eve of our assuming office again we will make a similar commitment to that community not for the purpose of filling up policy documents but because we understand the need and because we mean

what we say. It does not negate our obligations as a Party or those of any Party in Government in respect of the responsibility of minimising the losses and insisting upon the highest level of efficiency that can be achieved in such a works.

I understand that this debate will go well into the early hours of the morning, and you, Mr Speaker, well know my feelings about the sittings of the House late at night. I have expressed them many times, and I make no apology for doing so in the remaining minutes available to me in this debate. It is disgraceful, as publicly described, for any Government to insist upon members of Parliament sitting here after everyone else in the community has gone home, after the sun has gone down. It is of no value to us or the institution, and the situation deserves urgent revision.

If we are to make ourselves effective in this place, sittings should start earlier in the day and we should close down when the sun goes down; that is, at a respectable hour of the day so that all members of this House have some opportunity to be reasonably alert and can apply themselves appropriately to the subject before the Chamber. It is stupid to say that we should muck around, as is proposed yet again now, and be here at midnight on this debate when it could well be cleaned up in ordinary and respectable working hours, so that members could apply themselves responsibly, were alert, and were in an appropriate position to do so.

I do not intend to pursue that subject further. I know that a few of my colleagues would prefer to be hanging around this place until the early hours of the morning rather than be at home with their families or elsewhere in places of comfort. As far as I and a number of my colleagues on this side, and indeed, some members opposite, are concerned, those members who have committed their situation (including, I am pleased to see from the paper, my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, who has publicly announced his view) believe that we should pack up and go home when the sun goes down. With just a minute to go, I acknowledge the courtesies of the Government and Opposition Whips in this place today in allowing me to enter this debate at this time of the day, at a respectable time, and not the time at which I was earlier allocated of 10.30 p.m. or 11 p.m.

Mr Mathwin: You might have done much better if you'd stayed late.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I do not think so. I am an early starter and I have been since an early age, and I intend to remain conditioned in that direction. If honourable members in this House and others want the best from the member for Alexandra, they will invite him to participate in such debates in the daylight hours. In those circumstances I will give my best, and my best is—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I will not take up the challenge of the member for Glenelg.

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

STATUTES REPEAL (HEALTH) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Debate on motion resumed.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): In noting the reports of the Estimates Committees, I wish to refer particularly to the Committee that examined the health and tour-

ism budgets. In regard to the health budget, I led the questioning for the Opposition on behalf of my colleague Mr John Burdett, who is the Opposition spokesman for the health portfolio. As he is a member of the other place, the Hon. Mr Burdett could not be present on a House of Assembly Estimates Committee. Having divorced myself from the health portfolio since having held it as Minister, I found it extremely interesting to examine what the present Government has done in health matters and the attitude of the present Minister of Health to his responsibilities.

I do not want to dwell at any great length on the health budget, but I feel compelled to say that I regarded the Minister's attitude in the Committee as being one of overbearing arrogance. One of my colleagues referred to many of his speeches as being examples of megalomania. I think that anyone reading through the report of the Estimates Committee debate would come to the conclusion that a Minister consistently engaging in praising his own performance has very little indeed to recommend him.

One notable aspect of the Estimates Committee debate on health was the Minister's constant insistence on centralisation of power and his inconsistency in respect of his attitude to himself as Minister rather than as chief executive officer. He continually denies that he intervenes in any executive or administrative decisions of the Commission, yet day after day we read in the papers reports of the Minister's getting involved in what could only be described as the fine details of administrative and executive decision making.

The Minister's performance at the Adelaide Children's Hospital both last Friday week and in the days that followed certainly demonstrated that he is ill-fitted to administer the health portfolio. For a Minister to go charging in to a hospital and to have a confrontation in the foyer of that hospital with a member of the hospital staff in the presence of the media, and to then go and have cursory discussions with the Board and announce that the problem was virtually fixed and that in future all complaints from nurses and doctors could be directed to his own office, thus by-passing boards and administrations, I think is an extraordinary reflection of Ministerial incompetence. I want to briefly elaborate on what will occur if the Minister pursues the course that he has selected. That course has extremely serious implications for the health services.

It effectively abolishes the whole concept of the independent managerial responsibility of boards; it effectively reduces any authority that administrators have within their own hospitals; and it completely negates any authority or responsibilities that sector directors have on behalf of the Health Commission (in fact, it by-passes the Commission). The suggestion itself is thoroughly wrong in principle. In practice, it is highly discriminatory because it means that only nurses and doctors will be selected by the Minister to have direct contact with his office and to make complaints directly to him about what they feel might be deficient or inadequate in the health units in which they are serving.

If a Minister cannot and will not rely on the authorities, both statutory and administrative, that are under his control and if he will not establish a chain of command that enables him as Minister to keep his distance from administrative problems and concentrate on leadership and policy matters, then that Minister is doomed to complete failure and the services under his control are doomed to chaos. I know the enormous strength of feeling in the health services in relation to this action of the Minister of Health. In effect, he has made the management of health services in South Australia absolutely untenable. It means that the lowliest nurse or intern can have readier access to the Minister than can his own commissioners, his senior staff (the sector directors),

the honorary chairmen of hospital boards and, indeed, the administrators of hospitals.

This is an extremely serious matter which strikes at the whole concept upon which the Health Commission was founded. It completely destroys the valuable work of the previous three years in trying to bring some semblance of decentralised management into the health services. In speaking of decentralised management, I stress that I am not in any way advocating that such management should not be undertaken in compliance with the health, economic and industrial relations policies of the Government of the day. Quite clearly, it should be, but at the same time no Minister can hope to pursue every little rabbit down every little hole. Indeed, if a Minister tries to do that he will find that the whole system crumbles under him. I believe that that will happen with the health services in South Australia because, as each month goes by, the Minister is trying to assume greater control, more centralised power, and to remove future responsibilities from people who in the past have exerted those responsibilities. It is clear that, when anything goes wrong in the health system in future, there will be no one else to blame but Dr Cornwall.

I now turn to the tourism budget. When the tourism Estimates Committee resumed I expressed my concern at the way in which the Government had placed the Chief Secretary and tourism votes on a Friday, thus imposing what I think was an unreasonable burden on public servants in expecting them to appear before a Parliamentary forum on a Friday night. I accept that under the previous Government the health and tourism Estimates Committees were both conducted in the one day and, therefore, the time for examining tourism was restricted to the hours between 7.30 p.m. and 10 p.m. In fact, we had an even shorter time this year, because questioning on the tourism lines commenced at 4.45 p.m. and concluded at 8.45 p.m. Had that time been well used by the Minister I might not have felt compelled to again voice my criticism. Reference to *Hansard* will show that the Minister used the time allotted to give a series of long filibustering answers, very long on rhetoric and very short on substance.

Although it was my intention to forward copies of the Estimates Committee debate to interested people in the tourism industry, I do not know that it is worth the postage, because there is so little of substance contained in the Minister's replies that the tourism industry would not be much the wiser for having read it: wiser perhaps only to the extent of recognising that the Minister appears to have a rather limp grasp of his portfolio. I would like to work progressively through some of the inadequacies demonstrated by the Minister's replies and indeed by the tourism budget itself.

The first matter that had to be addressed was the real increase in expenditure in tourism, and I questioned the Minister as to the level of inflation that could be expected to apply in respect of the principal allocations in the budget, namely the promotional budget, tourism advertising and promotion. If we were to take the Federal Treasurer's figure of 7.5 per cent inflation in the forthcoming year, then that budget represents a substantial increase. However, in answer to a question, the Minister acknowledged that the inflation rate in respect of electronic advertising will be 12 per cent to 15 per cent; in other words, practically double that which the Federal Treasurer has forecast is the general rate of inflation. For press advertising it will be 8 per cent to 10 per cent, and promotional brochures will increase by 15 per cent to 20 per cent. There is a considerable amount of work being done by the industry and the Department on developing new promotional brochures, and there is certainly a lot of work being done by the regions.

When one looks at the allocation of funds to the tourism regions, one finds that last year's allocation was \$240 000. This year it has been increased to \$290 000. If one divides that differential of \$50 000 between the 11 tourist regions, each region would receive less than \$5 000. If one assumes that many of those tourism regions would want to spend those funds on promotional brochures, one finds that they would receive very little value for money. In fact, each of the regions would be fortunate indeed to obtain one promotional brochure out of that alleged increase for the regions. I will come back later to the regions, because I think that the Minister really exhibited his greatest weakness in the Estimates Committee when he failed to come to terms with questions about allocations to the regions.

Returning to the general budget, I acknowledge the Minister's statement that in last year's promotional budget there was a significant component of production costs which had to be met. They were if not once only costs certainly initial costs that will not be repeated this year; therefore, some of those funds will be able to be put into extending the advertising. Nevertheless, the industry's view is that, whilst that promotional budget is an increase (and the industry recognises the increase), this is the least that the Government could possibly have provided, that next year the crunch will come, and that at least an additional \$1 million will have to be provided if the Government is to be able to implement its policies, sell South Australia overseas, as it has claimed it will do, notably in New Zealand and Japan, and pursue marketing policies in the Eastern States, Western Australia and Queensland.

The next issue, which is regarded with importance by the industry but was dismissed in a few lines by the Minister, is one raised by the member for Mawson and one which I would have raised had she not raised it, namely, the question whether the Government can seek a system in which tourist projects can more readily seek financial support with a great deal more confidence than at present. The honourable member asked the Minister to outline the major projects that the Department sees as having priority. The Minister could refer only to the Porter Bay project at Port Lincoln which I thought was a pretty thin effort when he must know that there are significant projects on the drawing board all around the State. The Lady Nelson Park at Mount Gambier is one and the proposal for an interpretive centre at Port Augusta is another significant project. Those projects are not secret and there is no reason whatever why the Minister should not have mentioned them in answer to a direct question from one of his own colleagues. However, he stated:

I do not think I should announce publicly any of the other projects which we are considering and which we believe are viable and should have some priority.

I acknowledge that the grants for Lady Nelson Park have already been allocated. I am not certain about what the Government is doing in respect to the Port Augusta project.

However, the Minister also did not come to grips with the point of the question, namely, whether the Government is going to develop a low-interest loan scheme, which is what the industry wants. It is clear that consideration by the Industries Development Committee of applications for loans is not regarded by the tourism industry as being what is required in all the circumstances of the industry's need for cheap money which could and should be recognised by Governments as a valid reason for a policy decision to provide such funds in view of the industry's capacity to generate employment. If Governments around Australia are really serious about generating employment, they will recognise that investment in tourism is one of the quickest ways in which such employment can be generated. Yet, there has been no recognition thus far by this Government of the need of the private sector for access to low-cost loans. The

Minister gave no hope or consideration whatsoever to the industry in responding to that question from the member for Mawson.

Another issue raised by me was tourism week. I sought information on costs to the Government and the taxpayer of tourism week. I commended the Minister for what I considered to be an excellent liaison between his Department and the media, and I believe it was a valuable community awareness exercise which cost the taxpayer about \$10 000. I believe that that was good value. However, after that event, I had discussions with the industry: I had no discussions with it during tourism week as the Opposition was not invited to participate in any of the functions. However, afterwards I contacted members of the industry to ask how they thought it went. I was greeted with bemused amazement. The first that most of them had heard of tourism week was when they read about it in the paper. It became clear to me in discussion that the industry had not been consulted about or invited to become involved in tourism week. There was an enormous amount that the various sections of the industry could have done to make tourism week even more effective if the Government had had the courtesy, the wit and the basic common sense to involve the industry.

If hotels had had sufficient notice, they certainly could have featured some kind of special on the menu or bar list or made other special offers. I am sure they would have been willing to adjust their advertising programme in order to take account of tourism industry week. Restaurants and bus tour operators could have done the same had they been invited to do so but they were not.

I believe that the failure of the Minister and the Government to involve the industry in the preliminary planning of tourism week rather than merely present it with a *fait accompli* as the week commenced was a failure that should definitely be rectified next year. Other aspects of the Budget which require comment are the lines dealing with subsidies towards the development of tourist resorts. This is an area which is regarded by the industry and the regional tourist organisations as being the Government's Achilles heel and one which has not been dealt with properly in this Budget.

To see the reason why, one has to go back and consider the history of the subsidy towards the development of tourist resorts. I should explain that these subsidies go towards what one might describe generally as public facilities which enhance the tourism infra-structure. An example would be the signposting of roads in the Adelaide Hills according to a very carefully developed system which is firmly supported by the local tourism industry in the Adelaide Hills and which benefits the people, visitors and everyone who has ever tried to get from A to B in the Adelaide Hills. Another example would be the upgrading or complete rebuilding, where appropriate, of caravan parks. Tourist information bays would be a further example. There is a wealth of opportunities for upgrading the infra-structure in the various regions through the provision of subsidies towards the development of tourist resorts, subsidies which are met by grants from local government and sometimes by money raised directly in the region.

Mr Evans: At moderate expense.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is correct. In 1979-80, \$480 000 was voted towards subsidies for the development of tourist resorts, and that was the year of the Tonkin Government's first Budget. I will accept that that sum was pretty well laid down in the Budget when the Liberal Party was elected to Government and we did not disturb that allocation. In the following year (1980-81), \$540 000 was allocated, and that is a considerable increase. The standards in a number of caravan parks around South Australia were not what they should have been, and it was recognised that they had to be upgraded. The 1980-81 finan-

cial year was probably the last year in which so many approvals were given in regard to caravan parks, and subsequently the Department looked to other forms of development of tourist resorts.

If we take somewhere between 1979-80 and 1980-81 as the base, and, for convenience sake, \$500 000 as the base figure, had considerable increases been allocated in line with inflation (not real increases, merely a stand-still Budget upgraded to maintain the value of the grants and to keep pace with inflation), with a compound interest rate of 10 per cent, which I think is fair enough in terms of capital works over the past four years, the grant should now stand at \$750 000. What is allocated in this year's Budget? The sum of \$342 000 has been allocated. In other words, subsidies towards the development of tourist resorts received less funds in 1983-84 than they received in 1979-80. If one looks at it in real terms, one sees that that sum is probably about half the value of the 1979-80 grant.

When one realises that the carry-over of approvals from last year amounts to approximately \$200 000, one recognises that this year's grant is more than half swallowed up by a carry-over from last year and the Government is rapidly approaching the situation where the carry-over approvals actually exceed the grant.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is absolutely scandalous, and you know it!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before the Minister came into the Chamber, I said that I was about to elaborate on the background on this matter, which I will now do.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We provided more this year than you did last year and—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! The member speaking deserves to be heard in silence.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I was looking at the Chair when I started to say that I was about to read from the 1980-81, 1981-82 and 1982-83 lines.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In 1981-82, \$319 000 was voted for this line and \$308 000 was spent. That was not because the sum was cut back but because, as the Minister would know, funds allocated in that year were not spent in that year. The following year (last year) \$331 000 was allocated to this line and, as the Minister quite rightly said, this year \$342 000 has been allocated to it. That is not an increase in real terms. I am glad that the Minister raised the matter of job creation schemes, because he would know as well as I exactly what the tourism industry thinks of job creation schemes—it thinks that they are a farce and an insult. The Minister knows as well as I and the industry know that the criteria for job creation schemes do not match the requirements of regions for capital grants. Job creation schemes, in general terms, require money to be spent in areas of high unemployment, and the Minister knows that most of those areas are in the metropolitan area.

Mr Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trainer): I call the member for Mitcham to order. Interjections, especially when a member is out of his seat, are out of order. Also, I ask the Minister to cease interjecting.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I seem to have hit on a raw nerve with the Minister of Tourism. It is interesting to see his reaction to my remarks, because he knows that the tourism industry is very doubtful about the value of job creation schemes as a substitute for supplementing subsidies for development of tourist resorts. Why did the Government not recognise that if it wanted to create real long-term jobs in the private sector it could have allocated at least another \$500 000 (or even \$250 000) to the subsidies

towards the development of tourism resort lines, thus enabling private operators, contractors and construction companies in the regions of South Australia to create the kinds of jobs that will last? The building of caravan parks and establishing road signs, etc., will result in standards being upgraded, thus enabling the regions to attract more visitors.

The increased number of visitors will create an increased number of jobs, so there will be a double issue of job creation, one at the construction level from capital subsidies and another at the operational level, because tourist operators will be able to provide a better product for visitors as a consequence of which visitation will grow. I am being critical of what the Government has done but, on behalf of the industry and in the industry's interests, I am also being critical of what the Government has done, without in any way attempting to disguise the fact that under the previous Government funds first increased quite considerably and then, because of financial difficulties, were reduced. However, they were not reduced to the levels that this Government is proposing.

Certainly, we do not indulge in any misleading exercises by saying that these funds will be supplemented by job creation funds. It will be very interesting to look at the applications for the development of tourist resorts at the end of this financial year and see exactly how much money has been allocated from job creation funds to supplement that miserable sum of \$342 000 which the Government has allocated in this Budget.

Other aspects of the Budget are open to severe criticism, but fortunately I have motions on the Notice Paper that will enable me to deal with those matters in private members' time tomorrow. I repeat that the Minister's handling of the Estimates Committee did not do him or his officers credit. The fact that he was unable to provide much basic information to the Parliament is an indictment of the fact that he is very much behind in his homework and simply has not devoted the time that he should have towards giving approvals for the applications—and, after all, the Estimates Committee was here to examine just that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I take this opportunity to make one or two comments on the Estimates Committees. As commonly known in this place, programme performance budgeting and the Estimates Committees were introduced in this Parliament by the Tonkin Government. It was interesting to me, having been involved as a member of the Tonkin Government during the first three years of the introduction of programme performance budgeting and the Estimates Committees, to look at how the programme worked from the other side.

I am still convinced that the objective of programme performance budgeting and the Estimates Committees, if the system is allowed to work properly and if the Government provides the information that is sought by the members of Parliament, is an excellent one. However, we saw a number of instances in those two weeks where members were frustrated by the fact that Ministers were not prepared to provide detailed answers. In other words, they took the opportunity in many instances to beat around the bush and not be completely forthright in providing the information, for which purpose the Estimates Committees were truly set up.

Not only is the programme performance budgeting approach of tremendous benefit to members of Parliament and the people of South Australia, giving a proper insight into what is going on in Government administration and within the Government departments, but the programmes

certainly provide members of the Public Service throughout the various Government departments with a far better insight into what is going on in their own departments. I venture to state that many public servants employed in various Government departments do not have a great deal of insight into the broad base of their departments other than in the areas in which they are involved and for which they are responsible. Certainly, the programme documents provide a text of what is going on in the departments, showing what the long-term objective of the Government is and what progress is being made.

I trust that the Government will not continue to try to frustrate the Estimates Committees by providing in some instances as little information as possible, but will recognise the Committees for what they truly are: an opportunity for information not only to be provided to members of Parliament but to be readily available to the people of South Australia as a whole.

It is interesting to note also how the attitude of present members of the Government has changed dramatically from what it was when they were in Opposition. Certainly, it is unfortunate that the Chief Secretary has temporarily left the Chamber, because he was extremely critical of the manner in which the water resources portfolio was handled during the period when he was in Opposition as the then shadow Minister of Water Resources. I well recall the comments that he made in this House about *naegleria fowleri*—the amoeba which causes amoebic meningitis in the distribution system throughout South Australia.

In the Estimates Committee I asked several questions of the current Minister of Water Resources on this subject about what he had done since coming to office that was different from the approach adopted when I was Minister of Water Resources. When it comes to the crunch, the present Government has not altered one thing in the administration of the water resources portfolio and, in particular, in regard to the management of the distribution system throughout South Australia. The present Chief Secretary, who was most critical two or three years ago that *naegleria fowleri* was evident in the country distribution of South Australia, has been most quiet since coming to office. The present Minister of Water Resources readily acknowledged that last summer *naegleria fowleri* was widely distributed throughout the water distribution system in this State. When questioned about the State Water Laboratories and about whether the number of persons at that facility had been increased, he indicated that there had been no increase.

That was an area about which the present Chief Secretary was extremely critical, and he claimed that the former Government was neglecting its responsibilities to the people of South Australia in that it did not supply sufficient scientists in those laboratories. It is interesting to note that, after the Labor Government has been in office for 12 months, the number of scientists employed at the laboratories remains exactly the same as when the Tonkin Government left office. Certainly, the situation rings a little hollow when one looks back through *Hansard* at the various comments made by members of the present Government who are now Ministers. It does them little credit, because they have done absolutely nothing to correct the position. One of my major concerns in the Estimates Committee during the examination of the water resources lines was that I believe that we are reaching a critical stage in regard to the total assets of the E. & W. S. Department.

The assets to which I refer relate to the sewerage system in South Australia, principally in the metropolitan area, and the water distribution system of the State. Members will be aware that in South Australia there are about 22 000 km of distribution mains for water from the Murray River throughout the State and that many of those pipe mains

were laid many years ago. In fact, some of those pipe mains were originally laid in cast iron concrete lined pipes and in certain areas of the State where there is much chemical reaction with the cast iron, the cast iron in many instances has corroded and we have been left with just the concrete lining carrying the water.

As a result of that, much of the strength has gone from the pipes and we have a situation where throughout the year we are confronted with many burst pipes. Obviously, we are reaching the stage where some of the assets of the water distribution system are reaching the end of their effective life. I am concerned that no real provision has been made in the capital works programme for an effective replacement programme. If the current situation is left to go on for too long, obviously an absolutely mammoth capital works programme will be required to replace the existing assets. It is hard to estimate the total capital value of those assets in South Australia, but certainly it would have to be in excess of \$2 000 million. That would take a lot of replacing!

It was indicated that a study has been undertaken within the E. & W.S. Department and that a report has been completed which is in the hands of the Minister of Water Resources. I asked the Minister whether that report would be made available to the Parliament, as I believe that it is absolutely essential that Parliament should be aware of what the situation is. As I have said, we are looking at a massive capital investment in this State, and every member of Parliament should be aware of what the replacement cost would be in the longer term. The report, which I believe consists of some seven volumes, is an internal report prepared within the E. & W.S. Department. It is not a criticism of the present Minister that the situation is as it is at the moment, because this is a matter that has been developing over many years. However, it is a problem which must be grappled with and faced up to. By simply putting it off and not letting the people of South Australia, and members of Parliament in particular, know what the situation is is not doing the State a service, because in the not too distant future the Government of the day will have to face up to a massive capital expenditure programme that will be required to maintain that tremendous distribution system throughout South Australia.

It is recognised as being one of the significant distribution systems of any State or country in that we supply water over such a vast area from a single source. That asset must be maintained at any cost. Certainly, the productivity of South Australia is very much dependent on agriculture and the rural areas and, if there is a major failure of the system not only will the provincial cities of South Australia suffer enormously but the ability of agricultural areas to maintain their levels of stocking and the provision of stock and domestic water to the agricultural producing areas of this State will dramatically diminish. I trust that the Minister will see fit to make the E. & W.S. Department report available to Parliament so that Parliament can assess the overall situation. This matter is of major importance and the present Government should not be afraid to make the report available to the people of South Australia.

When the former Liberal Government was in office the present Minister of Mines and Energy on a number of occasions referred to the level of water rates that had been set in this State and whether or not the Tonkin Government was endeavouring to create a surplus in the operation and administration of the metropolitan water supply. It is interesting to note that the 22 per cent increase that the present Government instituted in South Australia this year will amount to a surplus in the operation of the metropolitan water supply of some \$5.5 million.

Traditionally, Governments have tried to operate and fix water rates in the metropolitan area of Adelaide at a level

that would roughly break even during a financial year. We now have a distinct break from a policy that has been exercised for many years by successive Governments. The present Government has deliberately set a rate that must be paid by people living in the metropolitan area, and it will bring in about \$5.5 million in excess of actual operating costs. That is something that has not received any publicity in the metropolitan area, and the Government has not bothered to inform the people of metropolitan Adelaide about that fact. In other words, it is using the metropolitan water supply operation as a Government revenue raising instrumentality.

A similar situation exists in country areas, to which I referred at length during the Estimates Committees, that is, the 28 per cent increase in water rates in Government irrigation areas. I keep returning to the 28 per cent increase not just because of the inability of irrigators in Government irrigation areas to meet the increase but also because of the situation with the Renmark Irrigation Trust in the Riverland, which is alongside the Government irrigation areas.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust has a similar rate structure to that applying in Government irrigation areas. In other words, growers pay approximately the same amount for the supply of water on an annual basis. In the Renmark Irrigation Trust area the Trust must meet 100 per cent of its operating cost as well as loan commitments to the State Government in relation to the Renmark Irrigation Trust rehabilitation of the distribution system.

As I have said, the Trust meets 100 per cent of its costs and must also meet repayments on loans. However, in the Government irrigation areas, which have a similar rating base and where farmers pay a similar amount per hectare for the supply of water, the State operation covers only about 25 per cent of the total cost. In other words, the Renmark Irrigation Trust is some 400 per cent more efficient and effective in the supply of irrigation water to ratepayers compared with the current Government operation. I appreciate that the Engineering and Water Supply Department provides other services in the community that the Renmark Irrigation Trust does not provide. However, that in itself is of no concern to individual ratepaying irrigators.

If we compare like with like, we have a situation where the Renmark Irrigation Trust can effectively supply its growers at a quarter of the cost charged by the State Government. That is a Government decision. It is the Government's affair if it wants to run that type of operation. However, to turn around and say that irrigators must pick up the short-fall in the style of operation run by the Government is quite absurd. Growers have no say whatsoever in how Government irrigation areas are run and, what is more, growers in the Government irrigation areas can do nothing whatsoever about the situation. The Government has turned around and said that water rates must rise by 28 per cent this year.

It is anyone's guess what the Government has in mind for the irrigators next year when it is only recovering 25 per cent of its costs and, in a like situation, the Renmark Irrigation Trust is recovering 100 per cent of its costs. Obviously, the Government is passing the buck to the ratepaying irrigators, and that is just not on. The Government needs to put its own house in order rather than try and lumber an industry that does not have the ability to meet that type of increase. The Government needs to put its own house in order and recognise that the industry just cannot meet that sort of payment. I believe that the State Government, if it is to persist with this 28 per cent increase, will have far more to lose than it will gain, because many more growers will be forced off their properties, and many more growers will not be able to meet that 28 per cent commitment.

The Federal Government's social security payments and community welfare payments will be dramatically increased. As I have said before in this House, the situation has deteriorated quite dramatically in the past 12 months, and that is indicated by a 100 per cent increase in the number of unemployed persons in the Riverland.

So, there is ample proof that the irrigators in that area do not have the ability to meet that 28 per cent increase. Once again, I call on the Minister to withdraw that 28 per cent increase, to have a study undertaken by the Director of State Development in order to determine what and if any increases that industry can withstand, and, whatever determination is arrived at, it should be applied. So, I trust that the Government will have the nous to realise that it cannot get blood out of a stone and that if it persists down this line everyone, including the Government, will lose.

The other area of considerable concern to me was the fishing industry, the attitude which had been adopted by the Minister of Fisheries towards that industry, and the statements that he had made in endeavouring to bring pressure to bear and force the professional fishermen to paying increased rates by the threat of increasing the number of boats operating in the industry, by limiting the amount of catch able to be taken from that resource, and by not allowing the transfer of licences.

In other words, the Government, through the Minister, deliberately set out to create a situation of blackmailing the fishermen into accepting the massive increase in rates that it had decided would be applied to that industry. Certainly, the massive increases were in the area of the abalone fishing industry, which is a very high risk industry, and one where I believe the fishermen involved do not have a terribly long working life, because of the pressure of diving at depths of 80 ft to 100 ft all year round, in all seasonal conditions. This soon takes its toll on their health. As such, those involved in this type of industry must, of necessity, make a fairly significant return on their investment as quickly as possible because it is not the sort of industry that one can remain in for 30 or 40 years.

As I said, the effect on one's health in that industry certainly limits the length of time that fishermen can be effectively involved in it, and the Minister seems to be absolutely obsessed by the fact that abalone fishermen are making too large a profit from that industry. However, as I say, they can remain in that industry for only a comparatively short number of years. They have to be able to make reasonable profits during the period because they do not have a long time in the industry. That is something that I do not think the Minister has really been able to take on board or come to grips with.

Also, I raise the matter of the ridiculous situation which has developed in the Department of Marine and Harbours requiring all fishermen to possess a coxswain's licence. That is fair enough and is a logical conclusion in relation to many of the larger boat operators. However, when we have a department or a Minister requiring that a Murray River fisherman in his 12-ft or 14-ft dinghy have a coxswain's certificate to operate or row that dinghy, things have reached an absurd stage. These fishermen have been on the river for many years. If one needs a coxswain's certificate to row a dinghy on the Murray River, things really have got out of control.

As I said in the Budget Estimates Committee, that would surely have to be bureaucracy at its best. If one can go up the Murray River in a 65-ft houseboat without a licence (and rightly so—and that is how it should remain for the sake of the tourist industry), how can we at the same time require a professional fisherman in a 14-ft dinghy to have a coxswain's certificate? That line of thinking is almost beyond belief, and one cannot understand the Government's

taking that sort of action. Whilst the matter is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Marine, the Minister of Fisheries could not believe that that was the case until I assured him that it was so. I trust that, on behalf of the industry for which the Minister for Fisheries is responsible, and in particular on behalf of the river fishermen, he will take up the matter with his colleague the Minister of Marine and ensure that that ridiculous situation is resolved as soon as possible.

The other area on which I would like to comment is in relation to the arid and pastoral lands of South Australia. During the time of the Tonkin Government and my time as Minister of Lands, members opposite had a great deal to say, and expounded their knowledge at length, on the pastoral lands and arid lands of this State. It was interesting to note at that time that, while they were so hotly opposed to any form of secure tenure in the pastoral lands—their belief being that any security of tenure would lead to the degradation of that land—they were unaware that some 30 per cent of the pastoral properties in South Australia were on perpetual lease. We have seen the present Government in office for almost 12 months. Its members had a great deal to say about the future of the arid and pastoral lands of this State, but to this time we have not heard a word from the Government about its plans for those areas.

Pastoralists and people living in the North of the State are left wondering what the future holds for them. The same applies in relation to the freeholding of land, which has always been, from a philosophical viewpoint, opposed by Labor Governments. However, it is interesting to note that in this Chamber some two or three years ago, when I introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act to allow for the freeholding of irrigation leases, the present Government did not oppose that legislation.

It is also interesting to note that since the Government came to office no further perpetual leases in the irrigation areas have been freeholded, nor have any of the Crown perpetual leases in this State other than those applications which were lodged prior to the 6 November election. After all, there is a provision in the Crown Lands Act that has been there probably as long as the Crown Lands Act has been in existence that provides for the freeholding of Crown leases in this State. However, once again the Government has seen fit to drop the axe on freeholding and not allow, even though the laws of this State provide for it, the law of the land to operate.

Finally, I refer to the Shack Site Review Report, a very detailed report which was handed down in March of this year and which could very well determine the future for many shack owners. That report has been in the hands of the Government for six months. It was prepared by a very effective committee representing Government interests, local government and the Shack Owners Association. Still the Government has not had the courage to grapple with that report, to accept it and let the people of South Australia involved with shacks know exactly where they stand. Many of its recommendations will give secure tenure to people with shack interests.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to be able to speak in this debate on the Appropriation Bill debate this evening. I would like to commence by referring to a question that was asked in this House on 2 June 1983. It dealt with firearms and was addressed by me to the Chief Secretary. The question was as follows:

Will the Chief Secretary say whether amendments to the Firearms Act and amendments to the regulations have been prepared and, if so, whether such amendments have been put to Caucus and

agreed to by Caucus? If that is the case, can the Chief Secretary tell the House when these amendments are likely to come before this Chamber and whether some of the restrictions will be eased? Further, can the Chief Secretary give some assurance that there will be no increase in fees?

Without going into the full details of the answer, I quote part of the Chief Secretary's reply as follows:

I will give no undertaking that there will not be an increase in fees that apply in relation to the Firearms Act. I could not do that, and I do not think that any member of a Government would be prepared to give that undertaking. I have not had a look at the fee structure, but that does not mean that that will not happen.

It is interesting to note that the Chief Secretary says that no member of any Government would be prepared to give that undertaking because, if we look at his policy speech, given in October last year, the then Leader of the Opposition was prepared to say (speaking on behalf of the Labor Party):

We will not allow State charges to be used as a form of back-door taxation.

He went on to say that the A.L.P. would not introduce new taxes, nor increase existing taxes during its term of office. However, if one reads that correctly, one sees that the then Leader of the Opposition was clearly linking charges and taxes as one and the same, making it quite clear that, if his Party were to gain Government, there would not be an increase.

Unfortunately for South Australia we have had, I believe, more than 30 increases in State taxes and charges. I have had the feeling that perhaps those charges are coming to an end and, even though they would not be increased for three years, the Government has increased so many of them that the possibility of more increases was very unlikely.

One finds in the proposed amendments to firearms regulations a new recommended scale of fees to be introduced from 1 September 1983, although we are still in the 14-day period during which such fee increases can be opposed. Thankfully, the member for Eyre has moved a motion to do so today. Let us look at these increases in fees, bearing in mind that the Chief Secretary said in June that he had not had a look at the fee structure involved here. The fee for registration, duplicates and so on, has increased by exactly 100 per cent. This certainly can only have a detrimental effect on another section of the community. The other three fees involved are being increased by 33½ per cent. Firearms licences will cost \$24 for three years or \$8 a year: they previously cost \$6 per year. Dealers licences will increase from \$60 a year to \$240 for three years, or \$80 per year. Pistol licence fees will increase from \$6 a year to \$8 a year. In his policy speech made in 1982 while Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said the following:

We need a Government willing to work directly with the private sector, to take the lead to unlock investment funds and create real jobs.

An objective in the Labor Party platform stated the following:

... we believe that the primary thrust of Government economic policy should be to develop employment opportunities and to use all means at its disposal to achieve this end. This includes creating a climate for private investment and employment; productive expansion of public sector activity ... Labor's expenditure policies will be designed to stimulate employment in both the private and public sectors of the economy while meeting social needs.

However, we now see that dealers licence fees will increase by one-third after an unequivocal guarantee being given that there would be no increases in taxes or charges. If that is stimulating the private sector, I fail to understand the English language.

I know that there are people in the electorate of Goyder who are going to be severely affected by this change in the law, particularly as it relates to dealers licences. One example I can think of involves a small shopkeeper who sells firearms in a limited capacity. The rest of his shop area is used for selling toys. This increased licence fee of \$240 for three

years will cause real hardship for this man, who is endeavouring to get back on his feet after facing tough times in the past 12 months to two years because of the drought, as is typical of many rural economic enterprises. It is a great shame that the Government thinks it is necessary to impose an extra licence fee of this kind despite its promises. Not only that, but people in rural areas who are able to take time off to perhaps enjoy the recreation of pistol or rifle shooting will have to pay a higher licence fee, a fact that I mentioned earlier.

So, it is hitting right across the board, let alone at the farmer who needs a firearm to protect his stock against animals that can be pests—all of this being instituted by a Government whose Leader gave a clear undertaking not to increase taxes and charges. Let us look a little further at the specific policy that the Labor Party put forward, and I repeat what I said earlier. It was stated:

Labor's expenditure policies will be designed to stimulate employment in both the private and public sectors of the economy while meeting social needs.

Unfortunately, that does not seem to be eventuating in other areas as well. In addition, the Leader said:

We need a Government willing to work directly with the private sector, to take the lead to unlock investment funds and create real jobs.

That is a responsibility that any Government in South Australia must face—to create real jobs. Yet, in going to businesses, I find that there seems to be a deliberate move to try to put a certain business out of production. I do not wish to mention the name of that business this evening, because I am prepared for further private negotiations, but I will say that in my electorate an engineering firm is working hard to employ people. At the beginning of the year that firm was employing four part-time workers; currently, it is employing three permanent employees and seven part-time workers in addition to the manager—a very significant increase in less than a year. Unfortunately, the manager has had to meet certain commitments: there have been solicitors' fees; raw material suppliers have demanded payment in regard to earlier ventures; and a finance company has demanded some payment.

So, it has not been possible for this enterprising person to outlay the amount of capital that he would have liked in the first few months of operation, but that does not seem to worry the Department of Labour, the representatives of which have repeatedly demanded that certain safety aspects be updated forthwith. The time given to him to update has in all cases been very limited. I have had to step in personally and endeavour to seek an extension of time. To date, it has been successful, and I give full credit to the Department of Labour for at least negotiating to that extent. But I was very disheartened when I learnt that new deadlines had been set and that a senior officer, in relation to employees of this company, had stated:

Employees working here would be better on the dole than working in conditions which could be hazardous to their health.

That is what is thought of employment—it is better to be on the dole! So much for the Government's undertaking to stimulate industry and create new jobs. I inspected the conditions, and, although I will not put myself forward as a safety expert, I think I have enough knowledge to work out whether or not something is dangerous. It was very strange that the equipment being used at present was deemed to be satisfactory 12 months ago.

It was deemed to be satisfactory when it was installed. Most of it was installed in the 1970s, certainly in the mid-1970s and onwards. Now the same equipment is being put under scrutiny, and the owner is being asked to comply with new safety conditions in just a matter of weeks. It seems wrong to me that such undertakings are expected at

a time when unemployment is increasing and when an enterprising manager is trying to help unemployed people by giving them the chance of a job and to progress in our society.

Other points also disturb me. It is well known that most other engineering firms in South Australian country areas, especially within a 200 km radius of the District of Goyder, have similar equipment that does not have any of the safety features that are required of this company, yet no pressure seems to be put on those companies. Why is one firm being singled out? Again, it seems that the inspectors arrive at any time, whether or not the manager is present. Surely it would be simple courtesy to advise the manager that an inspector is coming on a particular day, but that has not occurred.

The last visit took place at a time when the manager was in Adelaide trying to get some of the safety matters attended to by arranging with firms to undertake that work. As a result of that unexpected visit by the inspector, one of the firm's employees had pieces of paper put in front of him and it was virtually demanded that he sign them to indicate that the premises were not up to a satisfactory safety standard.

Any other person in private enterprise or even non-private enterprise would require that notice. Certainly, with most public sector departments one would not gain an appointment unless a prior arrangement had been made. Such a simple courtesy would not be hard to undertake. Further, workers have heard that one inspector said, 'We have put out certain working orders now. Once all this is done we will be looking at other works to be undertaken in this factory as well, because the owner is not going to get away with just preparing these items that we have specified.'

It seems almost to be a catch-22 situation, where the firm will never be able to catch up. One example concerns a separate area put aside for spray painting. This is one of the few engineering firms to provide that facility, but it seems that perhaps the facility is not quite up to current standards and that this spraying area is to come under scrutiny. True, it would be much simpler to just move outside into the open and pollute the atmosphere, but I do not know whether that will be a consideration of the department. What sort of costs are involved in bringing about a satisfactory safety level? If it is a minor cost, I suppose we can understand it. One brake press will require suitable electronic eyes so that once a worker is ready to operate the press no-one else can move into the area.

This brake press works at a current rate of six strokes per minute. Back in 1975, and I believe even after that, such a press did not require any additional safety practice. Having seen it in operation, I would be amazed to find that a person did not have enough space to move away from it while it was coming down to press a particular object. It is a very slow machine, and in fact the safety precautions might be such that they would prohibit or limit the use of the machine. Anyway, to put in the appropriate safety equipment for that machine would cost about \$6 000. This is a small company that is involved with some four part-time employees at the beginning of the year. It is now employing three full-time employees and seven part-time employees.

The D.L.I. has given the instruction that if things are not up to scratch by the deadline date that has been given the machine or machines involved will be banned from use. As most people would know, a very significant fine can be incurred if anyone uses a machine or machines after such an order in regard to them has been made. In fact, if one machine in particular was put out of operation the whole company could stop overnight. But it should be remembered

that in his policy speech the present Premier as Leader of the Opposition at that time said:

We need a Government willing to work directly with the private sector, to take the lead, to unlock investment funds, and create real jobs.

So much for that statement. I refer to another example relating to a completely different type of industry in the rural sector. Again, I do not intend to disclose specific details at this stage. I am prepared to give the Government more time for negotiation, even though to date many hours have been spent in negotiation. The industry concerned will acquire a considerable area of land again in the electorate of Goyder. It will employ probably only some five people altogether, but many part-time workers will be required during the year. As well as investing many hundreds of thousands of dollars initially, it is estimated that annually it will bring some \$18 million into South Australia. It will be no small enterprise.

The problem in this case is that this industry requires a large supply of water but unfortunately the water supply in the area in which it would be located is unsatisfactory at present. There is reticulated water there but that would not provide the appropriate flow of water. The Government has been asked to upgrade the pipeline. In real terms we are not looking at an excessively large amount of money when one considers how much the company would have to pay in annual water rates. I believe that the Government's outlay would be returned in something like seven to 10 years, or maybe sooner, depending on the rate that is fixed on the finance.

Although the Government has come part of the way to financing such a pipeline, it seems that it is not prepared to go the whole way. It would appear that the Government is prepared to sacrifice another important industry for South Australia, an industry that would bring in some \$18 million in real wealth a year. Again, what can we say about the objectives as stated by the Premier that the primary thrust of the Government's economic policy should be to develop employment opportunities and to use all money at its disposal to achieve this end?

Mr Mathwin: Just words!

Mr MEIER: Yes, that is becoming blatantly obvious. It is a great tragedy for South Australia, because the second example that I have given is a classic example of the fact that the Government can act if it so desires. It seems that that is not the Government's policy. I have mentioned two examples where the Government is not implementing its election commitments and, in fact, it does not seem to be interested in doing that.

Mr Mathwin: It's a timid Government.

Mr MEIER: Yes, it is a timid Government. The Government is quite happy to pay out money to create jobs from the point of view that a person can only be employed for a limited period. However, when it has an opportunity to put money into a pipeline so that another industry can get underway the Government is not prepared to go all the way. When the Government has an opportunity to prevent or temporarily stop some of the restrictive legislation, it seems that there is a never-ending battle to try and get the Government to do just that.

I could spend my time better than constantly seeking help to ensure that restrictive aspects of the D.L.I. have to be held up so that a company that employs 10 people at present can keep going for a little while longer. I hope that the company continues for a long time, because I believe that it will employ many more people in the not too distant future, provided that restrictions do not strangle it. I have mentioned other examples and I refer again to the petrol tax and the liquor turnover tax. In fact, I was speaking to a publican in my district the other evening. He is the owner

of a privately owned small hotel and he indicated that the new tax will cost him between \$5 000 and \$8 000 according to his calculations. That is a severe impost, and he only recently purchased the hotel.

Mr Ferguson: He must have a big turnover.

Mr MEIER: I cannot say what his turnover is, but I shall be happy to tell the honourable member the name of the town outside the House.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Were you saying this last year in respect of taxes?

Mr MEIER: I am saying it here tonight.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Were you saying it last year when your Government was in power?

Mr MEIER: I was not a member this time last year. I did not become a member until 6 November, so I will take it from the time that I became a member of Parliament. It would not have been appreciated if I had endeavoured to give a speech from the Visitors' Gallery.

Mr Ferguson: Double standards.

Mr MEIER: How can the Government possibly justify any of the increased taxes at present, bearing in mind that before the last election the Labor Party clearly stated that there would be no increased taxes? The then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, regarded taxes and charges as one and the same thing. Why was such a statement made? We have certainly heard Parties that have won Government coming into Parliament and saying that the financial situation was not quite as it had expected, and that has occurred in Victoria, in Western Australia and federally—but that is another story. It is easy to try and justify increased charges. I do not think the electors will swallow it. The electors are sick and tired of broken promises from this Government. As I mentioned earlier, after I had thought that we had seen the last of increases in taxes and charges, it is disappointing that firearm licence fees will also be increased. That is the one revenue raising area under the responsibility of the Chief Secretary.

Mr Mathwin: What about on-the-spot fines?

Mr MEIER: I will let someone else take up that matter because my time is fairly limited. I hope that this Government will give real thought to small business, the South Australian economy, the rural economy, and not keep imposing higher taxes and charges for the remainder of its term of office; it is so easy, with the stroke of a pen, to do just that. We are finding that industry is trying to come out of a depression. Further, the rural scene is looking promising at this stage, and it needs every encouragement. I pointed out two clear and specific examples where that encouragement could occur, but it does not seem to be occurring at this stage. I therefore bring it to all members' attention, and I hope that every pressure will be put on this Government to ensure that it does not continue in the way it has for the period it has been in office to date.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): In this debate I want to raise a matter of concern to country people. It is dealt with in the Review of Research Centres—the report of the Research Policy Advisory Committee dealing with places of research and scientific investigation into agriculture. It has given rise to a lot of concern amongst country people in my district, in the Adelaide Hills, on Eyre Peninsula and in the Upper North.

Another area that has come under surveillance is the Arts Council. At Kingston a conference was held last weekend, and the results of that conference impinge not only on the South-East but on the whole of the State. It is interesting to read an article from the Kingston *Leader* heralding this conference. The headline states:

How to deal with a difficult committee member.

I do not know what relativity that has to the article. However, I imagine that there will be many difficult committee members after they read this article and see its consequences, which will be felt in some regions, in relation to the Arts Council, right throughout South Australia. I will leave it to my experienced and learned colleague in another place, the Hon. Murray Hill, who is the shadow Minister for the Arts, to perhaps tell me more about this matter tomorrow. The opening paragraph of that article states:

In line with present thinking by the arts bodies in South Australia, the Arts Council is taking a new direction, and formulating new policies. The whole spectrum of their activities is to be widened. Less emphasis will be placed on touring and more assistance and encouragement given to local groups, in the form of workshops, residencies, exhibitions and arts access type programmes. The organising of an Open Zone Conference is in keeping with this new attitude and direction.

The article also states:

Peter Sarah, General Manager of the South Australian Arts Council, will speak about the Arts Council as a whole, its achievements and its hopes for the future, to be followed by Robin Cutbush, from the South-East.

I happen to know Robin Cutbush, who is a very fine gentleman. The article continues:

Chris Winzar, acting head of the Department for the Arts, will speak on Local Government and the Arts. Chris began his association with the arts some 16 years ago, when as a young and ambitious professional actor, newly graduated from NIDA he experienced the 'joys' of country touring throughout South Australia, New South Wales and Western Australia. Chris has seen many changes over the intervening years.

The article also states:

Most will be amazed at the level of community arts being carried out in the South-East. Michelle Hogan, Community Arts Officer with the South-East Cultural Trust, will give conference visitors an insight into what's being done in this line.

It also states:

An opportunity not to be missed, to see the result of Kay Gordon's work! As well as the verbal attractions at the conference, there will be a varied selection of arts and crafts . . . The conference commences with an hour long session for Arts Council delegates, when the first speakers begin.

I have a copy of Peter Sarah's notes. Although I have not met him, I daresay that I will after I speak about this matter. The sting is always in the tail, so one must read the last bit first. He is quite a character and quite witty, stating:

Some of the changes I've outlined are very different from what we have been discussing with branches over recent months; however, they represent, we believe, the most exciting, distinctive and necessary way for our organisation to best utilise its funds in servicing the arts needs of rural South Australia in the 1980s and 1980s.

It's not simply a case of 'tricked you' or a wild change of course from previous years, but rather a culmination of many papers, discussions and considerable thought and work by all the staff over a number of years. We hope you will join us in the new challenges and programmes that 1984 offers. The road is new but the path is familiar—

that is a political statement—

and there are many hurdles to jump. Yet, by tackling the problems this way we again can give the Arts Council not only a distinct role, but a vital one—something we have lost over the past few years.

We started with some quotes—let's end with a few, for they, too, can apply to the Arts Council.

—I may not be totally perfect, but parts of me are excellent!

—I'll listen to your unreasonable demands if you'll consider my unacceptable offer!!

That is the sting in the tail. However, we must look at the initial quotes. The heading states 'Zone Conference, October 1983'. It was held at Kingston, I believe last weekend. The starting quote, a tribute to Elizabeth Sweeting, states:

Public subsidy should be a tool for change, not an excuse for conservatism.

Peter F. Drucker states:

A ship that spends long periods of time at sea needs to be cleansed of its barnacles or their drag will deprive it of speed and manoeuvrability.

We all know something of that practice. The next quote is as follows:

Success for public organisations always means organising for the abandonment of what has already been achieved.

We can apply those quoted examples to many things. Yesterday, some concerned ladies came to my office and their general thrust was that there will be changes in the arts. I do not completely misunderstand the problems Mr Peter Sarah, Director of the Arts Council, has with funding, which indeed most of us have. I refer to page 3 of the notes where reference is made to the rationalisation of touring. I do not wish to quote the gentleman out of context, and therefore not do him justice, but he states:

With the constantly rising costs, and the level of response we receive to our touring programme, we have no choice but to face the fact and admit we cannot continue to tour large-scale productions to all towns in South Australia. Added to this the time taken in procuring shows suitable for such an enormous range of venues, the majority of them too small and poorly equipped, makes touring, as we know it, artistically and financially untenable. Let's bite the bullet now and recognise there are more effective ways of using our funds in developing the arts.

However, given the size of the town and district population, and the possibility of purpose built theatres in a number of regional centres, our touring of State companies and other similar ensembles should be rationalised to play the six regional centres or theatres in South Australia. The proposed circuit would be Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Renmark, and Mount Gambier.

God bless those hallowed centres. He further states:

Touring on a regional centres model could be viable. Also, few towns in the State (Ceduna is one exception) would be more than 1½ hours drive from any of the above centres.

I question that statement. However, he continues:

While this rationalisation of touring may be disappointing to many branches, we must face the facts, for country populations are unlikely to rise over the next 15 years and therefore our audience base will not increase, and, no matter how elaborate our productions are, there will always be limitations between what we can present in fully equipped regional theatres compared with smaller venues in many towns. The quality of the productions offered by the two State companies in regional theatres, as part of our 1983 programme, doesn't stand comparison with the traditional touring shows we have offered for the past 10 years.

I think that that is the gravamen of what Mr Sarah put to the conference, and it probably sums up in a nutshell the problem that he faces as Director of the Arts Council. I have received telephone calls from the ladies at Naracoorte and other areas and, of course, they are pressing their great concern that their own show may wither on the vine. In recent times we have seen at places like Penola big extensions at local and Government expense, and I refer, for instance, to Rymill Hall. The Naracoorte Town Hall has had extensions to it, as have buildings at Bordertown and Kingston (although I cannot speak with authority on that) and, of course, Millicent has a very fine civic centre. I also refer to Lucindale. These places have received these visits and I understand, from what has been put to the people, that they will not have these distinguished people come to them and, if they do, it has to be on a private funding basis: the subsidy will not be paid.

There are some real problems for the Department and the Premier (who is the Minister of Arts), and I am not doubting that. However, I wonder whether this is going perhaps a bit too fast too quickly and it is a matter that this Parliament should talk about. I am not a full bottle on this, but my constituents have asked me to raise this here, and I am doing so. Looking at the arts vote, we find that this year it totals \$23.174 million, which is not inconsiderable and which is a rise on what was put up last year. The actual vote last year was \$19.68 million and \$19.79 million was spent. That is a moderate increase. However, when we look

at the yellow book in the programme performance budgeting papers, we see that it is against what Mr Sarah said; we should look at what the Parliament said. Page 181 of the yellow book, under the heading 'Department for the Arts, Agency Overview', refers to the following:

CORPORATE/MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

To foster the pursuit of excellence in all areas of the arts.

To encourage the most efficient use and development of the State's artistic cultural, natural history and heritage resources and facilities.

To identify and enhance the arts input to the State's economy.

To promote an awareness of the arts as an industry and its potential as a major generator of employment in South Australia.

To promote joint development of the arts, tourism and recreational facilities to maximise their economic potential.

To assist development of the arts and of high quality arts venues and facilities in both metropolitan and country areas.

I emphasise 'country areas'. It continues:

To support the staging of all forms of artistic activities, performances and exhibitions and to promote the public's access to and appreciation of those activities.

It further states:

To assist the collection and display of examples and items of technological interest and develop displays of the State's historical and political heritage.

Amongst the issues, we see the following:

Increases in 'leisure' time, due to shorter working hours, and other factors, together with an increasing awareness and acceptance of cultural pursuits by larger sections of the community, have and will continue to increase the demand for expanded arts activities/facilities.

It further states:

The arts are, however, able to generate significantly increased ongoing employment opportunities as the industry generally applies a very high multiplier effect to the assistance provided, thus generating considerable revenue and attracting relatively high capital inflow.

It is interesting to see the strategies stated in the programme papers under the heading 'Agency Overview', as follows:

The Department's strategy will be: to establish an effective organisational structure with adequate staff to fully achieve the Department's objectives; to service the various advisory committees and administer provision of arts grants; to continue to closely monitor use of arts funds; to develop recommendations for policy and operating initiatives appropriate to the community's and arts industry's needs; to promote more effective/efficient administration and promotion of the arts; and, to encourage increased public and private sector support for the arts and to maximise revenue generated by the arts industry.

I have no quarrel with those statements, because there are well heeled people and people with enormous initiative in the community who will take up the strategy. A further strategy is this:

To establish a liaison with the tourist industry to identify ways of promoting joint development...

I have not quoted all of the strategies. Referring again to the yellow book, at page 181, under the heading 'Implications for Resources', it states:

Significant capital funds for the S.A. Museum redevelopment and funding for development of regional and minor arts and museum venues will be required in the longer term—

and surely it will—

Increased operating funds will be required in future to adequately staff and implement the S.A. Museum redevelopment project as recommended by the Edwards Report.

That was a very fine report. The quotation continues:

If standards are to be raised and frequency of performance maintained, support for the arts industry generally must be maintained. Major arts organisations will seek to improve efficiency and review charges, where possible, in order to maintain current levels of activity by maximising revenue earning strategies. Increased staffing and operating funds will be required to enable increased arts research and promotion work to be pursued by the Department.

Under the heading 'Agency Overview', on page 182, the following is stated:

The proposed total expenditure for the 1983-84 financial year is \$31 903 000 which is an increase of \$6 951 000 or 28 per cent on the 1982-83 financial year. This increase includes \$2 806 000 of recurrent expenditure and \$4 145 000 capital expenditure which provides for extraordinary maintenance in respect of the Adelaide Festival Centre, for the S.A. Museum Redevelopment Project and for upgrading the Art Gallery Store.

Mr Sarah does not have a corporate department of unlimited means. My plea tonight is on behalf of those concerned ladies and gentlemen who have rung me today. I have seen the fine theatres at Mount Gambier and Port Pirie, and there is one in the pipeline for Renmark, all of which will be suitable for putting on good shows, and it is reasonable to expect that people will attend them. Concern has been expressed to me by people from such places in the South-East as Millicent, Penola, Bordertown, Naracoorte, Kingston, Robe, Lucindale, Keith, and other comparable places across the State, but particularly by representatives of a Naracoorte art group who came to see me and by people who rang me today, that they are required to provide their own funding from now on. In a few weeks Colleen Hewitt, a well known singer, especially to Liberals, will be performing in Naracoorte, and her performance is attracting much attention. This type of artist demands a big fee, and nobody denies them that, but places such as Naracoorte, Lucindale and Millicent cannot take the full onslaught.

There is another side to this: we should remember, and I am sure that Mr Sarah remembers—if he does not I can draw it to his attention that this State went through a nasty drought last year: the primary industries suffered; they were ravaged; our flocks and herds were diminished; and our wheat crops were down. Mother Nature (the country) was taking a bit of a holiday. So, the Government's coffers were not filled, and that caused some problems in itself. Then came the horrendous bushfires and the drought. Trouble never comes alone, as is its wont. Perhaps, by these national calamities we have gone down the tube a bit.

I see the Minister smiling quietly on the bench. He knows that the glorious North through which he drives each week has an unprecedented wheat and grain crop in the offing. We will see enormous wheat cheques this year. If one wants to see some generators in action, look at cockies when their pockets are full: they are great economic people.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Frank Blevins fixed up the season for you.

Mr RODDA: We could even give them a concert if this thing all comes to fruition, but we do not want to lose sight of the fact, as I can appreciate, that there are perhaps some problems for the strategy. I could imagine Mr Sarah saying to me, 'All right, Mr Rodda, where will you get the taxes from to give me the money you are talking about?' There has to be some balance. He gave a good speech: there was a pointed message in it. Talking to the people who were present there, I found that it certainly had its effect.

I do not think that there should be a shut-off—a *carte blanche* turning off of the tap—but that is what will happen. Looking at Whyalla and Port Lincoln there will be some hot speeding for those people centrally situated in those regions driving 1½ hours into these major centres to see *The Merchant of Venice* or some other top show that the Arts Group may put on there. If one puts it on in six strategic places across South Australia, saying that they are all 1½ hours equidistant, with the exception of Ceduna, I think that the gentleman was stretching the imagination too far. It is little wonder that these ladies were rather concerned when they fell in their member's door yesterday morning.

I am being a little tough on Mr Sarah, but it is not a bad thing for people to perhaps gild the lily and hand out some messages to the Minister who, after all, takes the responsibility. I am sure that the Chief Secretary and I would be as

aware as is anyone that it is the Minister who takes responsibility for whatever his officers may say.

I do not know who wrote the article in the *Kingston Leader*. I would be interested to know how to deal with a difficult committee member and what relativity it has to this article, but it has caused a lot of concern amongst the people who are extremely interested in the arts. Let me say something else: concerning Mr Sarah and his Arts Group the matter is to their great credit. I notice somewhere in the remarks reference to other interests, such as tourism.

I will say something about libraries that have been put into the community. We have them throughout the South-East and they have been wonderful assets in the communities, stimulating interest in many things. We cannot have too much of that and of these first-class shows. It is obvious that if they have a season in Mount Gambier, in its wonderful theatre, they could not fit in that same show at Penola and Naracoorte, for instance.

Let us have something, but perhaps not so often. Surely such areas should not be left out altogether, and that is what I am saying. There is not an inconsiderable vote this year to the arts, and such an amenity should be shared in an equation that provides equity for everyone. To chop off such towns but still ask them to dig deeper is not fair. Reference is made to workshops, planning projects with and of the community and not simply for the community, more extensive field work, and co-operation between branches and community groups. Much effort is being put in and I hope that it is not just lip service. After all, something is being taken away.

What will happen to the capital that has been expended? I refer to the position at Penola. Will Rymill Hall just wither on the vine? It has been suggested that the Department of Agriculture tear down established places and create others? Businessmen and farmers have been through the mill, arguing across the table with bankers, seeking sorely needed funds, and they have had to worry about meeting the repayments of principal and interest. Decisions have to be taken. In regard to the arts, the same attitude must prevail.

I hope that the Government is not telling these people to draw back and cut services hither and thither, because it is the Government that has to carry the baby. It is the Government's baby for the time being. If decisions are passed down, it is the Executive's responsibility. The Executive takes advice from its officers, and mostly it is good advice. I refer to the community in the South-East and elsewhere in South Australia. The General Manager has said that such facilities are available within 1½ hours from the main centres.

There are many digitectors, as the Minister now on the front bench who is responsible for their administration would know. Those people would have a field day if they got to shows on time. It is a long way and roads are not so good. Under this plan, people will not see such shows, and I cannot stress the position strongly enough. The arts are doing a wonderful job. The arts have an appreciative and large following that is getting bigger. We find that senior students in high schools and tertiary students are tremendously interested and appreciative of what the Arts Council has brought to the country. I am sure that some productions can use the facilities at Naracoorte, Millicent, Kingston and Bordertown.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: I remember a meeting at Naracoorte which was a fine meeting.

Mr RODDA: I was not there. The Minister asked me to go to Naracoorte, but I had to go somewhere else, and on another occasion I still could not attend. There are fine meetings at Naracoorte. The Government has provided the House with much information. I read the Estimates Committee debate, but there was not too much about the arts. The Leader of the Opposition asked about something for

Kadina. It was a short debate. Perhaps it was timely. Perhaps the Kingston meeting had not come on before the Budget Estimates Committees were in readiness.

Having regard to the volubility and concern expressed by the people who came to see me yesterday as well as those who phoned me today, we could have kept the Estimates Committee's examination of the Chief Secretary's lines going for much longer than was the case a couple of years ago, and probably with equal vigour. The matter has sent more than a ripple through the district. I am pleased to have had this opportunity to raise the matter in Parliament and I hope that my remarks will not fall on deaf ears. I hope that this will provide a catalyst in so far as it will let the people that I represent know that the matter has been raised in the highest place in the land and that what has been said at Kingston will not go unheeded.

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate, because I enjoyed the proceedings of the Budget Estimates Committees. They gave honourable members an opportunity to raise matters of a general policy nature as well as specific matters concerning their electorates. I want to deal first with the Committee that examined the lines pertaining to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I am pleased that the Minister is in the House at the moment. We did not get a great deal out of the Minister. It was fairly obvious that he was using a fairly straight bat and that he was batting on a fairly sticky wicket. We gave him the benefit of the doubt. We endeavoured to be most charitable and to not get offensive or aggressive towards him, and I went to some lengths attempting to work out why the honourable member appeared to be so awkward.

In the course of one of my usual visits to the library I happened to pick up the Labor Party paper the *Herald*. I have now come to the clear conclusion that the reason why we could not get anything out of the Minister of Mines and Energy was because the member for Elizabeth was not sitting behind him, because it is he and his colleagues who are the architects of the policy. I was fortunate to pick up the *Labor Herald*. Page 21 contains a full page advertisement entitled 'Say "No" to nuclear war'. It states:

Say 'No' to uranium mining. Demand the phasing out of the uranium industry. Write to Mr Hawke, Mr Bannon (the Premier), Mr Holding, Mr Bowen, Mr Cohen and Mr Walsh.

It then states in big black letters:

No Roxby Downs, potentially the largest uranium mine in the world. No other new mines. No new export contracts. Cancel existing contracts with countries testing or dumping.

A large number of signatures appeared on this rather notorious document: there is a Carolyn Burrowes, of Unley; Peter Duncan, M.H.A., Elizabeth; the Flinders University Club; the Young Labor Club; and there is a Mr Stewart Sweeney, who was also the writer of another notorious article which appeared in the South Australian Institute of Teachers magazine and which was quite scurrilous and untruthful. I would think that he sits on the extreme left of the political spectrum. I would not want to do the honourable gentleman any mischief or to reflect on him at all. I might say that this advertisement did not appear in the *Advertiser* but in the *Herald*, South Australia's Labor voice, and there on page 21 is this paid advertisement.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think the voice has laryngitis?

Mr GUNN: No, I think that it was the Minister who had laryngitis, because he kept repeating one particular line. As a fair minded and reasonable person, I would say that the honourable member is aware of the futility of the type of nonsense engaged in by the member for Elizabeth and his colleagues. Unfortunately, the member for Elizabeth and his colleagues have the numbers, so the Premier and his colleagues have to ride out a difficult storm. It is unfortunate that it is the people of South Australia who will miss out. It is the people of South Australia who will pay for the games engaged in by the member for Elizabeth. The member for Elizabeth is controlling the Minister and the Premier like puppets on a string, similar to a Punch and Judy show. The member for Elizabeth is standing behind a curtain pulling the strings, and the Minister and the Premier are jumping up and down.

All afternoon during the Estimates Committee, we heard the Minister of Mines and Energy talking about uranium and Canegrass Swamp, but I will talk about that in a moment. The Minister skirted around that issue. We then thought that we would give the Minister a break and discuss other mining matters in Aboriginal areas in relation to the haematite problem. The same people are involved in that area. For years Mr Holding has been promoting and cultivating extreme left wingers, and he has infiltrated these areas with his people. I note that the Chief Secretary is laughing, but he knows as well as I the sort of people I am referring to, and I might name some of them for his benefit. We know what they have done. Their main purpose is to organise for the Labor Party. In fact, a few weeks ago one of them mistook one of my colleagues to be a member of the Labor Party and he was explaining to him what the Labor Party could do to get a better vote in the area and how they could organise. He did not realise whom he was talking to. That was a great effort!

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What sort of answer did he get?

Mr GUNN: I understand from my colleague that he was most interested in the advice that he was being given, and he encouraged him to give the information freely, which the person in question did. As I have said, the haematite situation was discussed in the Estimates Committee. It was suggested to the Minister that we had already lost \$30 million and that we would lose more money. I pointed out to the Minister that in the long term it was fairly obvious that it would be necessary to amend the Act, and the Minister grudgingly agreed. I believe that the Minister and the Government will not have the courage to do that. It gives me no pleasure to continue my criticism of the Minister.

Mr Trainer: Of course not!

Mr GUNN: Of course not, because I am a charitable fellow. I would not like it to be thought that I was taking unfair advantage of the Minister. However, when this sort of material appears and one has to sit for hours—

Mr Mathwin: Did it appear in your letterbox?

Mr GUNN: No, it was prominently displayed in the Library. I was quite amazed.

Mr Ferguson: How come the library does not have the *Australian Liberal*? Do you have something to hide?

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member would like some good reading material, I can help him out. I recommend that publication to the honourable member for his close perusal on a monthly basis.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Tell us about Queensland while you're on your feet.

Mr GUNN: Which particular part of Queensland does the Minister want me to refer to? I can tell the Minister a lot of good things about Queensland. I am aware that the Minister wants to sidetrack me, but he will not get off quite so lightly.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Why aren't you up in Queensland helping the Liberal Leader?

Mr GUNN: I understand that, under Standing Orders, I am obliged to be here tonight, and that is my responsibility. I also understand that uranium is being mined in Queensland and in the Northern Territory. At this stage our help is not required.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to ignore interjections and confine himself to the motion.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker: members opposite are trying to ruffle me, and I may lose my place. I am pleased to see that the member for Albert Park is present in the House. We saw the spectacle during the Estimates Committees of a number of Labor members standing up and reading out Dorothy Dix questions. One member picked up the wrong bit of paper and asked the wrong Minister a question, and he did not even realise that he was doing it. That proves just how incompetent some people are, like parrots reading from a wrong piece of paper.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It was not the Minister of Local Government. I understand that the press secretary had the papers shuffled and could not get them sorted out quickly enough, as a result of which he handed the wrong one to the wrong member. The member for Albert Park, of all the members, was the only one in the Labor Party who applied himself to the debate, and I would compliment him because he did—

Mr Mathwin: He's a contender for the front bench you know.

Mr GUNN: The member for Hartley would be the prime contender: he was trying out the seat this afternoon, so there must be some competition. However, I will leave that matter and turn to one or two other matters. Where does the Minister of Mines and Energy now stand in relation to the problems at Canegrass Swamp? As he knows, the company has been constructing a road, and it will very soon be reaching the stage where a decision will have to be made. I was interested to hear the comments of a constituent of mine, Mr Warren, from Coober Pedy, who was reported in an article in the *News* on 19 September 1983, written by Mike O'Reilly, and headlined 'Aboriginal elders seek sacred register'. It states:

A group of Aboriginal tribal elders has asked the State Government to help it prepare a historic register of sacred sites and boundaries in South Australia. The group, of at least 14 elders of tribes in the north of the State, contacted the Premier, Mr Bannon, with a request for help in developing the 'master plan' for sacred sites. The elders today called for public help in finding funds to carry out the work.

Further on, the article stated:

Mr Warren said he was angry Aborigines in the Canegrass area had not asked him to take part in talks with Roxby Management Services because he believed he would have cleared up misunderstandings which arose after work had begun on the road and pipeline. The spokesman for the elders said the register of lands and sites would help development companies wanting to explore Aboriginal lands to know in advance any areas which must be avoided.

Another article in the *News*, referring to the same gentlemen, states:

Mr Warren claims he is the tribal caretaker of the area. He said he had not been consulted by the Aboriginal protest group members who were 'too young' to have any authority under tribal laws. He said there would be no desecration of sacred sites if the road tracked through the middle of the swamp.

To my knowledge that statement has not been corrected. Mr Warren has lived in my electorate for a long time, and I sincerely hope that the Minister will take note of what he and all those people who have been supporting him in this

matter have had to say, so that the project can proceed. I hope that we will not have any more of these 'professional Aborigines' engaged in stirring activities purely to get publicity for themselves. It is quite obvious what is taking place. One only has to have a certain amount of knowledge of what has been taking place in these Aboriginal areas in the past five or six years. Many of the people who have centred themselves in Alice Springs and in the Aboriginal areas are totally unqualified to be advisers. Many of the European legal aid people—lawyers—are more interested in political activity, which I believe has had a detrimental effect on the Aborigines. I believe that their actions to date have done nothing to help the Aborigines. We have been told time and time again that the Aboriginal people want economic independence.

The only way they are going to get economic independence is for them to be in a position to exploit in a proper and regulated manner the minerals within the lands under their control. They are not going to be helped by these people who continue to make politically motivated statements and take action—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the Chief Secretary wants to walk around the House making those sorts of comments, I can really rub him up. He was out of his place.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has the call.

Mr GUNN: The House is in a relaxed mood tonight. I do not want to be difficult, but the course of action that just took place was unnecessary. I have made these fairly strong comments because I feel strongly about these issues. I have been going to those areas since 1970 and there has been a run-down in the areas. They have not improved as they should have. There has not been a great shortage of money in the areas, and I believe that the only way to help the Aboriginal people to help themselves is for the Commonwealth Government to appoint people who have a practical understanding of the problem, who are capable of managing cattle enterprises, who have some understanding about how to run businesses and who go there because they have a desire and not because they want to be involved in political activities.

I know I have upset people by my comments but I make no apology whatsoever. I know, from the first time I went there, the comments that those people made about me. Therefore, I am sorry that more South Australian people cannot be taken up there and shown exactly what is happening in those areas. I believe that if we could take a large number of people from the metropolitan area and show them the situation they would be very concerned at the conditions currently prevailing. During the Estimates Committee debate on the budget for the Minister for Environment and Planning, there was a great deal of discussion in relation to the effects of the vegetation clearance regulations, and we had an interesting debate with the Minister. I was not satisfied with some of the answers, and I believe that the Minister and his Department still have some way to go in clearing up a number of these areas. I wish to read a letter dated 20 September from the District Council of Peterborough to the Minister as follows:

Dear Sir,

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of 11 August 1983, regarding the vegetation clearance controls, in reply to council's concern as expressed in letter form. In practice, the legislation may be working in some places but in this area it is almost farcical. Representations have been made both by telephone—one councillor and myself—and personally (another councillor) and a visit has been made to the area by the area representative, Mr David Duncan, who had time for only a brief inspection. I wish to make it clear that no blame is being attached to him in connection with the application for wood-cutting. He has seen the thickness of the scrub area and knows that one tonne of wood

can be cut from an area of a quarter of an acre in this type of scrub.

The position has been explained to Mr Tim Dendy that the vast proportion of applications made from this area were from townspeople, several of whom are pensioners. They have been regularly cutting firewood for regrowth requiring a small amount of wood for fuel for winter heat. The cold at Peterborough during the winter period is intense. When temperature readings were taken at Yongala, some nine miles away, this was frequently the coldest place in the State during the winter months. The townspeople have been obtaining firewood from the scrub for a century and the scrub density has not been affected.

I quote one case that is most frustrating. An aged pensioner has been collecting his own firewood for years. Being too much of a gentleman to do anything that might place another person in trouble, he refuses to do anything other than legally; he is waiting approval for his two tonnes only per year. The application was signed by one of the owners. The consultation copy was received from the Department dated 24 June 1983. The first telephone call in regard to this application was placed from this office on 29 August 1983, to ascertain the reason for delay of the approval.

I was informed that a letter requiring further information had been sent. (In actual fact the letter is dated 30 August 1983.) It appears that the application had lain unattended, all for the total of two tonnes of wood per year. The applicant had to write a letter stating that no more than two hectares would be used for the wood, even though the officer was assured that the removal of the wood would be from a far smaller area than this and would be unnoticeable. When the letter arrived from the Department, the following was enclosed:

- 2 page letter (copy enclosed)
- 2 copies of a large area of the hundred of Coglin
- Example plan
- Aerial photograph
- 1 addressed envelope.

I could go on and read the rest of the letter, but I do not think that it is necessary because that clearly explains the problems that my constituents are facing. I want to refer to another matter in my electorate and that is the Olary School. The member for Mount Gambier raised this matter on my behalf, and I received a letter dated 23 September 1983 headed 'Re: the Olary Rural School', which stated:

You would be aware, Mr Minister, that Mr J. Connell, the Northern Regional Director of Education, has put forward his recommendation to close the Olary Rural School at the end of 1983. Members of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia, North East—Zone 16, wish to formally voice their opposition in expressing concern at the possible closure of the school. This seems unjustified when the attendance has averaged eight students over the past five years, and indeed, would remain static for the next three years with the present population. Although static, the enrolment situation could change overnight, if only one new family with a couple of children moved into the district after the drought has broken, which, incidentally is said to have been the worst drought in the history of the pastoral industry, and has not broken in the North-East yet. There being no alternative, students would be forced to study by correspondence lessons; contact with other children would be severely restricted and competition would be limited. In an area, which has been in drought for the past three years, we, as a united organisation, feel strongly enough to write on behalf of the community of the town and outlying pastoral properties who would suffer adversely through business and employment. When making your final decision on the possible closure of the Olary Rural School, we ask that you please take into account the above facts, as we feel that this could be another 'nail in the coffin' of yet another small, struggling community town.

The letter was signed by the President and the Secretary. Out of the \$650 million odd spent on education this year, the few tens of thousands of dollars that will be required to keep that school open is well justified. On the first occasion when they tried to close the Iron Baron School we managed to alter that situation. There has been some talk about the Parachilna School and there is now Olary. It is a small isolated community which receives few services from the Government, and we ought to be doing everything that we possibly can to encourage those people to live there. It is completely unfair to expect the parents to have to teach those children, even though it has been said that they would leave the building there.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The school is the centre of the population.

Mr GUNN: As my colleague the member for Torrens correctly points out, the school is the centre of the community. Many people might say that it is a small trifling matter. However, it is very important to this community and I sincerely hope that the Minister considers it sympathetically and compassionately, and considers what will take place if that school is closed. I know that some of his officers are getting frustrated, and they realise that the course of action that I have taken has caused a lot of work for them. I am sorry, but I have a responsibility in relation to those small schools to make these matters known.

There is another problem at Coober Pedy in relation to the toilets. That has been a real problem and, fortunately, the Premier looked at it the other day. I want to raise another matter because I was not able when the Attorney-General was before the Estimates Committee to be involved in his particular lines. Each Labour Day long weekend a race meeting is held at Coober Pedy and that race meeting raises money for charity, mainly for the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

The races usually take place on the Saturday and Sunday and the racing club must obtain a permit to sell liquor on those days. On this occasion a bad dust storm occurred on the Saturday and the races had to be cancelled. They wished to reschedule the races for the Sunday and Monday, but, having once cancelled them, there was a problem with the liquor licence and, because this occurred on a weekend, they were placed in a predicament.

Fortunately, I was able to speak to the Attorney-General about this problem. I compliment him on being so considerate and acting quickly to resolve a difficult situation. I know that the people who were there would join with me in expressing their thanks for the action that the Attorney took in getting officers of the Licensing Court to go to their office on the weekend to amend the application. I want to compliment the Attorney for this because I was fortunate enough to get hold of him on a Saturday afternoon and because I appreciate the effort that he made to solve this difficult problem.

It does appear that from time to time problems of this nature occur, and I was wondering whether the Attorney-General could get his officers to find some way of getting around this problem. First, the people involved were lucky to get me on a Saturday afternoon. It was even more lucky that I was able to get the Attorney-General on a Saturday afternoon. After looking in *Hansard* to get his Christian name, I found that there were two people with the same initials in the telephone book. However, I thought that he lived in a particular suburb and was lucky enough to get him. Had I not been able to get the Attorney, these people would not have been able to sell liquor at the races on the Sunday and Monday. Therefore, I wonder whether the Attorney's officers could consider this problem in order to ascertain whether or not it is possible to allow the local police sergeant or two justices of the peace in the township to have the authority to alter a licence when this sort of thing happens. The races were held for charity, and it would have been a great pity if, in order to continue with the planned programme, people had technically to break the law.

There are a number of other matters that I would have liked to raise in relation to the high cost of electricity, but I will deal with them tomorrow. I have a number of examples that I can give in relation to this subject. Also, I am concerned about the number of so-called uneconomic water supply schemes that are currently on the books of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I believe that Treasury will have to provide the E. & W.S. Department with money so

that some of these schemes may proceed. It is cold comfort to any of the 30 people listed who cannot get a reticulated water supply to a home or property. I realise that a significant cost is involved, but, as I have pointed out on a number of occasions, we subsidise a number of operations in this State and believe that we must make a start on some of these water supply programmes. Whether or not some capital contribution must be made by the people to be connected can be considered, but I believe that Treasury has to find funds for this purpose.

When one examines all the documents put before us and sees how money is spent one sees that if we were really looking at helping in difficult circumstances some of those funds would be diverted to help the people concerned, many of whom are my constituents. I could refer at length to the report into hospital services in South Australia or to the committee dealing with deregulation, a report handed to the previous Government, but I will deal with those matters on another occasion. I believe that the Budget Estimates Committees involve a worthwhile debate. They are a far better arrangement than the one that existed prior to their introduction by the Tonkin Government, and I would hate to see us revert to the sort of operation that existed prior to 1980, when I believe members were getting no useful information from the discussions that took place. I was pleased to join in the Estimates Committees debates.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, I will mention the casino situation in this State, and the picture that now reveals itself as to the way in which the original Casino Bill was brought into this place by a private member from another place. We well know the history of that because the Government was too scared to bring it in itself as a Government Bill, having seen it knocked out in the previous session by a majority of 19 voting against it on a conscience issue. Of course, we had a conscience issue a few months ago in which all those people changed their minds.

We now see the jigsaw fitting into place. The Premier has just returned from a trip in which he visited places in Japan and the like, from which he has a commitment, I understand, for a redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station involving \$150 million or thereabouts. He suggests that no carrot was given to the developers in relation to the casino, but it is apparent to me that the carrot and the incentive given to these developers was that they would get some priority in the consideration of the casino by the committee which has been set up to look into all applications for the casino licence. There is no doubt in my mind that if this development goes ahead at the railway station that will be the home of the casino.

This Government brought this casino legislation back into this place in an underhanded way, giving it Government time to be debated and having the audacity to say that all members of the Government had a conscience vote on the issue when, except for two (I think it was), they voted for the casino in the last fiasco that we had here.

I will now speak on some of the matters in relation to the committees in which we were referring, among other things, to the yellow book, if we were allowed to refer to it. We were called to order, certainly on Committee A, pretty regularly, being told that we could not really debate the yellow book; we had to refer to a particular line. In the labour and industry area, all members of the Committee had great problems in referring to the line they were speaking about. At one stage, the poor member for Florey was so exasperated that he came up to the front bench from which the Minister and his departmental heads were then explaining the situation, thumped the table and said words to the effect, 'That is the line I mean; I do not know which line it is, but it is somewhere in that book.' That was the way in which Estimates Committee A carried on for some time.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Even the expert legal knowledge of my learned friend, the member for Hartley, was not able to cope with the situation in this area, where the Chairman of the time insisted that we ought to refer to a particular line when, had we referred to the Minister's line, it would have covered pretty well everything about it.

Eventually, after some working days of this and a lot of heartbreak, worry and concern as far as the Opposition was concerned—because it is the Opposition's only opportunity to question the Minister and the heads of departments—we got down to a plane in which we were able to shoot some questions at the Minister, who was able to give us some information in relation to his departmental heads.

The area which I want to pursue is that in which I have been very interested for many years: that of juvenile crime and delinquents. I will refer to some of the matters which I brought forward to those Committees. One of them was stated in the yellow book, which at that stage was almost regarded by Opposition members as the forbidden yellow book.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: That is true. I stated:

There has been a 300 per cent increase in youths choosing the community service option in satisfying outstanding warrants.

I asked the Minister about the 300 per cent increase, because it was a massive increase in the number of youths asking to do community service work. In his answer the Minister stated (in part):

The Department has proved an example to other juvenile justice systems throughout Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere. Our juvenile justice system has enjoyed a wide range of options for rehabilitation and non-custodial care that the adult justice system does not enjoy.

That was a wide statement by the Minister, and to suggest that our system in South Australia is far and away in front of those applying in other States is quite incorrect in regard to community work orders. It is misleading; it is not true. Western Australia is far ahead of South Australia, as is New South Wales. I visited Western Australia three years ago and talked about the situation. They were well in front of us then and South Australia is dragging its feet far behind. Western Australia. The adult area of correctional services and community work orders is far in front of the juvenile area, and it has been operating for less than 12 months. Community work orders in the juvenile area have been operating for 2½ to three years. Certainly, there were some areas in which I gave assistance in providing work areas for young people, in an effort to keep them out of institutions, but that was never followed up by the Department. That was years ago. That was when my Government was in office and when I had much to say in criticising my Government about its break in this area and about its not proceeding with the job as I thought it should be done. Really, it all comes back to the Department and its keenness to get on with the job. In replying to the question that I asked the Minister, Mr Harris stated:

The primary objective of that scheme is to reduce the number of young offenders who may be detained in secure centres due to default of payment of fines and costs determined by children's courts. The number of warrants processed by the group dealing with these in the current financial year was 2 386.

That was the warrant situation, and not in regard to community service orders. He goes on to state:

Community workers have dealt with a quite large number of people during the past financial year (some 543 warrants as against 195 in 1981-82).

Even those figures do not match up, because the witness said that they were dealing with 2 386, and then referred to 543 warrants. He stated:

The community order service scheme can be incorporated as part of a bond made under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. In the past year 17 people were involved in that programme.

Now we have got down to 17, after starting with hundreds, when we get to the nitty gritty part of the question concerning community service orders.

Mr Harris further stated:

In the past year 17 people were involved in that programme. It should be borne in mind that that is a straight alternative to a child's being placed in detention on a detention order. I understand that the number is increasing slightly this year, as the success of the scheme improves.

My goodness, it would want to improve having regard to the fact that its rate of escalation has been just about nil. It is about time it improved. It has taken years to improve it to the stage of having 17 people involved. Mr Harris further stated:

But to mid March this year some 23 community service orders had been made. The indications are that the number of those issued will be about double that issued last year.

So, in answer to a question that I raised on 6 October we were told that to mid March 23 community service orders had been made. It is a very slow process, first of all to get the answers on these matters; secondly to work out the additions; and, thirdly, to see what is happening in regard to community service orders. I understand that panels recommend young people as being fit to undertake a community service order. That recommendation is given to the court, where the judge then decides whether to issue such an order.

I asked a further question in relation to this matter, because the answer that I had received was far from satisfactory. In reply, Mr Harris further stated:

During the past year a smaller percentage has been paying the fines—

he was now referring to orders made for working out a default of payment of a fine or costs—

and a higher proportion has been working out fines under community service orders.

When dealing with two separate matters, with one thing influencing another, it was difficult to get the correct answer. Mr Harris further stated:

There are still some cases where people cannot be located or where warrants have to be finally returned to the police for servicing. The warrant default programme involves people who, instead of paying out a fine in the required time, are contacted by the Department and work out their default order.

When the annual report from the Department for Community Welfare is prepared and is tabled in this House I will be very interested to get some straight information about what is happening. Perhaps an explanation of the whole scheme would enable people to better understand it. I believe that a number of schemes are involved, because later Mr Cox told me that a great number of schemes are operating. Perhaps an explanation of all the schemes that are operating and details of the number of people involved would be helpful, in view of the fact that 2 386 young people could be undertaking community service orders or working within the community.

Perhaps details could be given in the annual report of the type of work being carried out and by whom it is being provided. As I said, according to a reply that I received in answer to a question, 2 386 warrants were processed. I would like to have an explanation of the number and sex of the children involved and the type of work being undertaken. That would be a lot of community service orders, and if there were so many we should see them about the place somewhere, but I must admit that I have not seen them.

One of the best schemes that I put forward during the time of the Liberal Government was that in relation to the St Jude's Cemetery, at Brighton, which was in dire need of

care. I organised for the council to provide supervision and tools.

I was responsible for setting it up. There was no worry at all, which is the case in some of these situations where there may be a clash with the unions. There was no worry about that at all; it was all set up. However, nothing happened and nothing has happened at all. I will be very interested to see details of the 2 386 warrants and perhaps some explanation. Mr Harris went on:

The member mentioned the small number of community service orders. However, there is now a small number of people in our residential secure-care centres, and the community service order is an alternative method available for the courts to use as part of a condition of a bond.

We all know about that situation. Mr Harris continued:

There are different classifications of support. Some youths need a very high degree of supervision, and that is provided by our staff. Others need a lesser amount of supervision, and that is provided by some of the community organisations with whom they work.

Obviously, I suppose that some of them are working in Noarlunga and some at Norwood: there are still only two in operation. It will be nice to obtain some further information in that regard. Mr Cox then joined in and said:

It is an alternative to institutions . . .

It appears that they had to reassure me, as if I did not even know about that area. That is the dressing up part of the answer. I did not need that information—I was foraging for other information, and I am still doing so. I will be relying heavily on the Department's annual report when perhaps all will be revealed and we will all know what is happening. Mr Cox also reminded me:

It is an alternative to institutions, and if there are 55 young people at SAYTC for 17 to receive community service orders means that there has been a determination that they are not a risk to the community whilst they work.

In other words, Mr Cox was saying that only 55 young people are in SAYTC at any one time—not over a year or over the years. Of those 55 young people only 17 were fit to work in the community. Mr Cox also said:

Because we have six or seven alternatives . . .

I would like an explanation about the alternatives. If there are six or seven alternatives, that is okay, but I would like to know what they are. We are entitled to have that information. Mr Cox also said:

... we regard the community service order as a most serious matter . . .

Indeed, that is the case—there is no doubt about that—and so do I. Mr Cox then said:

... we try to take the decision that a person who goes on it will not place the community at risk.

I take it that Mr Cox is referring to the assessment panels when he says 'they' make the decisions. The final decision lies with the judge of the Juvenile Court.

The judge of the Juvenile Court makes the final decision as to whether or not a young person is fit to work in the community, not the Department for Community Welfare. The Department can give advice through assessment panels, but it is not up to the Department to determine which child receives a community service order; it is the right of the court to make that decision. I then mentioned the situation in relation to the Brighton Cemetery which had not been taken up by the Department. Mr Cox explained:

... we would be able to use this programme very much more (programmes such as the cemetery that the honourable member talked about). However, it is really related to an assessed risk and an assessed use of that programme.

That is great stuff and it means an awful lot! Still, I take it for what it is worth. Mr Cox then said:

The Cemetery is still not done . . .

We know that, and I have been telling the Department that for probably 18 months. Mr Cox then said:

... because no one was naughty enough to do it.

In other words, no child who had committed an offence and been placed in an institution was considered naughty enough to be released on a community service order. Perhaps no offender was as naughty as he should have been. Perhaps that is what Mr Cox meant. I believe that Mr Cox's statement is rubbish.

There must be some assessment by the court because, after all, the court would know the calibre of the young delinquents or offenders. The court would know the regulars, the recidivists, and it should have the right to say which offenders can and cannot work in the community. The office and the volunteers were referred to. I could say a lot more, but my time is rapidly going.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It always seems to go faster—

Mr MATHWIN: It always seems to go faster when I am on my feet. I now wish to refer to the report of the Correctional Services Advisory Council which was tabled today. As I have been interested in this field, I obtained a copy and read it. The Correctional Services Advisory Council was set up by the previous Government and has continued under the present Government. I congratulate the Government on that because I think it is a very good idea. I grabbed the report thinking that I would obtain information of what has been happening, what the council has been doing and what advice has been given the Minister. The first thing I saw was the following:

My dear Minister,

The Prisons Act, 1936-81, as amended, requires the Advisory Council to report to you, not later than the thirty-first day of October in each year, on the administration and operation of the Act during the financial year.

It names the members of the committee, and it is signed by the Chairman, Mr Phillip Rice, Q.C., on behalf of the Deputy Chairman, the Hon. D.W. Simmons. We all know Mr Simmons; he was Chief Secretary for a number of years. Mind you, he did not do anything, but he was the Minister. He procrastinated for the whole time he was in office and all he did was provide sani-toilets for Yatala—nothing else. The previous Liberal Government provided sanitation at Yatala at a cost of \$4 000 000. Mr Simmons, when Minister, provided sani-toilets—that was enough for Yatala. However, Mr Simmons is Deputy Chairman of the council, Mr Duggan, Q.C., Mr Kidney, J.P., and Miss Irene Smith, J.P. are members, and Mr Weir is the Secretary. Those people comprise the Advisory Council. I thought that I would obtain a copy of this report to find out what the council has been investigating, what advice it has given to the Chief Secretary and perhaps how much of that advice the Minister has proceeded with.

I searched through this document, reading it and re-reading it a few times, to find out what had happened. One of the things that happened was that Mrs Rickards resigned and the Hon. D.W. Simmons replaced her. A gentleman, not another lady, replaced her. That is great stuff from the Labor Party, which is always bragging and boasting about appointing ladies to different committees and organisations. One lady resigned and she was replaced with a male. I accept that the male had a lot of experience concerning prisons; although he did not do anything, he had seen a lot of them. The council visited all the correctional institutions within South Australia, and the report talks about additional visits to Yatala Labour Prison. The council was in operation when there were riots at Yatala, which has only been since the Labor Government came into power. When we were in power there were escapes, but since the Labor Party took office there have been riots, fires, barbecues, and all sorts of things at Yatala.

It is getting sorted out now, and I compliment the Minister as he is at least making some progress. The Government's hand was forced because of the last couple of fires at Yatala when the Star Force was not permitted to go and help get the fire engines in. We can look at the issues examined, including women prisoners. I wonder what kind of advice they gave the Minister on that issue. Reference is also made to grievance provisions for Tasmanian prison officers; meetings with local dignitaries concerned with the treatment of offenders; management of Yatala Labour Prison (that would be a long meeting); plans for filling departmental executive positions over the next five years, and so on.

Obviously the people concerned have done a lot of work in that area and have given a lot of advice to the Chief Secretary. However, there is not even a little hint as to what they have advised him to do or what information he has been given by this council. So, all in all, the report is vague. The report looks like time sheets which my workers would have given me when I was in the building trade. Page 8 refers to the Swink Report. At last we have a little bit of meat and the final paragraph states:

The council felt that the Swink Report could have been more helpful if it had stated which particular principles and philosophies of crime treatment had prompted the recommendations.

No further explanation is given at all. Obviously some information must have been given to the Minister in that regard. If part of the report is criticised something must have been done involving the Minister. Obviously it is a big secret, because the Minister is not going to tell, and it is not in the report. Perhaps one day the Minister will tell us. On page 10, under the heading 'Correctional Services Act and regulations', it is stated:

The council shares in the concern that has been publicly voiced for an updating of legislation and a clear statement of the aims and objectives in correctional administration. The Chief Secretary has been informed that we should welcome the opportunity to study the regulations to be proposed for implementation under the Correctional Services Act, No. 48 of 1982.

Quite obviously from that the Chief Secretary has not supplied the regulations to be studied. It is obvious that the council is concerned (as are we and as is anyone who has anything to do with correctional services) that the legislation drafted by the previous Government has not yet been introduced. The regulations have not been implemented, either, and that is not good. This 12-page document gives a brief report on what has happened but makes no recommendations on what action the Minister should take in relation to advice given to him. I am not criticising the advisory council, as I sincerely believe it has done its job, although, reading between the lines, I believe that the report is a watered-down document. I was also intending to refer to the problems with the north-south transport corridor, which in my area has caused great concern to my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman's time having expired, I call the member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It is interesting to note, this being my first opportunity to speak in a Budget debate, that this Government came to office having promised no taxation increases and no general charge increases, yet one finds that receipts for the Government have increased by some \$338 million but that overall an extra \$5 million has been spent. We have a Government which has spent a considerable amount of time blaming the Opposition for much of its debt. In fact, we find that the massive increases in taxes have all been spent on Government decisions. In the housing area that needs to be complimented. Right throughout the Budget debate the Government has been saying that it has had to fix up the debts of the previous Government, when in fact that is not true at all.

Today the Premier talked about the confidence report from the Chamber of Commerce, which is an encouraging

report to this State and which will continue hopefully to come out from similar organisations and any other groups of individuals who are considering our economic development. Unfortunately, the retail scene does not have running through it the same sort of confidence factor as is evident in part of the manufacturing scene, and I look forward in the near future to seeing the same sort of information coming out of the retail industry. As many members would know, the retail industry is made up principally of small business, and it is in this area where the greatest increase of employment could occur, but it is also the area that has seen the greatest loss of employment. It is an area where an increasing number of families are spending more of their time working in their own businesses and extending or developing those businesses. Unfortunately, however, it is an area where employment is being cut, and we need to have a very serious look at that matter.

Housing approvals are up, and that is also a very encouraging sign. Hopefully the money that the Government will spend in this area will continue to cause a growth in housing development, because that has a magnificent spin-off effect into all other areas. The most encouraging thing in the past two or three weeks for me as a new member has been my experience of the Estimates Committees. I have been able to learn for the first time what has been happening in many of the departments. This has enabled me, along with other members of the Committees, to ask questions about functions of a department and of particular Ministers.

There were one or two exciting days, and I was fortunate enough to be on the Committee dealing with health. As most people would know, the Minister of Health has perhaps one of the shortest fuses around, and this could be regarded by some as providing a certain amount of entertainment. There are probably not many people about who perhaps have such a high opinion of themselves. Indeed, I do not think that I have ever been told so often by anyone how great he is and how well he runs his department.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I believe he said recently that there were only three good Ministers in the Government: himself, the Premier and the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the member for Torrens for reminding me of that, because I had forgotten that the Minister concerned was so important as far as the Government was concerned. Bearing in mind his obvious treatment of the position at the Children's Hospital and the fact that he has such a short fuse, as demonstrated in recent days, I think that, now that the Sax Report is out, we will see even more examples of the Minister's short fuse.

One of the matters that concerned me during the Estimates Committee was the allocation of time to the tourism and technology portfolios. Tourism is probably the industry which, if properly promoted, will encourage the biggest growth in business, particularly small business. The resultant spin-off in employment and the expansion of small business will cause the economy to grow. We have the same situation in the area of technology, because technological change is the most important happening in our community at present. Again, there was a very short period allocated to discuss some very important changes in technology.

Another matter that concerned me was the Dorothy Dixer questions that were asked. It seemed to me that the time taken to ask those questions could have been better used by Government members to ask other questions. Unfortunately, the asking of these questions prevented Opposition members from asking many of the questions they wished to ask. The yellow books are what programme performance budgeting is all about. It is a great thing for a new member to be able to run through these books in an attempt to

understand what is happening in the whole of the Government's financial situation.

I now turn to the time of the night that debates are taking place, a matter referred to earlier by the member for Alexandra. It concerns me that we spend so many hours in this place and that we have to go through to this late hour of the night to finish a debate. When debates take place at this late hour many members are half asleep and those who are not asleep are not in the Chamber, so perhaps we ought to press the Committee investigating such matters to look into the matter of sitting times. As all members know, prior to the election the present Government talked about there being no tax increases. However, since it has come to office there have been 74 tax increases, 68 charges increases to 29 September, and six State tax increases. It is interesting that a Government that said it would not increase taxes has found it necessary to go to this extent to balance its Budget.

I am concerned about the effect of these taxes on business, and on small businesses in particular. The Labor Party platform deals with the needs of the small business sector and how small business not only provides a substantial proportion of private sector employment in Australia but also has an enormous potential to create jobs. The interesting thing about this comment is that unless small business survives it will not have the opportunity to do any of those things. One of the things of critical importance to small businesses is expenses.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And how those expenses are affected by taxes.

Mr INGERSON: Yes, and how those expenses are affected by taxes. I thank the member for Coles for reminding me about that. In the revenue or receipts of a recurrent nature there is this thing called taxation. It is interesting that of the nine taxes that have been lobbied, six have a direct effect on business. We ought to talk first about land tax, which has been increased by 20 per cent. That may not sound a very important issue but, with the increase in valuation of properties, some small businesses are seeing increases in their land tax bills from \$500 in shopping centres up to \$2 000—some incredible increases due to land tax, which is passed from the landlord directly on to small businesses.

The levels for pay-roll tax, fortunately, have been lifted as far as small businesses are concerned. It is an area on which the Government should be congratulated in that it is cognisant of the fact that pay-roll tax is the most iniquitous tax that there is, because it is a tax on employment and has a very significant effect on small business. It has an increase of 6 per cent and is obviously another significant expense as far as small business is concerned.

If the financial institutions duty—this magic tax which has not been shown to anybody yet, but is in the Budget at some \$8 million—is introduced at the rate of .4 per cent, or 40c in \$100, for every \$100 000 that a business turns over—

Mr Ferguson: You do not understand it. It is .04 per cent—4c in every \$100.

Mr INGERSON: .04 per cent, which is \$400 for every \$100 000 of turnover.

Mr Ferguson: You said .4 per cent.

Mr INGERSON: I stand corrected. To lots of small businesses, that will add up to be a very significant tax. Again, it is a tax on prosperity as far as small business is concerned.

The most significant increases for small businesses are the increases in tax due to electricity and E. & W.S. Department charges. It has been estimated by the Small Business Association that the tax increases by this Government will be of the order of \$850 to \$1 000 a year. That sort of increase on top of the problems that small businesses are

having in survival is very significant so far as their survival is concerned. I will now quote from the I.P.A., which talks about the public sector inflation and the area of taxation. It says:

Increasing State and Federal taxes and charges pose a major threat to the containment of inflation. Governments throughout Australia are facing serious budget difficulties. They are seeking, for the most part, to solve these problems by increasing their revenues rather than by taking the economically responsible route of reducing expenditure.

There is an exception to that rule; we have Mr Burke in Western Australia who did attempt some very meagre cost cutting initiatives. The article goes on:

Already prices in the public sector are rising at nearly twice the rate of the prices of goods and services in the private sector. Over the 12 months to March 1983 public sector prices rose by over 18 per cent, while private sector prices rose by only 10 per cent.

Through steep increases in charges by government authorities and in specific taxes, governments themselves—Federal, State and local—are adding significantly to Australia's high inflation rate. In fact, since 1980-81 selected State and local government charges (for example, electricity, water and sewerage) have risen by a huge 54 per cent. This compares with a 25 per cent increase in consumer prices overall during the same 21 months period.

The assumption that Governments and their authorities can automatically index prices and charges in line with inflation is contrary to the spirit of the Economic Summit; it imposes additional costs on private industry and individuals and will help lock Australia into a high inflation economy. The discrepancy between the public and private sector price trends is in fact larger than the figures suggest, since some of the price increases in the private sector directly result from Government action.

For example, the 2½ percentage points increase in sales tax introduced in the last Federal Budget contributed to price increases in many items originating in the private sector. Other increases in taxes and charges which would have significantly affected private sector prices include payroll taxes and energy prices.

Expenditure on 'public sector goods' accounted for only 18 per cent of consumer expenditure but made up nearly 30 per cent of the price increases in the past 12 months. If Australia's menacing inflation is to be successfully combatted, Governments must set a positive example of restraint by putting their own house in order.

As stated in the article, one of the major causes of inflation is the increase in Government taxes. The other quote to which I will refer deals with cuts in the Public Service generally, as follows:

The cuts in some Public Service (and Parliamentary) salaries, and reductions in Public Service employment, imposed by the West Australian Premier, Mr Burke, will produce only limited budgetary savings. However, his action has great symbolic significance. Mr Burke has asserted two important principles, one of economic equity, and the other of public finance. First, the costs of the recession should be shared between the public and private sectors—not by the latter only. Second, controlling Public Service outlays is an essential policy for a Government wishing to contain State Budgets (public sector wages and salaries account for some two-thirds of the State's current expenditures).

In terms of employment, private sector employees have carried practically the full weight of the recession. In the past year over 110 000 jobs have been lost in the private sector. New South Wales and Tasmania have been the only Governments to reduce Public Service numbers. In Victoria, by contrast, there has been an extraordinary increase in the numbers employed in the Public Service—about 8 000—

an increase of about 1 300 in South Australia—

In a period of low profitability and stagnating demand, the policy of increasing taxes and charges to protect Government employment and services inevitably has the effect of reducing employment in the private sector.

A study carried out by the O.E.C.D. in the mid 70s indicated that the average earnings of public sector employees in Australia exceeded the average earnings of private sector wages and salary earners by more than in any other country examined. It appears that since then the earnings advantage of the Public Service may have been somewhat eroded. However, this (relative) loss should be offset against the improved Public Service superannuation introduced in 1976.

As we all know, and as has been reported in the past few days, the increase by 12.3 per cent in superannuation, which

is another add-on cost in terms of the cost of wages to the Government, we will see a further escalation of costs as far as this Government is concerned and further increases in taxation. The report continues:

Nevertheless, it is indisputable that Government employment and Government-funded employment (notably in the health and education areas) provides relatively large numbers of jobs for higher paid professionals and relatively secure employment. It is time that more attention was given to helping the unemployed 'tool-maker' and his colleagues in the private sector—

in particular, the effect of Government spending on small business—

One important way Governments can provide this help is by holding down taxes and charges . . . this Government . . . certainly has not achieved this goal. But if State taxes and charges are to be eventually contained, Government costs will have to be cut.

I would like to turn to the health area, which was dealt with by the other Estimates Committee of which I was a member and comment on a couple of the matters raised. In particular, I refer to what appears to be the continual attacks by the Minister on voluntary organisations, in particular, St John, the organisations that are voluntarily raising funds for the Julia Farr Centre, and the fund raising committees within the Children's Hospital.

It seems a pity in this day when we have people prepared to give their time and to run efficient health services that they should be continually attacked and denigrated for the jobs that they are doing. Today the Sax Report was presented to the House. During the Estimates Committee examining the health budget the Minister of Health mentioned several times that the report was going to be a revolutionary document. Having looked at a few of the recommendations, I would say that that probably would be the only understatement that the Minister has made in the past two or three weeks. I refer to page 17 of that report and to the recommendations on the administration of hospitals. I want to spend a few minutes referring to some of the suggested recommendations and to what appears to me to be an obvious centralisation of power, which is quite contrary to the recommendation put forward by the Bright Committee.

Under 'Administration of Hospitals' the first recommendation is that boards of management be retained. That would appear to be a fairly forthright and bright start to the whole committee until one refers to the third recommendation, which states that explicit planning documents and guidelines should be provided to boards. I always thought that boards were set up to operate with some independence and with an opportunity to expand what they wanted to do. However, it has been recommended that they will have explicit planning documents and guidelines provided. It seems that there is not much point in having a board if the members of the board are to be provided with explicit details of what they will have to do. Another point of interest is the recommendation at 5.6, which states that:

All appointments to and removals from the board be made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister of Health.

Again, the Minister is wanting, and Dr Sax and his committee are suggesting, that we should have one person deciding who should be members of the board, and this power applies not only from the appointment point of view but also in regard to the point of view of removal. I have always thought that the Minister would not be involved with the day-to-day running of boards of out-country hospitals, or with any boards, but here there is an obvious desire to

centralise control in the hands of one man. I do not believe that that is a very good thing.

Point 5.8 refers to boards of management consisting of between seven and 12 members. Currently, there is a Bill in another place containing a suggestion that the number of members on the board of the Health Commission be reduced from nine to five. That reduction is in regard to the major board that controls the Health Commission, and yet here we have a recommendation that suggests that these primary and quite outward boards should have between seven and 12 members. It seems a little inconsistent that a major board should reduce its numbers while there is a recommendation that these primary boards need to have more people on them, obviously to give them broader and better advice on what they would like to do.

Point 5.10 provides that a list of all applicants together with the views of the board and management on applications for members of the board should be sent via the Director to the Minister. Again, we have a situation where the Minister, whoever he may be, will be controlling the applications of people nominated to a board. Page 18 states that hospitals funded by the Commission will be incorporated under the South Australian Health Act. There is no mention that there should be some voluntary movement towards incorporation or a suggestion that they be incorporated. Again, it seems to smack of the centralisation of all control and indicates that incorporation, whether or not it is required or wanted, will be very much a requirement under the recommendations. There is also a long list of recommendations which bring the control of hospitals further under a centralised function.

The other part of the report of interest to me is on page 143 in relation to the Queen Victoria Hospital. It is interesting to note that the report states that a feasibility study is in progress to determine the best option for the future location of the Queen Victoria Hospital. I believe that the study is nearing a conclusion. Suggested options for the Queen Victoria Hospital site include the current site, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital. They are the three sites considered in the feasibility study. Only a couple of paragraphs later, the report suggests that there ought to be a major feasibility study involving the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that the Queen Victoria Hospital could be transferred perhaps to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

On the one page, four different sites are mentioned, and further down on the same page the report states that, if it (Queen Elizabeth) is shown to be the successful site, Government support should be withdrawn from the Queen Victoria Hospital. There is an interesting play on words on page 146: five different options are given, one feasibility study is being carried out, another feasibility study is suggested, and halfway down the page it is recommended that the feasibility study should conclude that we need only one major set-up at the Queen Elizabeth site. It is interesting that in my district we have a continuing controversy over the Queen Victoria Hospital.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 October 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WORKERS COMPENSATION

3. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What action can be taken to prevent harassment to claimants of workers compensation when applying for employment?

2. What action can be taken in speeding up hearings for workers compensation claimants in the Industrial Court?

3. What action can be taken in providing a workers compensation claimant with job protection?

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

1. I am not sure of the nature of the 'harassment' referred to by the member for Hanson. Should this refer to instances of discrimination against workers who have made claims under the Workers Compensation Act prior to seeking new employment, then this continues to be a matter of serious concern to the Government. It is just one of several phenomena flowing from the existing state of the employment market in that employers have a wider range of job applicants from which to select. All types of screening factors therefore become more relevant in these circumstances. The possible elimination of the more dubious screening practices on the part of employers will be taken into account in my review of the State's workers compensation system. If the honourable member's question relates to other practices, I would appreciate him bringing them to my attention.

2. The time from when an application for compensation is filed in the court to the time when it comes on for hearing is now four months. This is the shortest lead time in the last ten years and has resulted from the appointment of additional judges and by 'block' periods being set aside when all judicial personnel make themselves available to hear cases.

Any further reduction in the lead time could create problems for the profession in investigating and preparing their cases and in particular making arrangements for the calling of specialist medical witnesses. Past experience has shown that if cases are called on too early they often have to be adjourned because of the unavailability of these specialist witnesses.

Nevertheless, delays of an unacceptable length in a significant number of compensation hearings continue to be of concern. This whole area will be critically examined in the present review of the workers compensation system being undertaken by the Government.

3. Under the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act, until such time as a worker's condition has stabilised and the employer's liability quantified, weekly payments must continue. However, there is nothing in either the Act or at common law which would prevent an employee's services being terminated in the interim. In some cases termination may actually be a condition of the final settlement.

This is clearly an area in need of investigation. It warrants careful examination in the present review of worker's compensation arrangements in this State. It is in fact required by State A.L.P. policy which commits the Government to examining a possible prohibition on terminating an employee's services whilst the employee is on accrued sick leave, annual leave, long service leave or maternity leave, or while on light duties subject to a medical certificate. I am pleased to note that the honourable member's obvious concerns in this area coincide with that of the State A.L.P.

The remedy available through the operation of section 15 (1)(e) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act relating to a harsh, unjust or unreasonable dismissal could of course be of relevance in certain cases. Once again, should the member for Hanson have any particular case in mind I would be glad to have the matter investigated.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

16. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Did the Minister, when in Opposition, give a commitment publicly or to individuals to examine the interest subsidy schemes for non-government schools which apply in other States and, if so, when will the Minister announce the results of the examination and, if not, will the Minister conduct such an examination forthwith?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, when in Opposition, I did give a commitment to examine the interest subsidy for non-government schools which applies in other States. The Advisory Committee on non-government schools has been asked to research this issue and report on the implications of such a scheme. After consideration of the advice I receive, I will advise Parliament as to the decision the Government will take on this issue.

L. P. G. CONVERSION

44. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the Government's policy on conversion of vehicles to use l.p.g.?

2. What programme, if any, is being followed to convert Government vehicles?

3. What steps are being taken to reduce dependence on petrol imported into South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government through the l.p.g. bus conversion programme and the Government vehicle conversion programme is actively promoting l.p.g. as a transport fuel and providing encouragement to the private sector to consider conversion.

2. A total of 54 departmental vehicles have been converted to l.p.g. and have accumulated 177 000 km on l.p.g. as at 30 June 1983. An estimated fuel saving of \$5 300 resulted. During the middle of next year a progress report will be prepared to detail the conversion and fuel costs as well as the servicing of l.p.g. vehicles. This report will be made available to all departments so they may give consideration to l.p.g. conversion.

3. Apart from the Government's encouragement of l.p.g. as a substitute for currently imported petrol and crude oil, other steps being taken to reduce this State's dependence on imports include:

- A strong energy conservation campaign (as part of the National Energy Conversion Programme) to encourage the public to drive more efficiently and thus reduce demand for transport fuels. Emphasis is also placed on fuel conservation and driver training in fleet applications.
- Consideration of the implementation of a Government Energy Management Programme with department and statutory bodies to cut costs and to save energy, including petrol and diesel. It has been estimated that savings of the order of 10 per cent should be achievable.
- A number of energy supply options (e.g. coal conversion, alkylation of l.p.g.) and alternative transport fuel options (c.n.g. methanol, biogas) are also being assessed

to determine whether they have any potential to supplement or replace imported oil products; and, if so, the extent of the potential and the possible time frame of introduction and the likely costs.

- Encouragement of oil exploration is also an essential part of this Government's programme to find indigenous oil and gas reserves and thus reduce the State's dependence on imports.

GAS RESERVES

45. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the increase in gas reserves as a result of the fracing process undertaken by the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation?
2. How does the cost of producing this gas compare with current costs of production?
3. How much has been spent to date on fracing work?
4. How much more work is it intended to do and at what cost?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The increase in sales gas reserves from the Patchawarra Formation is estimated to be 227 BCF. This estimate cannot be considered highly reliable as it is based on the assessment of only one 'frac' and is unsupported by long-term production history. The Patchawarra Formation was put on long-term production test on 25 August and better information should be available in two months. It is not possible to assess the potential for sales gas production from the Tirrawarra Formation at this stage.
2. Insufficient information is available at this point to establish total production cost of tight gas. However, it appears that well drilling and development for tight gas will cost about 2.2 times the cost of conventional drilling and development.
3. To date, \$11 850 000 has been expended on the fracing programme including the cost of drilling the wells.
4. In the present programme, there is one more zone to fracture in Big Lake 27 (Patchawarra Formation). This work will be done following completion of work on the Tirrawarra Formation. Work is suspended pending arrival of an hydraulic snubbing unit to enable completion of the Tirrawarra zone under pressure. Following completion of the Tirrawarra and Patchawarra zones, Big Lake 27 will be connected to the Big Lake field gas gathering system to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the frac. It is estimated that the additional cost to complete this work will be \$1 230 000.

O-BAHN OPENING

48. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many official invitations were sent out for the opening of the O-Bahn Transport System?
2. Who were the official guests?
3. How many members of Parliament received invitations, who were they, how many accepted and how many sent apologies?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. 142 guests were invited.
2. Members of Parliament; representatives of local government, trade unions, consultants, contractors and the media; and officers from the Department of Transport, State Transport Authority, Highways Department and Department of Mines and Energy.

3. Seven members of Parliament received invitations: the honourable members for Davenport, Gilles, Hartley, Newland, Norwood, Todd, Torrens. Five members accepted invitations; two forwarded apologies.

CATERING TRAINING

49. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Does the Government intend that Regency Park TAFE College should remain the sole provider of technical training in food and catering and, if not, is any provision being made for food and catering plant for the new Adelaide College of TAFE in Light Square?

2. If such provision is being made, what consultation and/or needs analysis has taken place to justify such action?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Regency Park College is the only South Australian TAFE college conducting technical training in food and catering and will continue to be the major focus in the future. Investigations indicate that the demand for courses in food and catering will continue to increase and that current facilities at the Regency Park college are insufficient to meet the future demand. Currently the feasibility of incorporating tourism programmes in the new Adelaide college is being considered. This activity would include studies in travel/tourism, the food and beverage certificate, and commercial cookery (which would be conducted in modest food and catering facilities).

2. Planning for TAFE is undertaken on a network basis which entails the consideration of the impact of new proposals on existing colleges. A preliminary demand study has been undertaken and the head of School of Food and Catering has already been involved in discussions. The study has also involved the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, the Department of Tourism and the various other elements of the tourism and hospitality industries.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

51. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What were the terms and conditions of Mr Maslen's appointment to the position of Superintendent of the Yatala Labour Prison?

2. Was Mr Maslen appointed under the Public Service Act?

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

1. The terms and conditions of Mr Maslen's appointment were those applicable to section 108 of the Public Service Act.

2. Yes.

WATER SUBSIDIES

69. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the total cost to Government schools for 1983-84 of the Government's decision to end water subsidies?

2. Will each school be reimbursed by the Education Department for the additional water rates following this decision?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated cost of the Government's decision to end water subsidies to the Education Department is \$650 000, off-setting funds have been provided in the Budget for this amount.

2. School water costs are funded and paid centrally by the Education Department and not by individual schools. The additional water charges will therefore be paid by the Education Department and schools will not be affected, in spite of allegations made by a member of the Opposition in a letter sent to school councils in August of this year.

STIRLING EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL

71. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the Minister's reply to the questions put to him in a letter from the member for Torrens on 3 February 1983 concerning the Government's deferral of the Stirling East Primary School redevelopment?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The questions have been replied to by letter dated 11 October 1983. Clerical oversight resulted in the delay, for which apologies to the member are extended.

PRISONERS REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEE

73. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Who are the members of the Prisoners Representative Committee at Yatala Labour Prison, for what offences have each been sentenced and what are the lengths of their sentences?

2. What are the areas of responsibility of the committee and how have these been defined?

3. Do the members of this committee have any privileges by virtue of their membership and, if so, what are those privileges?

4. What facilities does the committee have for its work?

5. On what basis does the committee determine its position on any matter and how does it communicate its decision and in what circumstances?

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

1. Currently there are only two members of the Prisoners Representative Committee—they are:

C. Conley, serving 15 years for trading in Indian hemp.

G. Easom, serving eight years for armed robbery.

2. The only responsibility of the members of the committee is to be prepared to communicate the results of discussions held with the prison management to other prisoners.

3. No.

4. The committee does not have any specific facilities available to it.

5. The committee establishes its position on the basis of consultation with other prisoners and communicates that position to the prison Manager during meetings with him.

AIR POLLUTION

74. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to control air pollution and, if so—

(a) what stage has been reached with its preparation;

(b) which organisations or interest groups have been consulted in regard to it and when did the consultations commence; and

(c) when is it intended to be introduced into the Parliament?

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

1. Yes

(a) The basis for a Clean Air Bill has been endorsed by Cabinet and a Bill is to be prepared by Parliament.

(b) Consultation has taken place with many organisations, both formally and informally. Extensive discussions took place with other Governments from 1978 onwards to provide for compatibility with other States. Discussions with other Government departments took place from 1980 onwards, particularly with respect to policy and health aspects. Formal consultation followed with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Local Government Association and councils.

(c) During the current session.

TRANSPORT PATRONAGE

101. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: With respect to partonage on S.T.A. buses, what are the average (annual or monthly) number of persons per trip, per bus route between 8.00—9.00 p.m., 9.00—10.00 p.m., 10.00—11.00 p.m., 11.00—12.00 p.m. on weekdays in the Adelaide Metropolitan Area?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The information requested by the honourable member is not available at the level of individual routes and service runs. A statistical sampling technique is used to analyse ticket sales to determine the average number of weekday journeys made in the metropolitan area on buses and trams in 2-hourly periods. Average weekday bus and tram patronage over all routes for 1982-83 was:

Time Period	Number of Passenger Journeys
up to 8.00 p.m.	183 400
8.00 p.m.—10.00 p.m.	3 300
10.00 p.m.—12.00 p.m.	1 300
Full Day	188 000

CLELAND NATIONAL PARK

103. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What plans have been formulated to decrease the fire hazards associated with the Cleland National Park and when will they be implemented?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Cleland Conservation Park has an extremely well developed fire protection plan which is basically two systems of fire prevention and associated suppression in the event of a wild fire. The first aspect relates directly to the protection of personal life and park assets such as buildings and the fauna zone in the event of a fire. The second aspect of the plan relates to the protection of neighbouring properties against the possibility of wild fire leaving the park and involves regular fuel reduction burning around park boundaries, mowing of vegetation and the maintenance of the existing fire access track networks. The National Parks and Wildlife Service is completing and upgrading comprehensive fire management plans for the whole of the reserve system. The Mount Lofty Ranges parks fire management plans are the first to be undertaken and should be completed by the end of October this year.

CAMP NOONAMEENA

113. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What plans does

the Government have for the future use and management of the National Parks and Wildlife Service property known as Camp Noonameena on the Coorong?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Camp Noonameena has been purchased to provide a northern ranger base on the Coorong National Park. An additional ranger has been appointed to the park and is expected to be in residence at Camp Noonameena when upgrading of the house is completed later this year. In the long term, and as resources permit, it is intended to develop a day visitor centre, together with a residential facility to cater for study groups and students wishing to visit the park for educational purposes. Staff of the Department of Environment and Planning have already commenced planning to develop Camp Noonameena for these uses. Discussions are currently being held with the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service to develop an interpretive plan for the Coorong National Park in which Camp Noonameena will be a major focal point.

RESERVOIR LAND

116. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What stage has been reached concerning the transfer of the reservoir land at Lobethal, previously owned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to the District Council of Onkaparinga?

2. Has the Heritage Agreement prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning been completed and, if not, when will it be completed?

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

1. The Lobethal Reservoir land is comprised of 3 titles under the Real Property Act, 2 closed roads and 3 sections of land not under the Real Property Act. The Crown Solicitor has prepared an application to bring the old system land under the provisions of the Act. Once this has been processed, all the land is to be consolidated under one title to be issued in the name of the Minister of Water Resources. A Heritage Agreement will then be registered on the title and the land transferred to the District Council of Onkaparinga, subject to that agreement.

2. The Heritage Agreement, together with all other documentation, is being prepared by the Crown Solicitor and it is anticipated that the whole process will be finalised in approximately 3 months time.

ATTEMPTED GAOL ESCAPE

117. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it a fact that a long serving criminal was very nearly successful in escaping from his cell at the Adelaide Gaol between 1 and 6 August and, if so, what are the details relating to this incident?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No.

GRENFELL STREET MAIL EXCHANGE

119. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: Is it the intention of the Government to lease part or all of the new and renovated buildings on the site of the Grenfell Street Mail Exchange for any Government department, statutory authority or Government agency and, if so:

(a) what departments, authorities or agencies will be accommodated on this site and what floor area will each occupy;

(b) what is the anticipated cost of annual rental for each;

(c) what is the anticipated commissioning cost for each body;

(d) where are each of these bodies now accommodated; and

(e) when is it anticipated that the buildings will be ready for occupancy?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is understood that it is not the intention of any State Government Department, statutory authority or Government agency to lease accommodation in the Grenfell Street Mail Exchange.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

127. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to extend the South-Eastern Freeway to Glen Osmond and, if so, when is it intended that work will commence and, if not, why not?

2. How did the number of vehicles using Mount Barker Road at Eagle on the Hill on 1 July 1983 compare with the previous 13 years on that date?

3. Does the Government have any immediate plans to alleviate the problem of traffic build up during peak periods at the Cross Road intersection at Glen Osmond and, if so, what are these plans?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Any major upgrading of the Mount Barker Road would involve serious environmental and engineering constraints because of the nature of the terrain in this section of the Mount Lofty Ranges. On present indications, and taking into account the constraints placed upon resources available for roadworks, it is unlikely that the Highways Department will undertake any major upgrading of this section of road in the foreseeable future.

2. 1.7.83—21 545 vehicles per day

1.7.82—21 350 vehicles per day

1.7.81—19 465 vehicles per day

1.7.80—18 486 vehicles per day

1.7.79—21 316 vehicles per day

1.7.78—20 570 vehicles per day

1.7.77—19 900 vehicles per day

1.7.76—14 810 vehicles per day

1.7.75—14 880 vehicles per day

1.7.74—13 440 vehicles per day

1.7.73—16 690 vehicles per day

1.7.72—16 480 vehicles per day

1.7.71—9 980 vehicles per day

1.7.70—9 590 vehicles per day

3. Modifications to the traffic signals at the Glen Osmond Road/Portrush Road/Cross Road intersection, which are anticipated to be carried out during the current financial year, are expected to facilitate traffic flow through this intersection.

REYNELLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

130. **Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. When was an application for upgrading of the Reynella Primary School first received by the Education Department?

2. When will the upgrading take place?

3. Is the application for upgrading on a priority list and, if so, what degree of priority is allocated to it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. No application as such has been received by the Education Department for the upgrading of Reynella Primary School. Instead the region identifies schools' needs. When the region was established in 1978 a list of schools in priority order for redevelopment was formed. This could be perceived as being the time when the needs of the school were clearly identified.

2. Reynella Primary School is not on the building programme for 1983-84. Consequently, the earliest that any major works could be contemplated will depend on availability of funds and its ranking in priority with other schools needing redevelopment.

3. Reynella Primary School is on a regional priority list. It is allocated third position on that list.

SCHOOL FIRES

133. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. In relation to each fire at a public school during the past 12 months—

- what was the name of the school;
- what damage occurred;
- what was the estimated cost of damage;
- what was the cause;
- what replacement classrooms and equipment were necessary;
- what was the estimated cost of replacing buildings and equipment;
- were the buildings and contents fully insured;
- how and with whom was the school insured; and,
- what was the total insurance payout?

2. How are school properties insured?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

(a)

School	Building Cost	Equipment Cost
Craigmore High	15 000	9 500
Elizabeth Downs Junior Primary	50 000	38 250
Elizabeth Vale Primary	5 000	
Henley Beach Primary	†	10 598
Kangaroo Inn Area	300 000	42 000
Millbrook Primary	150 000	34 000
Northfield High	1 000 000	480 000
Para Hills Primary		200
Salisbury North Primary	700 000	45 000
Tarpeena Primary	15 000	2 000
Torrensville Primary	25 000	3 000
Cummins Area	600 000	34 122
Fremont High		1 598
Mawson High		17 018
Munno Para Primary	†	19 786
Gilles Plains High	300 000	35 770
Seaton High	100 000	14 000
Whyalla High	400	
Plympton High	400 000	64 491
	\$3 660 400	\$851 333

† Replacement cost not known as at 5.9.83

(b) Damage included destruction of school buildings, substantial damage to portion of buildings, total loss and damage to fixed equipment and loose furnishings.

(c) The total estimated cost of damage is \$3 660 400 buildings and \$851 333 equipment.

(d) Bushfire caused damage at Tarpeena Primary School and Kangaroo Inn Area School, and the destruction of Millbrook Primary School. Arson has been identified as the likely cause of all other school fires listed.

(e) 19 relocatable classrooms have been moved, or are programmed to be moved from other schools to some of

the schools affected by fires. Reconstruction of facilities at schools will be programmed when an agreed extent of replacement costs are established. Lost and damaged equipment has been replaced from Education Department resources.

(f) A cost of approximately \$900 000 is estimated for equipment replacement. As noted in (e) total building replacement costs have not been accurately established. Some schools require major rebuilding and costs of this work are estimated at \$2 000 000. The relocation of transportable accommodation to other fire affected schools is estimated to cost approximately \$600 000. (The value of the buildings relocated is estimated at \$1 000 000).

(g) Refer to II.

(h) Refer to II.

(i) Refer to II.

2. No specific insurance policy covers school buildings and equipment. The Government accepts the risk as its own insurer and replaces buildings and equipment destroyed by fire provided there is no evidence of lack of due care by the occupier.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY

134. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What plans does the Government have to accept and to commence the implementation of the National Conservation Strategy for Australia?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A copy of the National Conservation Strategy for Australia has now been received from the Prime Minister. State Government Departments and agencies will be asked to consider the strategy and report to the Government on its various aspects. Following assessment of the report, the Government will determine its attitude to adoption of the strategy and further action.

FRUIT FLY

135. **The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: How many instances of fruit fly contaminating fruit were detected at the various road blocks operated by the Department of Agriculture during 1982-83?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The following table summarises detections of fruit fly contaminated fruit at Department of Agriculture road blocks in 1982-83.

Road Block	Fruit Fly Identified	
	Queensland	Mediterranean
Ceduna	—	37
Yamba	2	—
Oodlawirra	11	—
Pinnaroo	—	—
	13	37

SCHOOL VANDALISM

137. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Minister recently received a delegation from Eastern Region schools regarding vandalism and the lack

of security in schools and, if so, what assurances was the Minister able to give and what action does he propose to take to meet the seven recommendations passed at an Eastern Region schools meeting?

2. What plans, if any, does the Minister have to upgrade Education Department security for schools, when will these plans be initiated and what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. I received a deputation from representatives of the Eastern Region School Council Security Committee on 23 August, 1983. I assured the members of the deputation that the Government is concerned at the increase in arson, vandalism and break and enter incidents at schools and that consideration is currently being given to ways and means of improving security. The committee's recommendation will receive attention as part of the current review.

2. All available evidence indicates that silent monitored alarm systems offer the best protection of school property and a proposal to introduce a phased programme of installation is currently under consideration at Cabinet level. Other options, including those matters raised by the Eastern Region School Security Section, are also receiving consideration at the present time. I expect a decision on the silent alarm proposal including likely costs to be made within a few weeks.

TEACHER HOUSING

138. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Did the Minister issue guidelines to the Teacher Housing Authority that rent increases should not exceed 19 per cent and, if so, why have many increases been set at levels up to 28 per cent higher?

2. Did the Minister give an undertaking that he would consult with the South Australian Institute of Teachers on the method of Teacher Housing Authority rental increases and, if so, why did this consultation not take place?

3. Did the Minister give an undertaking that there would be no increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals during the wage pause and, if so, how does he know that the wage pause will end before October 1983?

4. How much of the maintenance backlog on Teacher Housing Authority houses will be made up by October 1983?

5. Was an undertaking given that there would be no Teacher Housing Authority rentals for teachers housed outside of the electricity grid and, if so, why have such rentals been levied?

6. Why have some part-time teachers been levied rental increases for Teacher Housing Authority houses greater than those applying to full-time teachers?

7. Does the Minister intend to adopt the recommendation of the Report on Government Housing that the Teacher Housing Authority should be subsumed by the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. On 4 July 1983, Cabinet approved that subject to rent increases not exceeding \$8 per week (52 weeks) all Public Service housing rents be increased by approximately 19 per cent to four fifths of the vacancy rent level charged by the Housing Trust and the Minister of Education in accordance with previous practice at the appropriate time direct the Teacher Housing Authority to simultaneously adjust the rent of its tenants.

Whilst the submission to Cabinet by the Public Service Board indicated that the movement in Housing Trust rents from 1981-82 was 19 per cent rent freezes previously determined resulted in the movement to the four fifths of the

vacancy rent level charged by the Housing Trust exceeding 19 per cent in a number of instances.

The key criteria under which rentals are determined is four fifths of the vacancy rent level charged by the Housing Trust and, in accordance with this criteria and Cabinet approval, the Teacher Housing Authority adjusted its rentals accordingly.

Notwithstanding the above, I have advised the Teacher Housing Authority that no rent increase should exceed 19 per cent (subject to dollar rounding).

2. In the country conditions deputation with SAIT on 13 April agreement was sought by SAIT that the method of determining any future Teacher Housing Authority rent increases be negotiated. The Minister advised that he hoped that these negotiations would eventuate, concerning an 'agreed' procedure. This agreement was reached in principle only and no mechanisms to ensure that it was done were discussed.

These mechanisms will be discussed with SAIT soon and some machinery set up to facilitate them.

3. Yes. It is expected that the Arbitration Commission hearing on the national wage case will be completed soon and a decision handed down. In theory, the wage pause has already finished on 30 June although the flow-on has not yet occurred.

4. Commencing in March 1983, the Teacher Housing Authority mounted programmes designed to catch up backlog maintenance including planned preventative maintenance for the purposes of maintaining the fabric and structure of its assets. As a result of these initiatives, the backlog of houses on Aboriginal lands, which are the areas of greatest hardship, has now caught up and no outstanding maintenance exists.

In other areas, progress has been made by carrying a full year's normal cyclic painting programme into three months April, May, June of the 1982-83 financial year. In 1983-84 subject to weather conditions, work is under way to tackle backlog on exterior and interior painting and other maintenance works such as guttering and downpipes, prior to paint repairs and any general maintenance to minimise repetitive day to day repairs. The Authority has budgeted for accelerated progress on removal of backlog maintenance as a result of rent increases to apply from October 1983.

As a further initiative, work has begun on a capital works programme of \$4.5 million, which includes the expenditure of \$2.1 million on Aboriginal lands. This capital programme includes disposal of houses found to be uneconomic to maintain and/or upgrade and utilise proceeds of disposal for provision of new low maintenance housing stock.

5. Yes, it was part of the policy. A draft Cabinet submission has been prepared on this matter but it has been 'frozen' because of the imminent release of the Government Employee Housing Authority report. Discussions and consequent decisions on this report will have an effect on this issue.

6. In accordance with prescribed rent setting criteria, part-time teachers are only eligible for subsidy directly related to that period of time when they are employed by the South Australian Government. Accordingly, part-time teachers do not receive the same extent of subsidy as full-time teachers and as a consequence high rentals can apply. This matter is also under investigation.

7. The report on Government housing will be released, discussions will take place and a decision will be made by Cabinet.

HOSPITAL CLEANING COSTS

140. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health:

1. What were the costs of cleaning the Royal Adelaide Hosital, Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital, respectively, for the year ended 30 June 1983 and how do these compare with each of the previous four years?

2. How many full-time and part-time persons, respectively, were employed on cleaning at each of the hospitals in the years 1978-79 to 1982-83?

3. Have contract cleaners been invited to tender or give estimates of cleaning costs at the hospitals and, if so, what were their estimates and recommendations and, if this information has not been sought, why not?

4. Has there been any reduction in cleaning staff at the hospitals since 1978-79 and, if so, to what extent and, if not, why not?

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

Royal Adelaide Hospital

1. Year	Cost \$
1978-79	4 154 098
1979-80	3 779 064
1980-81	3 780 482
1981-82	3 855 809
1982-83	4 103 932

2.

Year	Full time equivalent persons employed (as at 30 June)	Full Time	Part Time (20 hrs per week)	Casual (15 hrs per week)	Casual (8 hrs per week)
1978-79	433.0	314	180	—	—
1979-80	402.5	318	169	—	—
1980-81	361.5	270	161	—	55
1981-82	302.7*	231	121.4	—	55
1982-83	272.1	200	101	25.6	60

* 40 Part-time transferred with Dental Hospital transfer to S.A. Dental Service.

3. In 1980 two private cleaning companies were invited to quote on cleaning the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Their reports were discussed by the hospital's board of management, but before a recommendation was forwarded to the Health Commission, the details of the reports were published in the local press.

Following representations to the Health Minister at the time, it was agreed not to proceed with this type of cleaning, provided the unions and staff would co-operate in an investigation into cleaning methods and frequencies at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Subsequently, a Cleaning Advisory Committee was established and much progress has been made toward the modernisation of cleaning services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

4. Yes. See 2 above.

were comparable to existing in-house cost, and negotiations have not continued beyond that stage.

4. Yes. See 2 above.

Modbury Hospital

1. Year	Cost \$
1978-79	798 720
1979-80	650 563
1980-81	711 983
1981-82	817 048
1982-83	878 775

2.

Year	Full time Equivalent Persons Employed (as at 30 June)	Part time Persons (Note: Not F.T.E.)
1978-79	57	38
1979-80	25	69
1980-81	21	70
1981-82	18	72
1982-83	16	73

Flinders Medical Centre

1.

Year	Cost \$
1978-79	1 389 381
1979-80	1 391 192
1980-81	1 568 659
1981-82	1 758 287
1982-83	2 160 290

2.

Year	Full Time Equivalent Persons Employed (as at 30 June)	Percent Part Time (Approx.)
1978-79	150.5	—
1979-80	145.5	10
1980-81	147.5	35
1981-82	147.5	75
1982-83	147.5	88

3. Contract cleaning firms have from time to time contacted the Flinders Medical Centre on the issue, and discussions have been held concerning the possibility of entering a cleaning contract. Preliminary estimates of cleaning costs

3. Contract cleaners have not been invited to tender or to give an estimate of costs. An ongoing 'in-house' management programme conducted by the hospital to reduce costs and increase efficiency in the cleaning service is having positive results.

4. Yes. See 2 above.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital

1.		
	Year	Cost \$
	1978-79	3 313 000
	1979-80	2 369 000
	1980-81	2 022 000
	1981-82	2 218 000
	1982-83	2 460 000
2.		
	Year	Full time Equivalent Persons Employed (as at 30 June)
	1978-79	211
	1979-80	201
	1980-81	186
	1981-82	173
	1982-83	176
		Part Time Persons (Note; Not F.T.E.)
		137
		102
		97
		85
		101

3. The Board of Management of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital considers that the hospital has the staff expertise to perform the job analysis and restructuring necessary to establish efficient work methods and staffing levels. On this basis the Board has not considered it necessary to engage outside contractors to carry out the hospital's cleaning function.

4. Yes. See 2 above.

T.A.S.

141. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:
1. Which agency was the first to be introduced to the new computer-based Treasury Accounting System?
 2. How is the system progressing and which agency will be next to be selected?
 3. Is implementation of the T.A.S. proceeding as estimated?
 4. When will the programme be completed and what is the estimated total cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Treasury Department will be the first agency introduced to the new Treasury Accounting System in November 1983.
2. The acquired software packages have been loaded at the Government Computing Centre and have passed all tests satisfactorily. Finishing touches are presently being applied to the associated inhouse programmes. In sequence, the initial agencies to be implemented are Treasury, Auditor-General's Department and the Department of the Public Service Board.
3. There has been some slippage on the implementation schedule. It is now planned to operate the new system in Treasury from November 1983. At that stage the Treasury staff required to operate the system will have completed their end of year accounting and budgeting commitments and will be more free to undergo intensive training in the new procedures.
4. The implementation of other agencies will start in December 1983 and is expected to take at least three years. It is a complex task and in some cases will require a substantial upgrading of agency management accounting systems. The estimated cost to be incurred by Treasury in implementing all agencies is about \$500 000 (present day costs). Agencies will incur additional costs depending on other changes they would plan to introduce at the same time.

GUARANTEES

143. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What payments totalling \$209 921 were made under guarantees, pursuant to the Industries Development Act and the Rural Advances Guarantee Act in 1982-83, to whom were such payments made and why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Under the Industries Development Act, one payment of \$137 811 was made to S.G.I.C. and another payment of \$10 233 was made to the Ramsay Trust. These amounts related to the guarantee of the Ramsay Trust Debenture Issue and represented the costs incurred by the Trust in mounting the issue, which was unsuccessful. Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, a payment of \$61 377 was made to the State Bank of South Australia to enable the Government to take possession of a fruit growing property at Renmark. This property was security for a loan guaranteed under the Act and had been abandoned by the mortgagors. To prevent further deterioration of the value of the security I agreed to take a transfer of the bank's security pending evaluation of options on the future disposition of the property. These options have now been considered and the property will be sold as soon as possible.

AGENT-GENERAL'S OFFICE

144. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Why was the 1982-83 Budget allocation of \$12 000 for the visit of an officer from the Agent-General's Office in London to South Australia exceeded by \$9 010 and what was the purpose of the visit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Under the terms of Mr Rundle's appointment, it was agreed that the Government would pay first-class air travel (London/Adelaide/London) for Mr Rundle, his wife and his daughter once every two years during the appointment. Mr Rundle used the full entitlement for the first two years with his first return visit to South Australia in November/December 1982. The costs involved were:

Air fares	\$ 17 494
Accommodation and other expenses	3 516

This exceeded the provisional allocation which had been made in the 1982-83 Budget.

OFFICE OF CABINET

145. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are now employed in the Office of Cabinet and what are their duties, respective classifications and salaries?
2. Are appointments to the Office made from the Public Service or by private contract?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 13 permanent officers employed in the Cabinet Office, one of whom is part-time.

Classification	Salary \$	Duties
EO-3	47 170	Manage the activities of the Cabinet Office. Provision to Cabinet of an administrative service. Advise on priority areas of concern. Co-ordination and monitoring of Government policies and their implementation. Research and analysis of Government policy issues. Provide advice and undertake projects for the Premier, Cabinet and Cabinet committees.

Classification	Salary \$	Duties
AO-4 (2 officers)	31 556	Provide advice to Cabinet and its committees on the implementation of Government policies and the determination of priority areas of concern. Act as an advisor to a Cabinet committee as required. Undertake or supervise projects related to the implementation of Government policies and programmes. Co-ordination and monitoring of the effectiveness of projects. Conduct or supervise the research and analysis of policy issues.
AO-3 (2 officers)	28 641 30 666	Provide advice to Cabinet and its committees on the implementation of Government policies and the determination of priority areas of concern. Undertake projects related to the implementation of Government policies and programmes. Co-ordination and monitoring of the effectiveness of projects. Conduct research and analysis of policy issues.
AO-1 (3 officers)	26 479 24 359 25 747	Assist with the provision of advice to Cabinet and its committees. Assist with or undertake projects relating to the implementation of Government policies and programmes and the co-ordination of their effective implementation. Assist with research and analysis of policy issues.
CO-5	22 440	Responsible for submission papers to Cabinet. Supervise preparation of material for Executive Council meetings and laying before Parliament.
CO-4	19 854	Preparation of papers for Cabinet and Executive Council. Recording of Cabinet decisions. Preparation of Parliamentary documents.
CO-2	15 513	Provide a secretarial and clerical service to the Director and other staff of the Cabinet Office.
CO-1	13 853	Receptionist.
CO-1 (Part-time officer)	13 593	Extra assistance for typing.

2. No appointments have been made by private contract. All appointments are from the Public Service.

POLICE PENSIONS

148. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What was the reason for the \$783 624 overrun from an estimated \$3 923 000 to \$4 706 624 of the Government's contribution to the Police Pensions Act?
2. How many members retired during the past financial year?
3. Was there an under estimate of funds required and, if so, how did this occur?

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

1. In addition to the amount of \$3 923 000 allowed in the estimate of the Government's contribution, a further sum of \$500 000 was set aside by Treasury in the 'round sum allowances' to meet a cost of living increase to pensions of 13.8 per cent payable from the first pension day in July 1982. The total estimate was, in effect, \$4 423 000, leaving a true 'overrun' of \$283 624 at 30 June 1983.

The reason for actual expenditure exceeding the estimated figure was an unexpectedly high increase in the number of pensions paid.

2. Fifty-one retirements.
3. Yes. The estimate of funds required was based on a prediction of normal retirement expectations in comparison with preceding years. As it transpired, there was an abnormally high rate of retirement, particularly of officers at a senior level, between the time of the estimate and 30 June 1983.

RIVERLAND FRUIT PRODUCTS CO-OPERATIVE LIMITED

149. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. What are the accumulated losses of Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited (Receivers and Managers appointed)?
2. How much has been granted by the Government to cover losses and other payments?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The following figures were prepared by the Receiver/Manager earlier this year.

	As at 30.8.79 \$	As at 31.12.80 \$	As at 31.12.81 \$	As at 31.12.82 \$
Accumulated loss	1 023 262	11 638 699	18 267 634	22 673 726
Loss for year		10 615 437	6 628 935	4 406 692
Less pre receivership	1 023 262	8 354 380	2 227 321	521 256
Receiver/Manager losses (3 months)				
Year		2 261 057	4 401 614	3 884 836
Cumulative		2 261 057	6 662 671	10 547 507

Source: Receiver/Managers—1983 Outlook Report, page 3.

2. The South Australian Government has paid \$9 million to offset these losses to date, and has indemnified the Receiver so that all loans incurred on the Receiver's account will be met by the Government.

LOAN COUNCIL ALLOCATIONS

150. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Why was the Budget allocation of \$6 100 000 in 1982-83 exceeded by \$3 548 098 for Expenses of Conversion and Public Loans and who approved the excesses and when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Loan Council allocates Commonwealth bonds to the States to finance their borrowing programmes. The provision for Expenses of Conversion and Public Loans includes the cost of writing up to face value the proceeds of bonds issued at a discount. On 1 July 1983, Loan Council finalised the allocation of stocks to finance the States' borrowing programmes for 1982-83. The levels of discount were substantially higher than expected. Additional appropriation was required to enable the necessary bookkeeping entries to be passed.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE FUND

151. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Why was the Budget allocation of \$1 900 000 in 1982-83 for insurance of cash, motor vehicles, etc., and transfer to Government Insurance Fund for the payment of claims exceeded by \$4 175 867 and who authorised the excesses and when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Several major school fires occurred during the latter part of 1982-83. In June 1983, I authorised that an additional \$4.2 million be made available to the Government Insurance Fund towards restoration costs. This was the best estimate of loss which could be made in the light of the information then available.

SOUTHEND GOLF COURSE

153. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. When will the Minister answer the letter written to him by the Member for Mallee on 25 March, seeking his assistance in obtaining land upon which the community of Southend wish to establish a golf course?

2. Will he advise the Secretary of the Southend Progress Association, Mrs Kay Fennell, of the way in which the Association should proceed in obtaining title to the land described in that letter and, if so, what will that advice be?

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

1. A reply was forwarded to the Member for Mallee on 3 October 1983.

2. See above.

O-BAHN PROJECT

154. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. In relation to the O-Bahn project—

- (a) what is the estimated total cost of land acquisition;
- (b) what is the estimated total cost of landscaping; and
- (c) what is the estimated total track cost?

2. What is the anticipated cost of the Mercedes buses for the project, how many will be purchased and were tenders called for their supply and, if not, why not?

3. How many more passengers per day are likely to be carried on the O-Bahn system than are currently transported on existing STA buses from the area served?

4. Does the STA intend to charge a premium fare for passengers using the service?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. For the whole Busway estimated costs are:

Land Acquisition, \$5.533 million; Landscaping, \$4.030 million (not including Linear Park); Track Construction, \$15.139 million.

2. The estimated cost of the Mercedes-Benz buses is \$22 800 000 including all spares and special tools.

90 buses will be purchased.

Tenders were not called for their supply because the O-Bahn system is a joint development of Daimler-Benz and Ed Zublin, and warranty provisions for the whole system can only be effectively obtained from those developers.

3. Daily patronage forecasts are as follows:

Current (1983), 11 000; 1986, 15 000; 1996, 20 000.

4. No.

MEMBERS' ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

155. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. What are the reasons for the differences between the 1982-83 Budget allocations and the actual payments of

accommodation allowances for House of Assembly and Legislative Council Members, respectively?

2. How many Members from each House qualify for the allowance, and how is such allowance allocated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The amount which was budgeted for members' accommodation allowances for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council for 1982-83 was based on the level of claims which were lodged during 1981-82. The expected full year effect of an increase in the amount claimable per night (from \$45 to \$55 per night) from 1 January 1982 was also taken into account. The amount of expenditure which is actually incurred for members' accommodation allowances is determined solely by the number and extent of claims which are lodged by members. The total number of days accommodation allowance which was claimed by House of Assembly Members was reasonably even over the two years (623 days claimed in 1981-82 compared with 660 days in 1982-83). The total number of days claimed by Legislative Council members rose from 727 in 1981-82 to 884 in 1982-83, an increase of 157 allowance/days. The reason for the increase is because the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal altered the criteria for determination of payment.

2. Currently there are eleven House of Assembly members and eight Legislative Council members eligible to claim accommodation allowances. Allowances are paid on the basis of claims which are lodged by the members concerned. Any member (other than a Minister of the Crown) whose place of residence is situated beyond the metropolitan area as defined in section 7 of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1968-69, is entitled to claim an accommodation allowance whenever he or she is required to stay in Adelaide overnight in order to attend:

(a) any Parliamentary sitting.

(b) any Select Committee sitting, or

(c) any official Government, Parliamentary or Vice-Regal function, and incurs expense in so doing.

Members of the Legislative Council who are eligible to claim accommodation allowances are also entitled to be paid the allowance whenever they are required to stay in Adelaide overnight in order to attend to their electoral duties. The amount (per diem) of the allowance is determined by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal and is currently set at \$55 per day.

MEMBERS' ACCIDENT INSURANCE

156. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What new arrangements has the Government made to provide accident insurance cover for members of Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I direct the honourable member to the circular outlining details of the cover which is provided, which was sent to all members by the Presiding Officers on 7 July 1983.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND

158. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. How many persons are now receiving superannuation from the South Australian Superannuation Fund, and what are the estimates for each year until the year 2000?

2. What are the estimated costs to the State of payments to the Fund for each year until the year 2000?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 June 1983 9 824 persons were receiving a pension from the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

2. The Public Actuary is currently preparing a report on the anticipated numbers of pensioners and the superannua-

tion costs to the State in future years. The report is expected to be completed by the end of 1983 and I will then table it in Parliament. The report will update similar figures contained in a previous report on long-term superannuation costs tabled in Parliament on 16 July 1981.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY SCHOOLS

159. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Technology:

1. What high schools have been designated as high technology schools and what special equipment is being allocated to them?

2. What special programmes are being implemented in these schools and how many students are expected to participate in these programmes?

3. What are the objectives of this scheme and how much money has been spent on it so far?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. No schools have been designated, nor have programmes been determined.

2. The Director-General, through the Director of Curriculum, has established a project team to report on the issues by 31 October.

3. The preliminary terms of reference read as follows:

(1) to report on possible ways of introducing high technology into secondary schools from the beginning of the 1984 school year.

(2) to present options for the expenditure of the \$250 000 earmarked in the Education Department's 1983-84 budget for high technology programmes for secondary schools.

(3) to advise on the appropriate courses, staffing, equipment, facilities and inservice education of teachers required for these programmes in 1984 and beyond.

(4) to advise on funding to maintain and expand the programmes.

(5) to ensure that the programmes are accessible in relation to the needs of girls, country students and disadvantaged students.

(6) to present options for the location of high technology programmes in schools, educational centres, mobile centres or other suitable venues.

(7) to advise on needed curriculum development in courses, about, with and in technology and the impact of technology on society.

(8) to liaise with existing committees, other Government departments and educational institutions and organisations.

(9) to provide a preliminary report on the expenditure of \$250 000 in this financial year to the Director-General of Education no later than 31 October 1983.

AUDITOR-GENERAL

167. **Mr BECKER:** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. When will the new Auditor-General be appointed?

2. What was the reason the new Auditor-General was not appointed by 24 June when Mr G. Tattersall retired?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr T.A. Sheridan was appointed on 22 September 1983, and took up his position on 10 October 1983.

2. Mr Sheridan was engaged in the formulation of the State Government Budget. His appointment was made as soon as practicable after the completion of that work.

CASH HOLDINGS

172. **Mr BECKER:** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What action can be taken to halt the further decline in cash held by the Treasurer at 30 June from the lowest balance in 1983 since 1974?

2. What average interest rate was being earned on the \$84.6 million cash at bank and deposits with banks as at 30 June 1983?

3. How much cash is currently lodged at banks?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Basically, the amount of cash held by the Treasurer represents the balances of Consolidated Account, Trust Accounts and Special Deposit Accounts. The significant reduction in cash holdings in 1982-83 reflected the year's deficit on Consolidated Account of \$57.1 million. The Government's proposed deficit on Consolidated Account in 1983-84 of \$5 million will do much to halt the decline in cash holdings.

2. 14.03 per cent per annum.

3. At 30 September 1983, an amount of \$56 million was lodged on deposit with banks and an amount of \$5 million was held in the Government's current account. In addition, an amount of \$26 million was lodged on deposit with short term money market institutions. The value of cheques drawn but not presented was \$31.1 million giving a net cash position at 30 September 1983 of \$55.9 million.

MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET

174. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many and what makes and models of motor vehicles are attached to the Minister's Department?

2. In view of the comments in the Auditor-General's Report, can the size of the motor vehicle fleet be reduced without affecting the activities of the Department, particularly after hours crisis and support care?

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

1. 257 motor vehicles.

125 Mitsubishi Sigma sedans; 44 Ford Laser sedans; 14 Holden Gemini sedans; 13 Mitsubishi Sigma station sedans; 7 Toyota Landcruisers; 7 Subaru 4 x 4 Station sedans; 3 Holden Commodore sedans; 2 Chrysler Valiant sedans; 1 Chrysler Valiant station sedan; 15 Toyota buses; 7 Datsun buses; 7 Mitsubishi buses; 2 Ford buses; 1 Leyland bus; 1 Hino bus; 4 Holden utilities; 3 Toyota utilities; 1 Austin truck.

2. No.

RECEIPTS OF TAXATION

178. **Mr BECKER:** (on notice) asked the Premier—Was a shortfall predictable in the receipts of taxation on the recurrent account for the year ended 30 June 1983 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, and it was referred to in the second reading of Appropriation Bill (No. 1) in the House on 3 May 1983.

RECURRENT INCOME

179. **Mr BECKER:** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the reason for a shortfall of \$5 872 000 in recurrent income from public undertakings for the year ended 30 June 1983?

2. Can a more accurate budget prediction be made in future and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Principally the result of natural disasters (including the Ash Wednesday bushfires) and the effect of timber dumping and a depressed building industry on the operations of the Woods and Forests Department.

2. It will always be necessary to vary budget predictions as circumstances change over the forecast period.

SECONDARY SCHOOL COMPUTERS

180. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many computers are there in Government secondary schools?

2. How many students are there in Government secondary schools?

3. What computer training courses are available in secondary schools and how many students undertake these courses?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. There are approximately 600-700 computers in Government secondary schools. This number includes approximately 30 networks. More are known to be on order.

2. There are 78 000 secondary students in Government schools.

3. If 'training courses' means:

(1) vocational courses; then business education courses would be those taught. Inservice education of business education teachers has taken place over the past three years and most would be able to take such course. While it is possible to say that approximately 4 000 students undertake studies in Business Studies and Commerce, it is not possible to state the number using computers.

(2) Senior Computer Studies: then the number is in the order of 400 at Year 11. In addition, there are school based courses and Year 12 courses on trial.

(3) Computing awareness: then the number is approximately 16 000.

S.T.A. STRIKES AND BANS

181. **The Hon D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Were the S.T.A. bus drivers who recently went on strike paid for the period during which they were on strike?

2. Were the S.T.A. bus drivers who recently imposed bans on certain services paid for the period during which these bans were imposed?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Bus drivers were only paid for the time worked.

TEACHER HOUSING

184. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—What is the distribution of maintenance funds for teacher housing on a regional basis?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The preliminary allocation of maintenance funds for the Teacher Housing Authority for 1983-84 is:

	\$'000s
Central	190
Eyre	180
Northern	160
Southern and Riverland	310
South Eastern	110
Remote areas	150
On-costs	150
	<hr/> 1 250

Such allocations were determined after extensive review by the South Australian Housing Trust and Public Buildings Department inspectors.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY SCHOOLS

185. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—In establishing 'High Technology Schools', is the Education Department—

(a) to extend the scheme to country areas;

(b) to involve only high schools; and

(c) to call for applications from interested schools?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No schools have yet been designated, nor have programs been determined.

The Director-General of Education, through the Director of Curriculum, has established a team to report on the issues by 31 October 1983.

(a) Country schools will be considered along with metropolitan schools.

(b) In the first instance, secondary schools will be involved, although their services will be available to primary schools as well as other high schools.

(c) Procedures for identifying the schools have not been determined. In the first instance, all Regional Directors of Education have been invited to make suggestions.