HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 29 August 1984

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

PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence fees for the promotion of sporting activities was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: RAPE

A petition signed by 126 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reform the current laws relating to rape was presented by Ms Lenehan.

Petition received.

PETITION: MILLIPEDES

A petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide more money to research the biological control of millipedes, release the report of Dr Geoff Baker, and ensure that supplies of pesticide for the control of millipedes are readily available was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

RADIOLOGICAL BASED DISEASES

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (7 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My colleague the Minister of Health informs me that officers of the South Australian Health Commission have researched this matter and agree with the honourable member that there is no medical practitioner within the State who specialises in diagnosing and treating patients with radiological based diseases. There is no qualification in this field which is registrable in South Australia as a specialist qualification and it is understood that this situation applies throughout Australia. Even if there was such a specialist qualification the recruitment of a person with that qualification would not be justified as the number of cases referred by general practitioners or other specialists would be extremely small.

However, this does not mean that South Australia lacks expertise in the diagnosis and treatment of such diseases. The following groups have a depth of knowledge of the subjects:

Medical practitioners who are specialists in radiology or radiotherapy need to have an intimate knowledge of the problems that can be caused by excessive exposures to ionising radiation to ensure that their patients are not adversely affected by their treatment.

Medical officers in the Public Health Service have a responsibility for ensuring that individuals employed in occupations which expose them to ionising radiation and the general public have an exposure to radioactivity which is as low as reasonably achievable. This work requires the close understanding of the health effects of any such exposure. In the past, these officers have taken blood samples for possible radiation induced chromosomal aberrations and referred the samples to the Australian Radiation Laboratory for analysis.

Certain medical officers in the Armed Services have had training in diagnosing and treating casualties from nuclear, biological and chemical exposure which could be caused by warlike activity.

Other specialists such as dermatologists, haematologists, oncologists and gastroenterologists would be considering ionising radiation in their differential diagnosis of causation of the disease when examining a patient. These groups and others would have had training in the effects of ionising radiation on the human body in their undergraduate and specialist training. In respect of the honourable member's constituent, the South Australian Health Commission advises that he should be referred by his general practitioner to a haematologist. That haematologist will be able to assess his blood disorder and define the probable causation and institute treatment. Other people within the State who consider that they may be affected by exposure to radiation should consult with their general practitioners. Depending on the organ system affected (that is blood, skin, gastrointestinal tract) the individual can be referred to the appropriate specialist for his expert opinion.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Totalisator Agency Board—Report, 1984.

QUESTION TIME

HERALD ADVERTISING

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say why taxpayers' funds are being used to save the Australian Labor Party's newspaper the *Herald* from financial collapse, and will he put an immediate stop to this practice? A message on the front page of the July-August 1983 issue of the *Herald* stated that the paper was in financial trouble because it could not obtain advertising. Subsequently, a significant number of State and Federal Government departments have taken out advertisements in the *Herald.* The latest issue for August contains advertising worth $1 665 at normal rates, more than half of this being State Government money. It is estimated that in total more than $9 000 of taxpayers' funds has been spent on advertising in this paper since it appealed for financial help. As the paper is published solely for Party political propaganda purposes, the use of taxpayers' money to save it from financial collapse is completely improper and should be stopped immediately.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad to see that the Leader reads the *Herald.* I guess those who produce it will be pleased with the publicity given to it. The *Herald* has an increasing circulation which goes beyond members of the Labor Party as such. As far as its advertising is concerned, as with any journal, whether it be a house journal or not,

it has somebody in charge of obtaining advertising for it at the appropriate rates. No doubt it has attempted to seek Government advertising as it seeks advertising from any other source. I am not aware that there is any embargo on publications attracting Government advertising. The Leader of the Opposition said that the *Herald* was going into liquidation or could not obtain finance, or something like that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As with any small newspaper, it is obviously requiring advertising and seeks it wherever it can get it. No directive has been issued other than that commercial reasons will be applied in getting advertising. I am not sure whether the Liberal Party has a journal. We know that it has a headquarters that has just been knocked over, despite its being a heritage item.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to resume his seat. Some honourable members are creating so much noise that they are preventing other honourable members from asking questions. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Quite extraordinary sensitivity is being displayed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That quite extraordinary sensitivity increases with every word I utter. The final point I make is that if, in fact, the Liberal Party, the National Party or any other of the minority groups in our political system have journals, I would hope that they have advertising managers who are enterprising enough to seek advertising from all sources, including Government sources. I can assure them equally that there would be no embargo on any Government instrumentalities, if the commercial value could be demonstrated, advertising in such publications. The invitation is there.

BOATING FEES

Mr GROOM: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to a front page article in today's *News* concerning an increase in fees under the Boating Act? If so, will he advise the House of the requirements of the Act concerning fees charged for licences and registration fees connected with boats and whether the increase represents an example of taxation by stealth, as alleged by the Leader of the Opposition in that article?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is very hard to ignore such a lurid and misleading headline and article as is in the *News* today. It is as well to put the record very straight indeed: it is an extraordinary headline and an extraordinary beat up. While I know that tabloid afternoon newspapers have the need to present the news in as exciting and stimulating a way as possible, I really believe that this goes right over the top, and let me explain why.

The rise is represented as a 140 per cent increase in licence fees and a 42 per cent increase in registration fees. The actual amount about which we are talking is $7 in the case of the licence fees—$7! It has gone from $5 to $12 and, in the case of the registration fees, the amount is $5, or 10 cents a week. Incidentally, one could write that 10c off in one year, because the $5 extra which is being paid is for a new licence issue and, once one has that licence, one has it for life. It seems to me quite extraordinary to misrepresent the position.

Another fact is missing. Is this an increase that has been appearing month after month or year after year? Licence fees were last increased in December 1979—five years ago. Registration fees were last increased in March 1981, more than three years ago. They have not been increased in that period because under the requirements of the Act we attempt to ensure that those fees are spent (and they are put into a special fund for this purpose) in relation to boating safety. I would hope that one or two members opposite believe that there is some value in that. The member for Glenelg, representing a seaside electorate, certainly would. He would believe that there is some importance in boating safety and in ensuring that we put some resources into it.

I am not surprised, incidentally, when I refer to the Boating Act, that the Leader of the Opposition demonstrated an ignorance of it. He was featured on the pages of a paper failing to comply with a particular provision of the Boating Act earlier. I am further advised that that has caused inspectors quite a number of problems because, whenever they attempt to enforce that particular breach of the regulations, they are quoted the example of the Leader of the Opposition by people who say, 'If it's good enough for him, why isn't it good enough for me?'

So, I will excuse the Leader's ignorance of the Boating Act and perhaps suggest that he ought to do a bit of study. However, for those others who may be more concerned about the provisions, I refer to section 37 (1) of that Act, which provides:

> All fees recovered under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into a separate fund which shall be applied in defraying the cost of the administration of this Act.

In other words, the fees are to be applied in order to ensure that the general taxpayer is not subsidising this area, and that is quite appropriate.

The advice tendered is that, because there has been no increase whatsoever over that length of time, the fund is moving into deficit. Costs are expected to exceed revenue by $198 000 in 1984-85 and by $224 000 in 1985-86, a growing overall deficit. The Act requires that something be done about it and that the charges be adjusted in order to defray those costs. If no action was taken, there would be a deficit in the fund of about $426 000. It is very easy for the Opposition to take the line that it has consistently taken, which is that the Government should follow the Tonkin formula, sit on its hands and do nothing, not have the guts to adjust the particular rates, try to avoid the political odium of that, and run us into bankruptcy.

But I am not going to accept a deficit of $426 000 in that fund. The increases there will simply mean that that fund will come back into balance. That is as it should be and that is as the Act requires it. So, to talk about it being back-door taxation is absolute and total nonsense. The election promise said nothing about allowing this State to go into bankruptcy or about not adjusting charges where those charges were to be directed to specific purposes.

Let me say that if any Government is going to be subjected to the sort of attitude that is personified by that amount of a few dollars being added in order to pay for very legitimate costs for something like boating safety, heaven help the political system in this country. We are told in a thundering editorial that things like road safety and tourism are mere cosmetics. They are not cosmetics. Our responsibility as a Government must be met. It is required by the Act, and we must levy the charges to meet it. I believe that every person in the community recognises that and that, once one gets behind the headlines to the facts, one will realise why the action was taken.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: How does the Minister of Marine rationalise the Premier's statement just made that he is not going to accept a deficit of $426 000 in fees collected under the Boating Act, when the Department of Marine and Harbors made a $4 million profit last year? The Premier has just said that he will not accept the $426 000

deficit in fees collected under the Boating Act—a most extraordinary statement when the Department of Marine and Harbors made a $4 million profit last year.

I quote from the Auditor-General's Report. The receipts under wharfage, tonnage rates, etc., in the Department of Marine and Harbors totalled $24.165 million. Compared to that, payments were $20.401 million, giving a profit to the Department of Marine and Harbors of $3.764 million. The Premier quoted section 37(1) of the regulations under the Boating Act. He said:

> All fees recovered under the provisions of the Act shall be paid into a separate fund which shall be applied in defraying the costs of the administration of this Act.

The Premier has tried to make out that all fees collected under the Boating Act shall meet the total costs of meeting the obligations under the Act. I repeat to the House that the regulation says 'shall be applied in defraying the costs of the administration of this Act', not meeting the cost totally. How does the Minister reconcile the Premier's statement with the information that I have just given the House?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Perhaps I should ask the former Minister why he increased these registration fees by more than what was recommended by the Department in 1981.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Question Time will not proceed until honourable members come to order. I ask honourable members to come to order, or I will be forced to vacate the Chair.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Licence fees were last increased in December 1979 and registration fees in March 1981. The former Government recommended higher increases than the Department recommended because it did not want to face the problem of increasing these fees prior to the last election. The member for Torrens has asked me how I reconcile the comments made by the Premier.

Section 37 of the Boating Act specifies that all fees recovered under the provision of the Act shall be applied in defraying the cost of administration. The Act also provides that the fees prescribed shall not exceed such amounts as will result in sufficient revenue to meet this expenditure. Boating licence fees were last increased, from $3 to $5, on 1 December 1979. When the cost of administering the Act previously exceeded current revenue, without any increase the current break-even point would become a $200 000 deficit. So, there is an urgent need to cover the operating costs from these fees. All fees recovered under the provisions of the Act are paid into the separate fund, which shall be applied in defraying the cost of administering the Act.

The projected levels of income and expenditure indicate an excess in cost over revenue of $198 000 in 1984-85 and $224 000 in 1985-86, which, together with the current deficit in the account of $4 000, would amount to an accumulated deficit of $426 000 at 30 June 1986. So, the proposed fees will generate additional revenue resulting in a credit in the account of approximately $14 000 at 13 June 1986. The only way that we can reduce those costs is to reduce the number of inspectors, and that is just not on. We have had requests and demands to put on more inspectors, and we would like to be able to do that. However, one has to have the money to put on the additional inspectors, and I think that, with the boating activity that is taking place along the Murray River, it is probably desirable to have more inspectors. However, unless one has the finances one cannot put on more inspectors, and these increases are necessary.

RECREATION AND SPORT

Mrs APPLEBY: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport the details of the amount allocated in the Federal Budget for recreation and sport, and can he advise what will be the effect on sport in Australia, particularly South Australia, as a result of the Federal Budget allocation?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I have been formally advised by the Federal Minister (Hon. John Brown) in regard to the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I know that we have seven or eight different shadow Ministers of Recreation and Sport on the other side, but if all honourable members listened they would learn something. The allocation in the Federal Budget for recreation and sport will rise from $22.53 million expended in 1983-84 to $31.24 million in 1984-85. The major categories of expenditure in 1984-85 will be as follows:

> Sport, recreation and fitness programmes will receive $8.05 million, an increase of 27 per cent over 1983-84 funding.
>
> Life saving organisations will receive an increase of $0.275 million or 33 per cent over 1983-84 funding, with a total of $1.1 million.
>
> Assistance for sport and recreation for disabled people will increase to $0.7 million, 75 per cent higher than the August 1983 Budget allocation.
>
> A total of $1.2 million for the Commonwealth and Australia Games; $400 000 will be provided for team preparation and participation in the 1986 Edinburgh Commonwealth Games and $800 000 will be provided for the inaugural Australia Games in Melbourne in January 1985.
>
> The Interim Committee for the Australian Sports Commission will receive $274 000 for its administrative costs.
>
> Funding for the Australian Institute of Sport will increase by around 60 per cent from $5.56 million in 1983-84 to $8.92 million in 1984-85. This will permit the inclusion of two new sports and the commencement of the fitting out and furnishing of the sports science, administration and residential buildings.
>
> An amount of $162 000 is provided for the continuation of the Sports Studies Course at the Canberra College of Advanced Education . . .

Important, I think, from the South Australian point of view is the fact that almost $33 million for a three-year programme commencing in 1984-85 has been allocated to provide top-class international standard sports facilities, and $10.84 million will be available for the first year. As members will see, the information provided by the Federal Minister states that full-year funding for sport and recreation will increase substantially in every category in 1984-85 which, in addition to the already greatly increased allocation in 1983-84, will make a significant contribution to the future for sport and recreation in Australia. As to some of those programmes, particularly the $33 million allocated for a three-year programme, certainly representations have been made and will continue to be made in regard to South Australia receiving its share of the allocation.

CAR REPAIRS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether he endorses the use of taxpayers' funds to undercut the operations of service stations in South Australia? Questions have been raised in this House during the past week about activities at the Thebarton workshop of the Department of Mines and Energy. In his answers, the Minister responsible has demonstrated complete contempt for the extent to which some of these operations are in direct competition with private service stations. In his statement yesterday, the Minister said:

> What private industry charge is irrelevant.

This statement completely ignores the fact that service stations are small businesses with, in the main, seven or eight employees which should not have their operations undercut by taxpayer subsidised competition.

The Opposition now has further evidence that this is occurring at the Thebarton workshop of the Department of Mines and Energy. I refer to a letter to one private school

principal from the workshop's Principal Engineer which states that facilities of the garage at the workshop which can be made available include mechanical repair and maintenance functions, electronic tuning, wheel alignment and minor panel and paint work for light and heavy vehicles with diesel, petrol or LPG motors. This letter makes it clear that the workshop is undertaking a deliberate campaign to take work away from service stations and is doing so by quoting rates which can undercut the private operators because they are subsidised by the taxpayer. If the Premier does want to support small business he should immediately halt this practice.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is quite pathetic. Let us have a bit of perspective and common sense in questions in this House. We are talking about a very limited scheme which was introduced with the aim of utilising labour and materials which would be paid for at the proper charge-out rate in order to ensure that Government efficiency was maintained. There was nothing wrong with that. If the boot was on the other foot, we would have members opposite inveighing against us for inefficiencies and wastage. That certainly took place under an appalling policy that allowed run-downs in those areas and the dislocation of gangs, which meant that people were sitting in workshops, twiddling their thumbs or playing cards while the private sector was given contracts and received double payment for doing the same job. We were told that that was in the name of efficiency.

That came to a stop when we came to office, and it will not be repeated. The Minister of Mines and Energy has explained in detail exactly the circumstances of that particular situation, the action that was taken and the reason for it. He has also explained that it no longer continues, and the answers have been laid out completely in *Hansard*. I would have thought that that was the end of the matter, yet we still have such futile questions. Let us get things in perspective and decide whether we want the Government to run its business efficiently with care for the taxpayers' dollar or whether we want to indulge in the sort of waste that went on under three years of Liberal mismanagement that nearly drove this State bankrupt.

WHYALLA GAS PRICES

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy outline the background of the most welcome announcement by the South Australian Gas Company that gas prices in Whyalla have been reduced by about 10 per cent?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can outline the circumstances, and I share the view of the honourable member and, I am sure, that of his constituents that this announcement by the South Australian Gas Company is a most welcome one for gas users in Whyalla. The reduction has been made possible by the availability of liquid petroleum gas from the new facility at Port Bonython. LPG is the feedstock to produce gas at Whyalla and, before it came on stream at Port Bonython, it had to be road freighted either from Port Stanvac or from Melbourne. A price reduction of this nature for whatever reason is a rarity and the company deserves much credit for passing on so quickly to Whyalla gas consumers the freight savings that it can now achieve.

The South Australian Gas Company still expects to make a small loss on the Whyalla operation because it has had a loss operation in that area, I think, since it introduced liquid gas in about 1968. The price cut referred to demonstrates the benefits that can flow from the development of local resources. In a recent press release from the member for Mitcham, who I assume is the understudy, shadow Minister or whatever for Mines and Energy, he tried to suggest that the best way to provide for South Australia's energy needs was to shift the whole operation to another State. However, more of that perhaps at another time. I simply record my pleasure at the company's prompt passing on to gas users in Whyalla the freight saving resulting from its use of the company's new facility.

GOVERNMENT PETROL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inquire whether officers of the Department of Mines and Energy have been obtaining petrol at discounted Government rates from the Department's Thebarton workshop? Following questions that were asked in the House last Thursday about activities at the workshop, some people have contacted the Opposition to identify other irregularities. One former employee of the Department, who has given the Opposition his name and other details, has said that petrol has been made available from the workshop for use in the private vehicles of employees.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I will inquire.

SCHOOL UNIFORMS

Ms LENEHAN: Does the Minister of Education intend to alter regulations or legislation to enable schools to enforce the compulsory wearing of school uniforms? I ask this question because of the confusion that currently exists within the public school system as to whose responsibility it is to direct decisions on the wearing of school uniforms. This matter has been continually on the agenda of many primary and secondary schools in this State.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Discussions have taken place with parent groups in South Australia over recent months.

The Hon. H. Allison: For years.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is correct. Numerous views have been expressed over a long period. At the 1983 annual general meeting of the South Australian State Schools Organisation, a motion called for the compulsory wearing of uniforms in schools. That matter was conveyed to me in the normal course of events and I then determined that all parent groups in South Australia and the Institute of Teachers should be consulted as to their views on the adequacy of the present regulations concerning school dress. In February this year I wrote to all the parent groups, and it took some months for them to reply. I do not criticise them for that, because certain groups went to considerable trouble to canvass as wide a cross section of their membership as possible.

One group surveyed all its affiliated bodies within its particular association. A few weeks ago we received the final replies to the letter I wrote, and we have summarised the views expressed. While some views favour change to legislation or regulations which would enable schools to make the wearing of school uniforms compulsory, there have been as many views of the opposite persuasion. Generally, the viewpoints expressed seem to be that school communities should be making these decisions at the school base level as far as possible. However, the overall summary (inasmuch as one can summarise a survey) was that the *status quo* should be maintained on the basis that it is basically achieving what is desired, perhaps not perfectly, although no set of regulations may suit everyone's desires.

Whether or not legislation or regulations should be introduced to make the wearing of school uniforms compulsory, other issues need to be canvassed in any debate on this point. I have raised this in correspondence with all parent

groups in the hope that they, too, will tackle these issues. If regulations were to be changed to enable schools to have compulsory uniform wearing, what would happen about Government assisted students? There would surely be some financial obligation on someone to assist the families of those students to meet the cost of providing the school uniforms. If one works on a cost of $100 a year for uniforms, $4 million would have to be provided by someone. Would that onus to pay be put back on to the families of Government assisted students, the school communities or Consolidated Revenue? Someone would have to face up to that problem.

The next question is what would happen if a school determined a policy enforcing the wearing of school uniforms and that policy was abhorrent to a parent of a child who could go to that school, that school being a district school for that family, but the parent decides to send the child to a more distant school thereby incurring travelling costs. Who would have the financial responsibility of meeting, either in full or in part, the associated increased travelling costs? That issue would have to be faced up to. It cannot be argued that the full burden would have to be borne by the parents: that is not a sensible proposition. Another important matter which has not been canvassed in debates previously is common law questions. On the one hand, we require children of certain ages to go to school: there is the element of compulsion. If, on the other hand, certain schools can enforce policies that are abhorrent to certain parents we may be saying, 'No, your child cannot go to this school, even though it is a district school, unless you adhere to the uniform policy.' There could be common law questions to be resolved in that regard, and that issue has not been tackled so far.

The debate has been about whether or not a school can have the power to enforce the wearing of school uniforms. There has been no consideration of whether schools would contemplate having hybrid policies, a policy that applied uniforms to one group in a school and a non-uniform policy applying to another group in a school. In secondary education it may be the opinion of the school that it does not want to enforce on a group of young adults the wearing of a uniform that it asks its junior students to wear. For different reasons, primary schools might prefer to have a differentiation of policy for junior primary children, suggesting that they may not have a uniform policy, but senior primary (year 3 to 7) students may be subject to a uniform policy. That issue will, I hope, be canvassed by the community in further debates on this matter. However, I am determined at this stage that the *status quo* be maintained. I do not propose any change to the regulations that would enable school councils to enforce the wearing of uniforms.

I have approved publication of an administrative guideline that sets out all the options available to school councils and principals concerning matters of school uniform or dress. In fact there are a number of options that school councils can consider. It is not just a matter of uniform or no uniform; there can be school dress policies that make a range of designs or colours available, and because all those matters maybe are not known to every school community, the publication of this guideline will make those options more widely known to schools in South Australia.

TRAIN STRIKE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Why did the Minister of Transport tell this Parliament yesterday, in relation to the ongoing train strike in this State, that he was doing everything possible to have STA train services running as soon as possible when he had not even spoken to the union official who is directing the present train strike? On ABC radio this morning the State Secretary of the Australian Railways Union (Mr Crossing) said that the Minister of Transport had not attempted to speak to him during the current strike. It is now five days since the strike was first announced and the Minister has not done a thing. It is the most damning evidence that this Parliament could have that this Minister has done absolutely nothing to resolve this strike.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member to order. Question Time must not be used in a substantive fashion. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The reason that I have not contacted the Secretary of the Australian Railways Union since last Friday night, when I asked him would he give—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Why didn't you ring him last Friday?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Is the honourable member still asking questions?

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Yes.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The reason that I have not spoken to him since last Friday night is because he has been very busy negotiating with Australian National, and the other thing is that the member for Davenport—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: —does not understand, nor does he want to understand, that the dispute has nothing to do with the State Transport Authority.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Yes, it has. All the trains are on strike.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Of course they are, and I am doing all I can within my power to try to get them back.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The member for Davenport says that we are involved. According to the Secretary of the union, we are not. I would like to read the following telex that the Secretary of the union sent to the Manager of the STA:

> We have received your answer to our earlier telex today regarding our decision to call an indefinite stoppage of our members from 0001 hours Monday 27 August 1984. Whilst we agree that at this time the areas of dispute are confined to Australian National employees, the majority of our members working in STA are made available from Australian National. Also, the meeting on Monday will not only determine the duration of the stoppage, it will also address the STA position and make an appropriate decision.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Davenport to come to order.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: That is an untruth. I have asked them to exempt—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I do not know how one gets the message through the thick skull on the other side. I have explained to the honourable member that I contacted the Secretary and spoke to him personally last Friday night prior to their meeting and requested that the STA be given an exemption. I am meeting them at 4.30 in my office today. I do not think I will need the assistance of the member for Davenport, knowing his record in escalating disputes over a number of years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is like something out of *Pickwick Papers,* the way it is going on. I must remind honourable members that while the Chair has been very tolerant in permitting detailed explanations, the Chair must draw the line once it gets down to debate, and certainly

when it gets to the substantive point of calling Ministers to resign.

SOFT DRINK QUALITY CONTROL

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Health in another place, report to the House on the accuracy of a recent press article that criticised quality control standards of an Adelaide soft drink firm? If the report was correct, what steps has the Department taken to ensure—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question as framed is presently out of order because, as I understand it, the Minister is being asked to comment on the accuracy of what somebody else said. If the honourable member brings his question to the table we can try to sort it out and press on with something else.

STA FINES

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Transport urgently investigate the administration of the $50 'on the spot' fines in respect of fare underpayment and introduce an inspectorial system which is sensitive to the travelling public? I was approached by one of my constituents last week and I subsequently wrote to the Minister on this subject. This week I have been approached by another constituent. Each constituent has travelled only occasionally on STA buses and therefore is unaware of the fare structure. Each commenced his journey during the off peak period when lower fares operate—namely, 60c per single ticket. Each ascertained the cost of travel, because they did not travel very regularly, they boarded the bus, and tendered the same amount on the return journey, when in fact the amount should have been 90c. Although each explained his situation to the inspector, a $50 'on the spot' fine was imposed.

Each was very upset and embarrassed by the incident; both felt that they had been treated like criminals. Both constituents explained that they had personal difficulties with being on a bus, having thought that they had done the right thing and then having been accosted by an inspector. I refer to a letter written by a person who is very well known to me and for whose integrity I can vouch. The letter states:

> I rarely travel by bus. On 24 August I caught the bus at Hawthorn and the fare was 60 cents at about 2 p.m. I returned from the city at about 5 p.m. and bought a ticket in the street, not knowing that the fare should have been 90 cents. I didn't know that fares were different amounts at different times. An inspector boarded the bus and said that I had avoided paying the correct fare and my fine is $50.

Is this not unreasonable?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The honourable member wrote to me about this matter and he has received a reply. I have had a number of requests to investigate these 'on the spot' fines since they were introduced and, quite frankly, I do not want to become involved directly in them. A lot of people ring up and say, 'You are a friend of mine. I want you to get me out of this,' but the whole idea of the 'on the spot' fine is to stop fare evasion. Since it was introduced a total of 122 adults and 217 juveniles have been issued with infringement notices, all broken down into the various categories.

I support these very strongly in the case of anyone trying to avoid paying the fare, and that has gone on quite considerably over a number of years. However, all individuals have the right of appeal. They can write to the Authority and the whole matter will be investigated, and the decision is made on the circumstances. With respect to the issue that the honourable member raised—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How many questions do members opposite want to ask in half an hour? I will further consider the incident to which the honourable member has referred and bring down a further reply for him.

FOREIGN LAND HOLDINGS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Lands say whether the State Government intends to set up a register of foreign owned companies owning land in this State? Recently I was informed that the Department of Lands was unaware of the existence of any such list or publication. Therefore, can the Minister say whether he intends to set up such a listing of land owned by foreign companies in South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is no immediate intention on the part of the State Government to set up such a register. We are co-operating with the Commonwealth and other States in a survey to determine if at all possible the extent of foreign land holdings in this country and, indeed, the extent to which this position has changed in recent years. The best information that I can obtain is that the level of foreign land holdings is probably very small and the amount of movement that has occurred in recent years has also been very small. For example, in the period from 1976 to 1980, of cases brought under the notice of the Foreign Investment Review Board only 2.56 per cent were in the State of South Australia, but these represented only 0.05 per cent of land transferred and only 1.01 per cent of the value of such transactions.

Of course, that does not give much information about the base, but it does suggest that whatever the base is there has not been very much movement in very recent years. As the honourable member knows, we have the LOTS system in operation in this State, but the LOTS system does not of itself give us the direct information that we require. There would be a good deal of cost involved in modifying that system to take account of foreign ownership. It would be necessary outside of that system to trace beneficial interests in land through corporate and nominee ownerships, which, of course, change from time to time. So, they are some of the problems which stand in the way of an immediate implementation of the system.

We have decided to co-operate with the Commonwealth in the light of Deputy Prime Minister Bowen's letter to the Premier on 1 February this year. It was similar to one sent to other States and in it was noted that there was in principle support from most States for the establishment of such a register, including support from this State. There were questions about the cost effectiveness of the system and what the Commonwealth proposed to do was to use the 1984 agricultural census as a starting point for a survey to determine the feasibility of producing foreign ownership and control statistics. We are awaiting further advice from the Commonwealth on that matter. However, I reiterate that we are happy to co-operate. I am sure that the honourable member will want to maintain his interest in this matter and I will endeavour to give him and the House progress reports.

SOFT DRINK QUALITY CONTROL

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Health in another place, report to the House on the quality control standards of an Adelaide soft drink firm which recently received criticism in the

press? Recently, an article in the *Advertiser* headed, 'Soft drink firm's record deplorable: SM,' states:

A company which sold a bottle of soft drink containing a mass of grey matter had a 'deplorable record' in product quality standards, a magistrate said yesterday . . . 'The public have a right to be defended from this sort of irresponsibility,' Mr Amey said. 'The defendant company's record is deplorable to say the least.'

The article further reports on the types of products actually inside the soft drink when it was purchased by the consumer. The report continues:

Mr Amey said the company had 'a very bad record indeed' and had had a number of previous convictions under the Food and Drugs Act. These included convictions for a dead lizard, a dead cockroach, dead insects and chips of glass in bottles of Coca-Cola.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will certainly take up this matter with my colleague the Minister of Health and bring down a report on what steps can be and are being taken in relation to this company about which there was a remarkably adverse report in the *Advertiser*. I thank the honourable member for providing me with a copy of that report.

It seems that the company involved believes that, because it produces more than 1 million units a day, it is a defence against having an odd (if it is only an odd) bottle of Coca-Cola that fails to reach the set standard. It seems to me that, if one or two bottles fail to reach the standard required by the Health Department, many others might vary between what is totally unacceptable and what is acceptable. If I bought a bottle of drink that was unacceptable and did not meet the health standards, I do not think I would be impressed with a company that said, 'We produce 1 million bottles a day, so you are a bit unlucky.' I think the matter the honourable member has brought before the House is one of serious content. Obviously, the Minister of Health has had dealings with this company before. I will certainly be delighted to bring down for the honourable member a report on what action is being taken to ensure that the consumers in South Australia get the quality of product for which they pay.

OFFSHORE SAND

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning consider the use of satellite surveillance in an effort to find offshore sources of sand? I understand that some investigations have been made in an attempt to locate offshore sand deposits which are imperative in view of the deterioration of our beaches and subsequent loss of sand. The Minister will agree that this is a very serious situation and that it is of paramount importance to locate replenishment sand, preferably offshore.

Will the Minister seek the assistance of the satellite investigations by the newly formed land surveillance group which was a branch of the Department for the Environment and which I understand uses Landsat? I understand that that is now situated at Technology Park and that it could undertake the project of locating deposits of offshore sand if requested to do so.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD. The honourable member's information is entirely correct and his sentiments are laudable. I am only too happy to take up the matter. I would be a little surprised if in fact some work has not already been done in this area by the Remote Sensing Team, although it has not been brought directly to my attention. I can certainly confirm that there is a long-term problem as identified by the recently released report which indicates that ultimately we will run out of sand available from the northern beaches for the replenishment of the beaches in the south, including those that are dear to the heart of the honourable member. There is a further sand resource on Torrens Island, but that is indeed limited. What we very badly require for the long-term health of the metropolitan coastline is an offshore source of sand which can be fairly cheaply carted to the correct areas. I thank the honourable member for his question and I will certainly take up the matter.

TOILET FACILITIES

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Department of Local Government would be prepared to consider reviewing the problem of improving public toilet facilities for handicapped people in country areas? I was recently approached by two elderly constituents, one of whom was disabled, who found only one suitable public toilet during a motor car trip from Adelaide to Port Lincoln, and that was at Dublin. The wife is bound to a wheelchair and has great difficulty in using toilets other than those that are specifically designed for handicapped people. My constituent also took a motor car trip to Mount Gambier, and the only suitable public toilet was at Coonalpyn.

There is a pressing need for the upgrading of public toilet facilities for handicapped people. Not only do local councils need to be more aware of the problem, but also the State Government should consider providing subsidies to councils for the upgrading of public toilets for handicapped people. The amendments to the Building Act in 1980 mean that building regulations for new buildings will provide appropriate facilities for handicapped people. The problem is, of course, that this process will take at least a decade to manifest itself.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am constrained to say that I hope the outburst of hilarity that erupted from the Opposition benches had nothing to do with the honourable member's question, because it is of incredible importance. I will be pleased to be assured that it was not because, if it was, I am appalled that any member of Parliament would react to an important question in such a way.

As Minister of Local Government and as Minister of Tourism, I am particularly concerned about the question raised by the honourable member. I know from my own experience when I used to take annual holidays with a friend whose wife was suffering from a progressively debilitating complaint how difficult it is for those people to enjoy a holiday because of the lack of suitable toilet facilities for their use not only in South Australia but throughout Australia. Those same people are housebound: they cannot go out to shows or to restaurants. In fact, severely handicapped people cannot enjoy any social activity unless they programme beforehand to travel from toilet to toilet that can cope with their needs.

This is a very important question. The honourable member has raised this matter with me in a broader sense previously, so I am able to say that I have asked my Department to review the problem that he has raised. I understand that during the International Year of the Disabled Person in 1981 an encouraging number of local authorities upgraded toilets or built new facilities to meet the needs of handicapped persons. I am pleased to say that the caravan parks at Clare and Port Augusta have provided such facilities which enable handicapped people to holiday, which they were previously not able to do. Also, changes to pavement and street design were introduced to overcome difficulties with wheelchair access.

As the honourable member has mentioned, the Building Act was amended in 1980 to provide appropriate facilities for handicapped people, but, as he has stated quite correctly, the new regulations apply to new buildings and do not affect the large number of older buildings that provide inadequate

access for people who are suffering not only from severe disability, but disability generally.

There is an active local government subcommittee of the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled. This problem has been passed on to it and I have asked it to provide me with an urgent report as to a realistic programme that might help overcome the lack of such facilities. I am concerned about the matter that the honourable member has raised. The problem is one about which we all as members of Parliament and as members of the community should be concerned.

Following the report of the subcommittee, I will certainly undertake to my colleague that this matter will be placed before Cabinet for its consideration. I am unable to give the honourable member an accurate assessment of how long that report will take to reach my table, but I can assure him that I have asked for the most thorough investigation of this matter, and I am certain that as a result of it some concrete action can be taken here in South Australia. I am pleased and assured by the interest that has now been displayed by honourable members opposite that the criticism that I might have levelled at them initially was probably misplaced.

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WOODVILLE ROAD CLOSURE

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I seek leave to amend the motion standing in my name by striking out 'Windsor Gardens' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Woodville'.

Leave granted.

Mr GROOM: I now move:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act, 1961, relating to traffic prohibition (Woodville), made on 19 April 1984 and laid on the table of this House on 1 May 1984, be disallowed.

The error in the wording of the motion as it is printed on the Notice Paper is the result of an administrative error: the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation was dealing with regulations concerning Windsor Gardens and others concerning Woodville, and a typing error was made.

The motion, as amended, is the result of a unanimous decision that was made by the Subordinate Legislation Committee as a consequence of residents coming to the committee, seeking to give evidence, and complaining about road closures. The evidence of those citizens was sent to the Woodville council, which was given a chance to reply. Consequently, the Engineering Liaison Officer from the council gave evidence to the committee.

The conclusion to which the officer representing the City of Woodville came was that an examination of the submission by the residents, further consultations with other residents, and consideration of the desire of residents outside the area immediately adjacent to the closure had reinforced the feeling that this solution might not be the most appropriate action that the council could take to meet the needs of all residents of the area. In the ultimate paragraph of his statement, the Engineering Liaison Officer stated that, if it was not possible to defer the confirmation of this regulation, he would support the motion for disallowance already given, but it might be appropriate that, after further investigations and trials, a similar course to this regulation should be again followed by the council.

The officer from the Woodville council was given the chance in evidence of saying whether he would like the council to have the opportunity to rescind what was effectively its own regulation or, alternatively, whether he would rather that the Committee formally moved to disallow it. He said in reply to that question that, because of time constraints, if the motion were rescinded it would have to go back to the Road Traffic Board, the Crown Solicitor's Office and to Parliament. Therefore, it could be another six months before the council could even try the second closure. However, if the motion was rescinded through this process, by the time the second gazetted notice for Murray Street was published, a second trial could be conducted and the matter could be back before the Board in two months. Any amended regulations could then be brought into the system. Therefore, the preference from the council officer was that the committee recommend that the regulations be disallowed.

The regulations also involve the closing of Murray Street, Albert Park, to which no objection has been raised. It is understood that regulations to implement this closure will be made in due course should disallowance of the present regulations occur. Consequently, given these unusual circumstances, the Committee believes that the regulations should be disallowed so as to enable the Corporation of the City of Woodville to ensure that those who may be affected by the closure are given every consideration.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion, but I hope that, merely because the Committee has taken the course of action that it has in recommending the disallowance of these regulations, this will not set a precedent and that every time there is a disagreement in a council area the Committee is not expected to recommend the disallowance of recommendations. I believe that the discussions on this occasion clearly highlight the need for a council to have full and frank discussions with the local community before submitting regulations to Parliament, because that would solve many problems.

I also believe that the subject of this road closure highlights the need to change that system under which the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation operates. I cannot urge the House and the Government too strongly to consider that matter as soon as possible, because the Committee has had to take much evidence and, in fact, the regulations are operating, whereas they should have been brought to Parliament and considered by the Committee before they operated. I sincerely hope that other councils take heed of what has happened on this occasion so that the Committee does not become a group of people that must sit in judgment on every road closure that occurs in the metropolitan area.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion and the remarks of the previous speaker. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has not available to it the resources that would enable it to examine every road closure occurring in a council area. The matter of road closures should be talked out at the local government level and agreement reached before the proposition is put before the Committee. The Committee has examined road closures in several council areas, and much evidence has been tendered to it. Frankly, I believe that, if this sort of activity continues, the Committee will have to have its own independent experts to examine each situation. The Committee simply cannot do that. I support the remarks of the previous speaker and hope sincerely that all these matters are examined at the local level before they come before the Committee.

Motion carried.

KINGSTON MINING

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I move:

That this House opposes the mining of the Kingston lignite deposit until and unless—

(a) the inadequacies and inaccuracies of the environmental impact statement are rectified; and

(b) an indenture Bill (which defines adequate provisions for compensation to the Kingston community, the Lacepede District Council and private landholders who may be affected by the development) is passed by this Parliament.

I gave notice of this motion 15 months ago. In fact, we debated it during the last session of Parliament, and we voted on it. The Government decided that it could not support it. Nonetheless, I bring it back to the House again in the hope that the Government, and its back-bench in particular, has come to its senses, albeit in its snoozing state and indifference to the matter and the procedures of the House at this time. If it has not, it will be a sorry commentary on the integrity and capacity of this Government, particularly the Ministers responsible, to take a proper stand and proper responsibility for the people of South Australia in general and the South-East in particular. The motion is simple enough and is straightforward. It accords with the way in which I opened my remarks on the previous occasion on 21 September last year, and it is quite appropriate to do likewise again.

During the course of my remarks on that occasion I drew attention to inadequacies and inaccuracies in the environmental impact statement. There were glaring examples of a macro nature right across the board. Furthermore, I pointed out to all concerned the pitfalls if we did not have an indenture Bill. There were grave implications indeed. I will not bore the House with the details I put before it at that time, but simply say that we are again back at square one.

The EIS, the responses to the EIS, the amendments prepared to those responses and now the Government's assessment report are all, in so far as they relate to the hydrology of the mine, totally irrelevant. How does this happen to be the case? Because Western Mining has decided that, instead of dewatering the mine pit and using dry open-cut methods, as it proposed in its initial submission and its EIS, it will now wet-dredge the deposit. Therefore, all the work done to identify the risks to the hydrology of the region by the people engaged in the preparation of the initial EIS, but more particularly the people who put up their own money and the district council which used ratepayers' money to make responses to that EIS, goes for naught.

So, the same position still obtains, with one notable exception: that, at the seminar organised during early April of 1981 (so far as I can remember) by a National Party candidate who happened to be opposing me at the last election, a Mr Cant of Western Mining was in attendance and was asked, 'Why not use wet-dredging technology?' He is on the record (indeed, tapes still exist of the answer he gave to that question) as saying, 'It is not appropriate.' There are good reasons why it is not appropriate: first, that immediately overlying the lignite deposit is a layer of sand, and not far above that layer of sand is yet another. That is not sandstone: it is just sand and, once the wet-dredging technology was to be attempted, he pointed out to the meeting, sand would simply ooze into the coal and be taken up by the dredging buckets. It would end up, after the coal and sand were dried, clogging up the internal space of the furnaces into which the coal was blown to be burned. It would be glacified and would make the furnace useless in a very short time.

The high costs of maintenance, repair and replacement of the furnaces would make the project non-viable. That is the first reason. The second reason was that it would be an appropriate technology to apply only to the northern pit site where it is estimated that, if one wet-dredges it, there is no risk of the Dilwyn aquifer flowing over the surface, because the head that can be calculated on the Dilwyn aquifer is an artesian aquifer. 'Artesian' means that, when a hole is drilled into the water-bearing strata, the underground basin of porous rock material is such that the pressure in the basin forces the water up through the hole and out over the surface of the land. The Dilwyn aquifer is an artesian aquifer. It will flow to ground level at the northern pit site, and it is therefore possible that we could use wet-dredging there. Nowhere else can it be used, Mr Cant told the meeting, because at the other sites the water will rise above ground level by several metres.

If one were to erect a column over the hole drilled in the ground, it would have to be several metres tall before it could contain the spontaneous capacity of the water to rise above ground level and reach a static level. Therefore, even though we are not dewatering a hole, we are nonetheless wasting the water resource. The Dilwyn aquifer (the subsurface sublignite acquifer immediately beneath the coal), if depressurised, will still have to be pumped out to sea or pumped somewhere. The farther south one goes the better the quality of that water.

Mr Cant made the point that, if we could not use the wet-dredging technology, we would have to dewater, first, because of the sand and, secondly, because we have to pump out the water, anyway. We might as well have a dry pit, as we will not save much by leaving a little puddle in the ground after 30 years, a puddle which by definition is a kilometre long and 400 metres wide. That is some puddle! That is about what would be left.

There was another reason: unlike the coals wet-dredged elsewhere, and unlike other ores wet-dredged, the Kingston coal does not have a heavier-than-water specific gravity. That means that it does not sink. It will readily form a slurry. It is also soft, Mr Cant explained at the meeting. It will break up and we will have not coal in water (that is, lumps of coal in the bucket with a bit of water around it): we will in fact have a slurry of sand and suspended particles and lumps of coal. A great deal of cost would be involved to dewater that sufficiently before crushing and blowing it into the furnaces. A cost would be involved in drying it out sufficiently and, added to that, is the high maintenance cost of replacement and repair of the furnaces in the fashion to which he—and not I—alluded.

How is it then that from two years ago to this day it is possible to ignore those reasons altogether and say, 'We can wet-dredge it'? I ask all members to consider that point in determining their attitude to this motion. We need far more detail than we have been given to date. Indeed, I guess we (I say 'we' on behalf of my constituents) will now have to go again through the whole painful expensive process of reassessing another mining technology for that deposit, because to mine it by wet-dredging will require the preparation of another environmental impact statement. That is tragic, because the decision to change the technology used in mining was made at the eleventh hour—the fifty-ninth minute and the fifty-ninth second—before the Government released its so-called assessment report.

God knows how many times Cabinet and the Minister required officers of the Department of Environment and Planning to rewrite sections of the report. I do not know—I was not there. But, after having been told that the assessment report was to be given to us late last year, then being given a firm assurance that we were to have it in the middle of February and then being told that it would be available 'by the middle of next week' (on 23 February), we still did not have it.

We were then told that the report would take a further three weeks and, lo and behold, we got it just a few weeks

ago, about six months later than when the final assurance of the deadline was given—amended five times. They must have been doing something with it in the meantime, I suggest. If one has the report, one releases it. If one does not have it, one does not say that it can be released, because there might be a slip between the cup and the lip and, of all people, the Minister for Environment and Planning would know that. I have never taken him for a fool—a knave maybe, but not a fool.

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order. I think that 'knave' is unparliamentary language.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. Quite clearly it is reflecting on the motive and character of another member, and that is against the Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is very difficult to come to any final conclusion as to whether or not the honourable member is reflecting. The word expressed, as I understood it, could have been a reflection on the honourable Minister but I am giving the honourable member the benefit of the doubt because there is a thin line, as I see it, as to whether or not it was a reflection. However, I ask the honourable member to refrain from making such allegations.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, in future I shall comply with that request. I will simply say that the Minister deliberately set about to mislead the public of South Australia and me by the statements he made which are demonstrably incorrect as to the time at which he would release the final assessment report.

I refer honourable members and others who may be interested to pages 991-2, 1379-80, 2139-40, and 2 142 of *Hansard* of 1983, where they can find the substantial part of the debate in the last session. I was scathing in my criticism of the contributions made by the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Mines and Energy in that they at no time addressed the substance of the motion before the House. I happily and publicly acknowlege that the Minister of Community Welfare was being very generous to his colleague in that he took the call when his colleague was caught—how do we say it in the bush?—with his pants down and, accordingly, spoke for some time saying things which I am sure he would rather not have said, had he had any indication of the necessity for him to fill in that gap while the Minister of Mines and Energy dashed out of the Chamber—and down to his office to try to grab some non-existent notes, or whatever else it was he went for, and get back to the Chamber to make a contribution. All I remember is that on his return the Minister of Mines and Energy tried to convince the House that the motion was irrelevant because it predicated or presumed on the findings of a committee which he had appointed at that time, but in no way did it do that.

That committee was not considering substantive matters contained in this motion. It does not presume to state whether or not mining will proceed or whether or not the mine will be chosen, and that is what Mr Stewart's committee was to do. This motion merely states that if it is to proceed then for our sake, for God's sake and for everyone's sake let us make sure that we first of all get the errors and omissions in the EIS fixed up and please pass an indenture Bill.

Well, in the event, the final assessment report has identified and vindicated the proposition which I put before the House then, and members needed no more information about this matter than I was able to give in this Chamber at that time to make up their minds about the desirability of supporting the motion. At page 62, under 'Hydrological issues', the assessment report states:

> The hydrological effects of the proposed project on the groundwater system in the vicinity of the mine have been identified in the draft EIS and in public submissions as one of the major potential environmental impacts of the project.

Later on one finds errors, inadequacies and deficiencies referred to in the 300-odd pages of that assessment report. As in all of these cases, private members' time is so restricted that, if one makes a detailed speech which vindicates the view and supports with evidence the opinions being expressed, one finds oneself taking up colleagues' time much to their dismay, and that is distressing to me.

So, I will refer members to that report, not only to page 62 but also to page 167, where there are conclusions to chapter 6—'Social issues'—and this vindicates the necessity for the indenture to which I have referred. The report states:

> . . . there is a very real chance of adverse impacts occurring—unless the proponents and the local and State Governments act to avoid or minimise those impacts.

The report later states:

> . . . the social impacts likely to be associated with the combined project would not be of sufficient magnitude to warrant its termination provided the proponents and Government commit sufficient finance and resources to enable an adequate response to the needs of an increased population at the appropriate time.

What does 'sufficient' mean in those circumstances? It is my judgment that it would mean more in terms of ultimate cost than the project could bear, because the resulting effect of that increased cost would be to make the sent-out cost of the electricity that could be generated in the power house, supplied by coal from that mine site, so dear as to be uncompetitive with the alternatives which could be used from, say, Lochiel, Sedan or even Wintinna. At page 201 of the report it states:

> The Department of Environment and Planning concludes that a working group should be set up to investigate fully all aspects of compensation for project-related impacts to circumvent any possible anomalies that could arise at a later stage—

that is an identified inadequacy of the original EIS—

> This group could comprise representatives from Western Mining Corporation, Crown Solicitor's Office, Department of Agriculture, Department of Mines and Energy, Engineering and Water Supply Department and the local branch of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association.

There are serious impacts on the biophysical environment and on flora. The report points out, with respect to native vegetation:

> The Kingston lignite project will affect directly or indirectly some 11 000 ha of pastures and 4 800 ha of native vegetation. The 4 800 ha includes vegetation that is to be affected by dewatering (that is, within the 1 m drawdown zone); vegetation that is to be cleared to accommodate the lignite pits (480 ha).

I do not know whether that was adequately covered in the EIS; I do not recall that it was. At page 277, reference is made to the need for additional funds for the purpose of providing social infra-structure through the medium of the Grants Commission, or whatever may be the case.

Clearly that was inadequately dealt with in the original EIS. The need for an indenture Bill is referred to at pages 282 and 283. At page 283 appears the statement:

> An indenture agreement could not determine in detail what any person affected by the total development would receive by way of compensation until the final project investigations and designs have been completed.

But even then it would not be possible, as there is no certainty of the extent to which any aggrieved party suffered or would be likely to suffer damages, because that is before the event. An indenture Bill would need to spell out exactly how these damages were to be determined. It would have to be agreed before the mine could continue because, the one thing we do not want—and the one thing to which I referred and expressed concern about all along—is an outbreak of violence between the proponents and local residents whose property values (as they know them today) and productivity may be destroyed, and there would be the likelihood of violence as a consequence of that. An indenture Bill

which identifies that consequence would surely preclude it from happening. At page 284 we read:

> These potential problems have been recognised by the Planning Act Review Committee, which has recommended an amendment to the effect that planning consents relating to a project for which an EIS has been prepared should be the responsibility of the South Australian Planning Commission . . . It is therefore suggested that an indenture incorporating all the recommendations in the present draft assessment report would provide a practical solution for the Kingston lignite project.

If that is not a vindication of the same appraisal process through which I went and which drew me to bring this motion to the attention of the House 12 months ago, then I do not know what is. Furthermore, if the Minister charged with the responsibility of administering the Act relevant to projects of this kind has neither the intelligence nor the competence or inclination to make those appraisals and assessments, he ought not to be the Minister. The Government that gives him its confidence ought not to be the Government.

I simply draw attention to the comments made at page 285 of the assessment report for those people who wish to look at it in brief, and then again at page 291. That assessment report contains much interesting material which, as I have said, vindicates the position that I asked the House to adopt as a matter of urgency 12 months ago, a position that would save an enormous amount of anxiety in the whole region of the South-East community. Furthermore, it would clarify the position that would be taken by the Parliament (by either Party in Government) if, as and when approval to mine the deposit were given.

We must know that in the first instance the EIS is adequate and accurate, free of errors and omissions. We must also know, in all fairness, what the terms of compensation are to be for the people there, whether they be in the district council itself or individual landholders. Indeed, underlying all of this is my otherwise enormous concern for the impact on the natural environment—the rare and endangered species that have been identified in that EIS. I commend the motion to the House and repeat that I do not believe that the kind of comments, statements and publicity given to this issue by the proponents from time to time can be trusted.

I want to refer, before concluding, to a statement made by the proponent in July last year—just over 12 months ago. I will read only parts of it, because that will demonstrate the point that I made about the great concern now existing in that part of the State and elsewhere about this proposal. I read from the statement:

> However, the results of detailed investigations clearly indicate that the capacity of the aquifers of the region to recharge from the normal rainfall pattern is vastly in excess of the total amount of water which will be withdrawn to meet the combined needs for farm use, irrigation, mine dewatering operations, and the Kingston South-East town water supply.

That is blatantly untrue, because there were no detailed investigations. So, how can such investigations clearly indicate anything? They did not happen. The statement continues:

> The investigations were carried out over 36 months by experienced groundwater engineers on behalf of Western Mining Corporation. These investigations determined the methods to be used for mine dewatering, and evaluated the effects on the availability of groundwater to surrounding users and on the Kingston South-East water supply. During this work there was close co-operation and exchange of information with the State Government departments concerned.

I did not know about it if there was. I think that those detailed investigations were done on desk tops and not with drilling rigs; they were punching number crunchers and not holes in the ground. Whenever one punches a number cruncher or a computer, one only gets out as good as one puts in, as the saying goes. One can construct the kind of information that goes in to give one the kind of construction one wants on the information coming out. The statement continues:

> It is recharged by rainfall from distant areas to the east and south.

That refers to the pressurised aquifer and, if the statement is correct, how on earth if it is depressurised does that not have some impact on the underground water in those locations farther afield? I do not know. One cannot simply say that it will not happen. One needs to be able to demonstrate that it will not happen. One will therefore need to know what the porosity (or transmissivity) is, and quite clearly inadequate information to determine that essential or basic data was collected.

Whatever one puts in is what one gets out. They did not get out much. I acknowledge that such mines elsewhere in the world are invariably located in agricultural regions, as the statement indicates:

> Some lignite mines in West Germany, for example, are in areas of highly intensive farming and pump volumes of potable water far in excess of those required for the Kingston project.

My response to that is, 'So what!' They are not very close to the dry Mallee and they do not represent part of the green triangle that saves this State every time there is a drought. They are in Germany, where the average annual rainfall compared to evaporation gives a growing period far in excess of what we enjoy on average anywhere here in South Australia. What is more, those farmers are probably grateful for a bit of dewatering. One other point which I wish to make appears in this paragraph:

> If the pressure conditions and thickness of the formations are known, the rate of movement can be readily calculated, allowing estimates to be made of the amount of drawdown of water level (or pressure) at various distances from the pumping operation. The lowering of the water level (or pressure) results in a 'cone of depression'. However, this effect is not necessarily uniform in all directions, due to differences in transmissivity within the aquifers.

The whole of that statement is predicated by the word 'if', yet they did not know because the 'if' is the pressure conditions and thickness of the formations. No attempt was made to determine what they were very far away from the coal site. So, that is the statement by the proponents about the effects and consequences. Another one that is in error is this:

> The water to be pumped from the mine area will be highly saline, most being unsuitable for agricultural use.

That is blatantly untrue, and the television cameras which have been down there in company with my Leader in recent months have clearly illustrated the point that that statement was not true. We know that the surface aquifer is indeed suitable for irrigation and is being used to irrigate considerable areas—square miles—of pasture. The volumes of water being pumped by one man alone are in excess of what the corporation stated it would have to pump to dewater the mining site originally.

Therefore, in conclusion I say that the switch at the very last second in mining technique from dry pit, open cut operations to wet dredging is a deceitful trick and it will be demonstrably difficult if not impossible, according to the statements made by Mr Cant, of Western Mining. In no circumstances, therefore, should any member of this House contemplate allowing approval to be given to the mine unless we first rectify the deficiencies and errors of the EIS about any mining technology that may be used and, secondly, pass an indenture Bill through the Parliament. I commend the motion to honourable members.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this House expresses its grave concern that the Government is selling large areas of land essential for the construction of the north-south transport corridor and at the dishonest manner of paying inadequate compensation to the Highways Fund for the land sold and calls on the Government to stop further sales of land and to pay all moneys received for land already sold into the Highways Fund.

In early May or late April I asked a series of Questions on Notice of the Minister of Transport. I refer to Question on Notice 541. I will not go through the exact questions, but basically I asked what land held for the north-south corridor had been sold, how much money had been received, and to whom had that money gone. After a very considerable delay (and in fact one could only say the rudest possible delay from any Minister), I received on the first day of this session (2 August) eventually a reply not from the Minister of Transport, who still has not acknowledged his part of the question, but from the Minister for Environment and Planning. Without reading the whole reply I will read the first part, which states:

In response to the Question on Notice No. 541.

1. The Department of Environment and Planning assumed responsibility for the land between Regency Road and the Glenelg tram line.

I stress: the 'Glenelg tram line', which is on the southern side of Anzac Highway, not the old Glenelg train line, as I would have expected. The reply continues:

Of this land, 82 allotments have been sold to the South Australian Housing Trust at a cost of $3.849 million. Of the land which remains in Highways Department control, no land has been sold or transferred.

I also point out the last question (as there were four parts to the question), which had the following reply:

4. The estimated total area of surplus corridor land disposed of during the past 18 months is equivalent to 113 allotments. The total moneys received from the sale of this land amount to $4 509 200.

I say from the outset that I find that answer very confusing and in some ways conflicting because, if the Minister had answered truthfully, then it would appear to me that the first answer that he should have given should have been for the total amount of the land sold, but then we see a figure further down. I will deal with the figures that the Minister has given in the first part of the question and then the third answer, which is this:

As at 30 June 1984, $1 119 387 has been placed in the Highways Fund. The balance has not been allocated.

That is the crucial point, because in fact the Government has sold $3.8 million worth of land, or possibly $4.5 million worth of land, and has given so far only $1.1 million to the Highways Department for road construction. The rest, according to answers given on other occasions, apparently is being held in a special fund under the control of the Minister for Environment and Planning and for use at his discretion. Therefore, more than 70 per cent or $2.7 million of the money received from the sale of the land for the north-south transport corridor is apparently being withheld by the Bannon Government as a slush fund.

The money should be returned to the Highways Department for spending on road construction. This money is being withheld illegally as the Road Grants Act makes quite clear that the money must be spent on roads or returned to the Commonwealth Government. I will come to that in a moment. Two interesting points come out of this reply from the Minister for Environment and Planning. The first is that the Government has no faith, trust or confidence in the Minister of Transport in selling this land. The disposal of the land was transferred to the Minister for Environment and Planning—yet again a vote of no confidence by his own Cabinet colleagues in the Minister of Transport.

However, what I think is the alarming fact is that apparently the old Glenelg train line, which runs parallel to but just north of the Anzac Highway, is up for sale and grabs. We all know that that is a long-standing transport corridor which must be held for the future, because it is of vital significance to the State. As I said, withholding that money and not returning it to the Highways Department for road construction or to the Commonwealth Government is against the principles laid down in the Road Grants Act, which is a Commonwealth Act. Obviously, I am not able to read right through the Act, but I would like to read section 11, which states:

11. The grant of financial assistance to a State under section 10 is subject to the condition that the State will, during the year . . . expend the moneys paid to it on the carrying out of projects by way of the construction of arterial roads in the State.

Further on, the Act quite clearly specifies that if one fails to carry out the instruction under section 11, then one must return the money to the Commonwealth Government. In this case, neither of those alternatives has taken place. The money in fact is still being held by the Minister for Environment and Planning, apparently in a slush fund. That is yet another case of the Treasurer (the Hon. Mr Bannon) wanting to get his sticky little fingers on Highways funds and then to use them for other purposes. If this money was spent on roads, the widening of South Road (which is absolutely crucial at present to relieve the traffic congestion in the southern areas) could be finished within 12 months, rather than having to wait until at least 1988 or beyond, as the Minister of Transport has now stated we will need to wait.

His only argument for deferring the widening of South Road throughout has been inadequate funds. The money is there; it is sitting in a slush fund but the Government is refusing to release it to the Highways Department to spend on the widening of South Road. I have written today to both the State and Commonwealth Auditors-General asking for a full investigation into this misuse of road funds. I will not read the whole letter to the House but, I have outlined the circumstances and enclosed a copy of a letter I have received from the Minister for Environment and Planning which reveals the fact that these moneys are being held by the Government and are not being released for road construction. I have asked both those Auditors-General (because it involves both State and Commonwealth funds) to investigate the matter fully and report to me as fully as possible.

The residents of the southern metropolitan area would be horrified to know that such large sums are being directed away from urgently needed roadworks. The Minister of Transport has often used the argument that the scrapping of the north-south transport corridor and the selling of the land would release funds for urgently needed roadworks but we now find that that is not occurring. I refer to a press release from the Minister of Transport dated 20 June 1983. I am pleased the Minister is in the House at present because he will recall that press release. The Minister is leaving before he is found to be wanting in terms of the accuracy of that statement, on page 4 of which he said:

Surplus land will be disposed of in stages over a number of years to preserve market values—

Listen to the next quote:

Funds generated will be used by the Highways Department to provide capital for improvements to the present system under new priorities. The total value of properties currently held by the Government in the corridor is in the vicinity of $50 million but that value is subject to market fluctuations.

The Minister said that by selling off the surplus land money would be available for urgently needed roadworks but the money has not gone into roadworks, it has gone into a

Government slush fund under the control of the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Premier. One could say at the very least that the people of the southern districts have been misled. I believe that statement in that press release is a blatant lie because the Government obviously had no intention whatsoever of making those moneys available for road construction.

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I seek your ruling that the word 'lie' is unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair upholds the point of order. I ask the member for Davenport to withdraw the word 'lie'.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I withdraw the remark, but I point out that I did not call any particular member a liar; I just said that a lie had been told. I certainly withdraw the remark. It was the most blatantly dishonest statement I have ever seen a Government make, when it says one thing knowing full well it had another intention in mind throughout. So far the Bannon Government has sold 82 allotments of land in the corridor for the sum of $3.8 million, but only $1.1 million has been paid to the Highways Department; the other 71 per cent is being held in a special fund 'for purposes yet to be announced'.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: To help offset the deficit.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yet to be announced. I think it is a slush fund to be used to try and buy votes in the western suburbs of Adelaide. I would like to refer now to what councils in the member for Ascot Park's district have been saying about the sale of land. Opposition to the sale of the available north-south corridor land is now almost unanimous, with the exception of the Bannon Government itself. The Liberal Party, the RAA, and the editorials of the *Advertiser* and the *News*, most local government bodies, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, some of the Federated Chambers of Commerce, transport planners and most people have advocated that the land in this corridor should be kept for future use. The editorial in the *News* on 17 August stated:

> The land—all of it—should be held until a comprehensive plan can be worked out to take an expanding city's traffic into the next century.

The editorial on the same day in the *Advertiser* stated:

> The Government would be ill advised to proceed too hastily with the disposal of land which may yet be needed for a north-south corridor.

In a press release, Mayor Newberry, Chairman of the Southern Region of Councils, strongly expressed the view that the land should not be sold. In that press release, which was issued on 16 August, he also said:

> In view of these difficulties the region in general and the Marion council in particular remains convinced that the north-south corridor should be retained from Anzac Highway to Sturt Road, allowing this and future State Governments to keep their options open in the provision of major new roads servicing the south.

That statement was made by the Mayor of a council in the district which the member for Ascot Park represents.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Royal Automobile Association of South Australia sent to me a letter damning the decision to scrap the north-south transport corridor and sell off the land. An article in the September 1983 issue of *South Australian Motor* entitled 'Chaotic Vision' strongly criticised the decision. We must not forget that the RAA represents more than 400 000 motorists in South Australia, which is almost one-third of the population of this State. Mayors from Meadows, Marion, Willunga, Noarlunga, Brighton, Unley, and Mitcham all visited the Premier, the Minister of Transport and the Minister for Environment and Planning on 16 August last year, when they strongly put the case to them for reinstating the north-south corridor and the retention of the land needed for such a corridor.

In another letter Mr Simpson, who is Chairman of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation, expressed the same view. Mr Oswald, the Acting Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga, has written a letter expressing similar sentiments. A letter from a leading business man and chairman of a company expressed exactly the same views. A letter from the Flinders University Liberal Club expresses the same views. A letter from the Unley Chamber of Commerce and Industry pleaded with the Government not to sell the land. A letter from Mr H.P.C. Trumble, Secretary of the Metropolitan Central Region of Councils Inc. (covering all the councils in that central region), expresses a strong view to the Minister of Transport and pleads with him not to sell off the land in the north-south corridor and to reinstate the corridor. I also have a letter from Mr C.A.C. Catt (Town Clerk of the City of Noarlunga) expressing the same view. There is also an article in the *Hills Gazette* from the Mayors of councils in the area saying the same thing. Finally, I have a letter from a representative of the City of Unley—

An honourable member: The Mayor?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, it is not from the Mayor. It is from Mr Terry Sutcliffe (Senior Planning and Traffic Officer of the City of Unley), expressing the same view. He is a senior officer of local government, not expressing a political view but damning the decision of the Bannon Government. That is the sort of unanimous support that exists out there for the stand taken by the Opposition in relation to this matter. The land held in the corridor is a valuable asset, which has taken over 20 years to accumulate, and the sale of that land is an act of planning vandalism.

It is the worst planning decision ever inflicted on Adelaide, and that is saying something in a city that can be very proud of its origins and planning under Colonel Light. It is the worst planning decision ever; it is nothing but an act of planning vandalism. The Bannon Government has scrapped the corridor and sold the land for short-term political expediency: first, to get its hands on money and, secondly, to remove what it thinks is a problem that affects at least the districts of the Premier, Deputy Premier, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Mines and Energy. That is how crude the political decision was. They made the decision for purely local, selfish and short-term reasons.

The long-term transport needs of Adelaide and especially of the rapidly growing southern suburbs have been totally ignored. The decision to scrap the corridor was based on projected traffic growth of only 1 per cent a year, and that was covered in various articles released when the decision was announced. That 1 per cent a year represented the traffic growth some years ago, whereas since 1982 traffic has grown at a rate well above that. In 1982, the growth was 1.4 per cent; in 1983, 3.1 per cent; and in the first four months of 1984 the growth rate was 4 per cent—four times the original figure used as a justification for scrapping the north-south transport corridor. The Government's predictions in terms of traffic growth have been well and truly blown apart in the space of 18 months alone.

I have another question that shows the incompetence of the Minister, but I will not deal with it now. Already the Government has reversed part of its earlier decision and reinstated the north-south transport corridor between Sturt Road and Reynella. Everyone knows that: the Premier made that announcement recently. That decision has already been strongly criticised as only moving the existing traffic congestion from Darlington one kilometre closer to Adelaide. There has been universal agreement that the solution put forward by the Premier will not solve Adelaide's southern transport problems.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: No mention about by-passing Morphett Vale.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, that has been ignored. The sum of $45 million has been put into a short-term road that will move the problem one kilometre. I predict that eventually the whole north-south transport corridor will be needed in Adelaide. There is no more certain fact. I now turn to what the Highways Department itself has predicted. These are Highways Department figures confirmed and put out by the Minister of Transport in March 1983. The population projections indicate that the existing road system, even with improvements, will not be able to handle the traffic load after 1990 in the Darlington area and after 1992 on Anzac Highway. This is only seven and nine years away respectively.

These population projections show that between 1981 and 1991 the population of Adelaide's southern suburbs will increase by 46 per cent in contrast to the total population, which is expected to increase by only 8.9 per cent during the same period. These areas already experience considerable traffic delays and will obviously be subject to even greater delays. No doubt the Government, in scrapping the corridor and selling off the land, has failed to take account of the housing explosion currently occurring in the area of Seaford, Reynella East, Hackham and Hackham South.

This Government will have much to answer for in a few years time, when Adelaide's traffic is in chaos and when southern residents face long and tiring journeys to and from work. I call on the Government to freeze the sale of land in the north-south transport corridor. That is the least it can do. I also call on the Government to ensure that all the money from the land already sold and from any further land sales be made available for road construction. My disappointment is that the planning of Adelaide's transport needs is in such utter tatters.

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

SALINITY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to initiate any meaningful discussions with the Federal Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria to expedite the necessary salinity mitigation works for the Murray-Darling system, and calls on the Premier to convene a Heads-of-Government conference as a matter of urgency.

The House would be well aware that in 1981, at the direction of the then Liberal Government, the Engineering and Water Supply Department prepared a document in line with the Government's policy at that time to determine a permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem. That document was carefully prepared after much research and from knowledge within the Engineering and Water Supply Department gained from consultants who had been engaged over a period to study the salinity problems in the Murray-Darling system, as well as from experience gained in oversea study of similar situations, especially the Colorado River and its tributaries in the United States of America. In summary, the proposal states:

The major water resource problem facing the whole length of the lower basins of the Murray River including South Australia is salinity. Salinity results in damages and production losses to irrigate crops, and additional costs to industry and to domestic users amounting to many millions of dollars per year.

The problem has been a major concern when low flow and high salinity levels have occurred. Progress has been made on salinity mitigation measures in the past few years, but further works are required to provide acceptable salinity levels in the lower river under regulated conditions.

The proposal continues:

It is apparent that what is required is the establishment of agreed salinity standards for the River, particularly at the South Australian border, and the implementation of measures to achieve that standard.

This proposal was put to the Prime Minister at a meeting which was held in Melbourne in November 1981 and which was attended by the Prime Minister, the Minister for National Development, the Premiers of the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, and the Water Resource Ministers of those States. At that conference agreement was reached between the three States and the Commonwealth on a new River Murray Waters Agreement and consideration was also given to this proposal that I have outlined, namely, a permanent solution to the River Murray salinity problem.

That proposal was a very detailed submission involving an estimated cost at that time of about $400 million. When one considers the money that has been provided by the Federal Government in the recent Budget for salinity mitigation works, it highlights the Federal Government's degree of concern for the problems associated with the Murray River system. That concern is so small that the Federal Government has allocated only $700 000 to South Australia for the necessary works to be undertaken. It means that the salinity control programme within the Murray system has been brought virtually to a standstill. The proposal for a permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem states:

The general proposal is for the Commonwealth Government to:

- provide the necessary capital grants for the implementation of two Victorian salinity mitigation projects which will effect a substantial reduction in salinity.
- provide financial assistance for irrigators in the three States to enable them to adopt improved irrigation systems and practices. This will assist in reducing high ground water tables and river salinity.
- provide capital grants for the design and construction of additional works for intercepting the remaining significant salt inflows—and which will make possible the achievement of the proposed salinity standard.

In the United States, Federal and State Governments concerned have recognised the importance of improved irrigation practices in reducing the overall salinity problem, particularly of the Colorado system, and legislation is currently being considered in that country whereby 50 per cent of the cost of improved irrigation practices will be provided by the Federal Government, 25 per cent by way of grant from the State Governments concerned, and the irrigator being required to find the remaining 25 per cent.

The need is clearly documented for improved irrigation practices to be implemented. Recently, the South Australian Minister of Water Resources, when visiting the Riverland, called on irrigators to implement modern irrigation practices, but unfortunately the Minister did not provide any form of incentive. In fact, the disincentive is there inasmuch as the Government has stopped work on the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas. The Minister should be well aware by now that, without a modern irrigation distribution system providing a given supply of water on tap at all times, there is no way in which one can effectively implement and improve modern irrigation practices.

The attitude of both the State and Federal Governments indicates that they do not regard the salinity problems of the Murray River as a high priority. That is a great pity as far as South Australia is concerned, because the whole future development of this State depends very much on the quality of water in the Murray River in South Australia, whether it is for irrigation purposes, industrial use or domestic use. It has been clearly documented in a proposal, the Lock 2/Lock 3 Ground Water Interception Scheme, which could

very significantly reduce the level of salinity in South Australia.

Consultants have indicated that that proposal will reduce the level of salinity at Morgan by about 70 EC units, with a net value to South Australia of about $3 million per annum at a total cost of about $16 million. In response to a question I asked the Minister about a week ago regarding this matter, his reply on 21 August (page 401 of *Hansard*) was as follows:

> Cabinet approval was given in September 1983 for the expenditure of $1.56 million for the preliminary stage, which is expected to take until 1987 . . .

That is $1.5 million for a study that will continue until 1987! Obviously, the consultants have already reported on this project. Obviously, more detailed work is to be done on site, but to string that out until 1987—and I take it that that is the earliest possible date—indicates clearly that this project has been put on ice or shelved and that we will see little of it until the turn of the decade. That is not good enough. This one project will cost the people of South Australia an additional $3 million per annum and, as long as the construction work remains in limbo and does not get off the ground until about 1988 or 1989, it will be well into the next decade before we start to see the benefits of that project.

Since the Liberal Government lost office and the heads of Government from Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth were gathered together, no further meeting has taken place or been initiated by the South Australian Government. I remind members that South Australia has far more to gain and far more to lose from the quality of water in the Murray in South Australia than have Victoria and New South Wales. Certainly, those States have nowhere near the dependence on the Murray system as does South Australia, and it is very much up to South Australia to take the initiative, as it did in 1980-81, because I am certain that Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth will not do anything about it.

So, the Commonwealth contribution to the Murray Valley salinity and drainage control in South Australia now amounts to the massive figure of $700 000, when in total the programme will cost anything up to $400 million if we are to be serious about it. The Federal Government contribution in recent years to Murray Valley salinity mitigation in this State has varied. In 1979-80 it was $1.3 million; in 1980-81 it was $2.3 million; in 1981-82 it was $1.8 million; and in 1982-83 it was $1.5 million.

Last year, the first full year of the present Labor Government, it was down to $1 million. Now it is down to $700 000. So, the Commonwealth support for Murray River salinity control is disappearing. That is not good enough and in years to come South Australia will have to pay the cost of this delayed programme.

I have indicated that one of the very effective measures that can be put into operation virtually forthwith is an incentive programme for improved irrigation practices, and this has been proven around the world in similar situations. As I told the House just before the Minister came in, the United States Federal Government is so convinced of the need for improved irrigation practices—exactly what the Minister referred to in the Riverland just recently—that it is contributing 50 per cent of the costs of on-farm improved irrigation systems, the State Government and the farmer each paying 25 per cent of the cost.

That is a massive incentive, but the Federal and State Governments recognise that it is the most efficient and cost beneficial method for the taxpayers of the United States to come to grips with concerning the salinity problem, particularly in the Colorado River. To date, we have seen absolutely no contribution from our Federal Government. In fact, we have had a scheme running in South Australia initiated by the Liberal Government in which a farm grant system operated through the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It ran in parallel with the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas. Now that the rehabilitation of Government irrigation schemes has come to a standstill, so have any incentives to provide for improved irrigation practices.

Either the Government is serious about future water supplies to South Australia or it is not. One must recognise that we are talking about a problem that has a long lead time and if we delay until such time as the water reaches an absolutely critical point which affects suburban gardens to the degree where plants and lawns are dying because of the salinity level, it will be many years from then and countless millions of dollars will be spent before the situation can be reversed. I am concerned about the salinity control in the Murray-Darling system by Federal and State Governments having virtually ground to a halt.

No initiative has been taken by the Bannon Government to even call a heads of Government conference to discuss this critical matter. It has just been pushed aside because it does not have a high profile as far as the public is concerned. Until the public does become aware of the real problem by seeing plants and lawns in gardens dying, nothing will be done. It will be too late and the damage to South Australia and the discouragement of people wishing to come here and set up businesses will be enormous. The disincentive to come here as a result will be tremendous indeed.

So, I commend this motion to the House. I call on the Premier and the Government to initiate a conference of heads of Government in Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales and the Commonwealth to determine a programme of priorities so that this work will proceed. If that does not occur, then South Australia will be condemned to a future of extremely poor quality water, of people not being prepared to come to this State and set up businesses because of the damage that will be done to industry resulting from corrosion. The same applies to domestic use—household fittings, and facilities will be corroded and home gardens will be damaged. I ask honourable members to unanimously support the motion.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION DEPARMENT STAFFING

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

> That this House deplores the lack of action by the Minister of Education in not bringing schools which are under their quota of ancillary staff up to the allocation which has been notified to them for 1984, thus causing particular hardship and lack of educational opportunity in affected schools.

I shall confine my remarks to the continuing efforts that I, the school council at Cambrai, and interested bodies have made throughout the whole of this year in relation to the ancillary staff allocation for that school. Cambrai Area School serves quite a significant section of the Murray Plains in relation to secondary education provisions. This excellent school over the years has been well staffed by dedicated teachers providing, in my view, excellent grounding for the secondary students in that area. It caters for a significant part of this region of South Australia.

So, it is with a great deal of regret that I have to come into this House and move this motion referring specifically to that school in my district. But, as I understand it, the problem is certainly not isolated to the one school, which is my particular interest. My colleague, the shadow Minister

of Education (Hon. Michael Wilson), and others, I think will have more to say later in this debate. But, suffice to say that, if I read into the *Hansard* the correspondence surrounding this matter in relation to the school, it will highlight, probably as adequately as would any other debating material, just what I am aiming for in this resolution.

The history of this matter goes back to December last year, when a letter was forwarded to the Minister of Education. It stated:

Dear Sir,

The school council wish to draw your attention to a point of concern. According to the staffing formula our school is entitled to 6½ hours increase in ancillary staff. No transfer application was received after this was circularised in the ancillary staff vacancy list No. 2.

Accordingly, within the school we decided to allocate the 6½ hours as follows: 2½ hours to Y. Schultz, and 4 hours to F. Havelberk. No indication of any policy change had been received by the school until our Principal, Mr G. Murray, telephoned the ancillary staffing officer to notify the Department of our wishes. He was then told that our wishes would not be implemented due to a policy change, freezing such small increases, although it was previously within the guidelines.

If, in fact, that was an effective policy change, how disgraceful and discriminatory that would have been in relation to a smaller school, and Cambrai Area School, in my judgment, is not a particularly small school. The letter continues:

We wish to protest strongly here at the assumption that a small percentage increase of entitlement can be absorbed. We have a small number of ancillary staff whose work load is continuous and heavy. For example many of the teaching staff do their own clerical work to help alleviate the heavy demand upon the ancillary staff. Hence we do not believe that our needs are being met at present. It would further appear that because we are small that we are being expected to cope with yet a further disadvantage.

That is the point I have just made. It would be a disgraceful state of affairs if, simply because the school is relatively small in relation to some of the other metropolitan high and secondary schools, it was to be the subject of such a policy change. The letter concludes:

A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr Roger Goldsworthy, MP, for his support in this concern which we believe will ultimately affect the quality of education offered to children in his electorate. We would be grateful if the policy change could be reconsidered and we were able to implement our reallocation before the start of the new school year in 1984.

So that goes back to December last year. Subsequently, I wrote to the Minister of Education on 22 December 1983 in the following terms:

Dear Minister,

I have been approached by the Cambrai Area School Council who are concerned at a change of policy in relation to the provision of ancillary staff. As a result of this change of policy they have been told that they cannot employ two part-time ancillary staff as they were entitled to previously. They were also unaware of any policy change and had approached two people to work at the school.

I understand the council have already approached you directly. I would appreciate any information you can give me in relation to these policy changes which appear to disadvantage small schools such as Cambrai Area School in my electorate.

I received formal recognition of that letter, which I shall not read to the House, saying that the Minister had received my letter and was considering it. I wrote to the secretary of the school council informing him that I had written to the Minister, and I shall not take the time of the House to read that letter. The Minister did not reply directly to my letter, but wrote to the secretary of the school council and advised me that he had done so. The letter is dated 24 January 1984, so we come into this calendar year in this sorry saga. The letter states:

Dear Mr Henderson,

I refer to your letter dated 16 December, in which you express concern that a 6½ hour per week ancillary staff vacancy at Cambrai Area School is not to be filled. At the end of each year it is necessary to make adjustments to the level of ancillary staffing in schools because of changes in enrolment. In the past, use has been made of clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award which allows the employer to reduce the hours of school assistants in order to make the necessary adjustments.

You may be aware that I have undertaken not to use this clause but to bring about the adjustments to staffing levels by encouraging ancillary staff in schools which are over their entitlement to transfer to fill vacancies in other schools or to reduce hours voluntarily. You will appreciate that this voluntary process is somewhat slower than the forced reductions previously employed.

And a damn sight more inequitable, too, as this sorry saga as I have described it unfolds. The letter continues:

A result of this voluntary process is that some schools are still over their 1984 entitlements and it has therefore been necessary to delay the filling of some vacancies. The position at Cambrai Area School has been affected in this way. Positions such as this will be filled progressively as ancillary staff hours are made available from schools currently over their entitlement.

The fact that Cambrai Area School may be 'small' (as you describe in your letter) has in no way influenced the decision not to proceed to fill the 6½ hours, as all schools have been considered in the same way. Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

That did indicate that there was at that stage no policy change and that the Department intended to fill this quota of ancillary hours at Cambrai Area School. I have mentioned the fact that that letter was sent to the school and not to me, and that the Minister wrote to me indicating that he had sent the letter. Then I responded: I telephoned the school and discussed the matter. I wrote the following letter on 3 February 1984 to the Minister of Education:

Dear Minister,

I wrote to you regarding ancillary staffing at Cambrai Area School on 22 December 1983 and you forwarded to me a copy of the letter you sent to the school. Having read the reply it seems to me to be a most unsatisfactory position where Cambrai Area School is being penalised while they wait around for some other school to voluntarily reduce their staff numbers to the required level. I write to inquire if there is any indication when this will occur.

On 3 February this year I indicated to the Minister that in my judgment this situation of Cambrai Area School simply cooling its heels while some other school that was over quota decided voluntarily to reduce that quota was quite unsatisfactory. Therefore, I wrote to the Minister, as I have indicated, asking when the reduction was likely to occur. I wrote to the secretary of the school council indicating what I had done. I shall not read that letter to the House.

I then received a letter from the Minister thanking me for my approach. It was the usual formal thing, indicating that my further submission was being investigated and a reply would come as soon as possible. That was on 8 February. I then wrote to the secretary of the school council and sent him a copy of that holding letter. I then received a letter in response to that from the secretary of the school council, as follows:

Dear Roger,

The school council wish to thank you for your persistent efforts with respect to gaining us our entitlement of ancillary hours. We would like you to continue to pursue this matter and point out that now our entitlement has increased, due to an increase in teaching staff, by four hours. This means that we are now 10½ hours below our entitlement.

I acknowledged that letter. I received a letter from the Minister on 29 March—so, we are getting well into the first term: school is well under way—as follows:

Dear Mr Goldsworthy,

I refer to your letter dated 3 February 1984 in which you seek an indication as to when the vacant ancillary staff position at Cambrai Area School will be filled. A notice has been placed in the Education *Gazette* dated 9 March 1984, advertising current vacancies to all schools and I anticipate that this will encourage ancillary staff to transfer from schools over established to fill vacant positions such as the one at Cambrai Area School. I anticipate that similar notices will appear on a regular basis during the year. Thank you for raising this matter with me.

Some hope! I sent that letter to the secretary of the school council on 6 April. Then the Hon. Michael Wilson, who had had complaints not only from me but elsewhere around the State, raised the matter in a grievance debate in this place, when he canvassed two matters—both, by the way, affected Cambrai Area School to which I am referring. He referred to this completely unsatisfactory situation. I suspect that this was getting towards the end of April this year. The date does not appear on this extract, but it was getting towards the end of the sitting and of the first term, I suspect.

The Hon. Michael Wilson raised two matters. One was the matter of the lack of provision of ancillary staff. At the same time the Minister waited around for something to happen. The other matter, which also affected the Cambrai Area School related to a reduction in the service to librarians in school libraries. The next development in this sorry saga was that I forwarded that information to the School Council to let its representatives know that the Opposition was continuing to push this matter and was concerned about what was happening (or what was not happening, I should say) at Cambrai Area School. On 3 August, I received a letter dated 30 July this year from the Cambrai Area School, as follows:

Dear Roger,

Further to our previous correspondence and your efforts to achieve our ancillary staff entitlement we are still 6½ hours short of our entitlement. The School Council passed the following motion at their last meeting 16 July 1984:

> The Cambrai Area School Council is extremely disappointed with the Education Minister's failure to provide many country schools, including Cambrai Area School, with their much needed basic ancillary staff entitlement at the beginning of each school year. This inaction shows how considered school council and staff appeals for assistance are ignored by the Minister to the detriment of country students.

The school council would appreciate any pressure you could bring to bear to redress this inequality for country schools and in particular our school.

Out of a real sense of frustration, the school council having raised this matter in December 1983, having appointed its ancillary staff according to the guidelines which were extant until that time, having been told that this Minister had changed the rules, that he was not going to reduce over quota schools so that those under quota could simply swing while he hoped for the best, I must say I believe the school council was extremely patient during the whole of this sorry saga, I have moved this motion.

I have sent to the school council a copy of this motion, and I shall await with a great deal of eagerness the response of the Minister of Education to this situation. I ask the House to consider where is all this hoo-hah about equality in education which the Labor Government is trumpeting to the world at large throughout this State and nation, when the Minister will allow a disgraceful situation to occur throughout two terms this year (when the matter was raised in December last year) where some schools are allowed to remain over quota simply because it does not suit the convenience of those people who are over quota to remain in that fashion, while other schools like Cambrai Area School languish through lack of adequate educational provision. What sort of wishful thinking is it for the Minister to stick an advertisement in the appropriate publication hoping that he will get someone to go to Cambrai Area School?

There is an obligation on the Minister to see that that school is properly provided for. If he is not willing to take the step of transferring staff, as happens in other aspects of staff in schools, then he is obliged to provide staff for that school. If he will not compulsorily transfer staff then in my judgment he has no option but to make staff available and to get that out of his budget or seek a further budget allocation, because it is absolute nonsense to be talking about equality of education when a Minister is prepared to allow an excellent school, which is providing the only secondary education in that area of the State to be short-staffed in this important area. That makes a complete farce of any suggestion that there is equality of education throughout this State. I could and I will suggest to the Minister that maybe Cambrai Area School is not electorally significant to the Labor Party.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I think that would be a fair suggestion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They vote for me, so it is not electorally significant for the Labor Party. The Cambrai Area School is significant to me and to the people of its area as well as being significant to the welfare of South Australia because it makes an excellent contribution to the rural economy which underpins the whole of the economy of this State, and to sell short those people who make an enormous contribution in what is not very congenial country (it is drought-prone country), I believe is absolutely disgraceful. If they are to be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency it does not speak much for the Labor Government which proclaims its doctrine of equality of educational opportunity. If this Minister has not got the stomach to compulsorily transfer staff he has no alternative but to make further staff available in situations such as this.

Mr Trainer: And decrease taxes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Absolutely ridiculous! If he has not the stomach to transfer staff from over quota schools (we raised this matter in December last year, and one of his promises was to soft soap the Teachers' Union and he says he believes in equality of education), he has no recourse open to him than to make that staff available and to find the money. It makes an absolute farce of equality of education in this State. This lack of courage—

Mr Trainer: Spend more, cut taxes and reduce the deficit.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Or transfer staff. What staff will voluntarily pull up their tentpegs and go to live in Cambrai from some other over quota school? There is a special need in these country areas. If the Minister thinks he can satisfy the school council by putting in an advertisement, 'Here is a vacancy, would you like to turn up?', that is tripe! In my 15 years in this place I have seen no other example of lack of courage, lack of guts in coming to grips with a very real problem in relation to educational provisions in this State. I can think of no other dilly-dallying gutless approach to a problem, which in electoral terms is insignificant to this Government but which to the people concerned is vitally important, in a school which is well run, efficient and provides an excellent grounding for these secondary students. For such a school in a significant area to be hamstrung because of a gutless, smooth-tongued Minister who can charm an audience but has no guts to do something about this problem, is absolutely disgraceful. I shall continue to raise this matter in the House. It has gone on since December last year, and Lord knows how long it will be before he does something about it.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Ask him to go up to Cambrai.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He has the correspondence; let him go up and have a look. He will pat them on the shoulder and say, 'What a wonderful job you are doing,' come back here and do nothing about it. I will continue to raise this matter. It is one of the thicker files I have in my correspondence with the Education Department, and it will get a lot thicker. Much more will be said about this in the House unless—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The smart arse comment from the member opposite, who does not think this matter—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to moderate his language a little. What he said was certainly unparliamentary.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know where it says in *Erskine May* or Standing Orders that 'smart arse' is unparliamentary.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It does not matter what the honourable member thinks, I have made a ruling that I believe it is unparliamentary.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will withdraw it but I think if that sort of frivoulous comment indicates the level of concern of the member opposite, the member for Ascot Park, Lord help him.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COORONG CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I move:

That this House condemns the payment of $194 000 to the Storemen and Packers Union for the redevelopment of the Coorong Caravan Park on the recommendation of the Federal and State Governments, overriding the priorities for approval of grants for the development of regional tourism resorts as laid down by the Department of Tourism and breaching the undertaking of the Minister of Tourism given in the 1983-84 Estimates Committee that Commonwealth job creation funds would be used to augment the inadequate Department of Tourism funds allocated for the purpose of assisting approved projects.

I wish to provide for the House the background to this motion and to demonstrate that, if the House has any consideration for justice and equity, this motion must be supported. The background goes back several months to earlier this year when the Storemen and Packers Union purchased the Coorong Caravan Park, I believe, for $80 000. Some time later, in about mid May, I was approached by a person who told me that the Government planned to grant $134 000 to the Storemen and Packers Union in order to upgrade the Coorong Caravan Park. That person was right in his general intelligence but not precisely correct in relation to the sum involved.

With my knowledge of the enormous backlog of applications for grants for the development of tourism resorts and with my recollection of the undertaking that had been given by the Minister of Tourism in the Budget Estimates Committee last year, I found this information difficult to believe. I therefore tried to check throughout the South-East as to the validity of the statement and, having checked in one or two reliable places, I prepared a statement which I released to the *Advertiser*. I realised that I was going out on a limb in making this allegation, because it was a serious charge to claim that a Government had made a massive grant to a trade union (as a CEP grant was involved, the agreement of the State Government was obviously necessary) without sufficient evidence to substantiate it. However, I believed that I had sufficient evidence, so I gave the *Advertiser* a statement that the State Government was to be condemned for lending its weight to any moves to make a grant of this nature to a union. I said that worthwhile community projects that had been in the pipeline for years would have to be pushed out of the way in order to provide the funds to Mr Apap and his union officials. I also said that the tourism industry in the South-East was furious at the prospect of such a grant being made, and no wonder! I understand that the union had been told by the Government to apply for the grant. I have no way of proving that and, if the Minister can disprove it when he responds in this debate, that is all to the good; but that is the general assertion.

The implications of this are serious indeed: the taxpayer will be subsidising the holidays of unionists while the general public will continue to pay full fees at the park. I understand that members of the Storemen and Packers Union will get a 20 per cent discount and members of other unions a 10 per cent discount. I imagine that, as some members of the Government are paid-up members of their trade union, we will see Labor members tripping off to the Coorong claiming their 10 per cent holiday discount. It is a pretty prospect, is it not? I am not sure of the union status of the Minister of Tourism, but he will no doubt enjoy cut rates when he goes to the Coorong Caravan Park. Whether that is considered fair and just by the taxpayer is a matter that the House and the public will have to consider.

Mr Ferguson: Surely you get a few discounts around the place, too.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No. Although I have been offered discounts, I do not accept them. As a politician who may one day be exercising financial judgments, I do not accept a discount that is offered to me as a politician. It is important to realise the background of this matter.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles does not require the member for Ascot Park to make a speech for her.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. It is important to look at the financial position of the Storemen and Packers Union. It is not as though the union is a mendicant body that can hardly keep body and soul together, let alone mend a few fences around the caravan park. The Storemen and Packers Union is widely known to have a substantial bank balance and, in addition, it holds 1 000 shares in radio station 5AA. Those shares will have soared in value as a result of the bid by the Totalisator Agency Board to buy the station, a bid that was approved, I understand, by the Australian Broadcasting Control Board this week. So, the union's bank balance will have been considerably increased as a result of its investment in station 5AA. Let us say that the Storemen and Packers Union is not short of a bob or two or incapable of investing capital in the redevelopment of its caravan park. However, it has been successful in its bid to obtain a grant.

After I had released that statement to the *Advertiser*, a journalist, very properly, contacted both the union and the Department of Labour to check the allegation. Although the response from the union was not printed on 18 May when my allegation was printed, I accurately recall and noted that the journalist rang me back to say that Mr Apap denied any knowledge of the application. It is important for that to go on the record.

Mr Ferguson: He may have been away on holiday.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, he was not on holiday: he was available to the journalist. He answered the allegation and said that he had no knowledge of the application. It surprises me to find members on the other side defending Mr Apap because I should have thought that, after the Labor Party's grave mistake in endorsing him for the seat of Semaphore, there would be little defence from members on the other side for Mr Apap.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Albert Park is willing to come to the defence of Mr Apap even though the voters for Semaphore, who are, by general attitude, Labor supporters, absolutely denounced Mr Apap. The more seats for which Mr Apap is endorsed the happier

the Liberal Party will be because it will mean more Liberal and more independent Labor members in this House.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not recall. I do not think that is relevant. At the time to which I was referring, I was speaking to the Chief of Staff.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order and answering them is also out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: On 15 June, I had further notice that a grant had been made, and I was told that the grant had been increased from the original figure given me ($134 000) to about $180 000. On receiving this additional information, I again made a statement to the *Advertiser* and it was printed. The *Advertiser* by now must have realised that there was substance in this allegation.

Mr Ashenden: They are slow sometimes!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Not always. The *Advertiser* printed the statement, and at the bottom of the report appear the words:

> Mr Apap, the Minister of Tourism (Mr Keneally) and the Minister for Labour could not be contacted for comment last night.

That is not at all surprising—I should think that they would want to keep well away from a potentially embarrassing situation.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Right, so you were. I should not respond to interjections, but that is an interesting point, because later, when the grant became public, I was in Singapore and could not pursue the matter with the vigour that I would have had I been here. So, the two protagonists were out of the State at key times.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Why do you think the Minister was out of the State at the time?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Because I was on Government business.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The timing was most fortuitous. However, on 26 June, whilst I was overseas, the Acting Minister of Labour, Mr Hemmings, weighed into the argument and said that a Community Employment Programme grant of $193 000 had been made to the Storeman and Packers Union and 'that it was not a political pay-off'. That was stated in the *Advertiser* of 26 June. He denied that the union had jumped the queue.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Do you understand the Community Employment Programme grant scheme?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I do indeed, and I will come to that in a moment. The article continues:

> The Regional Director of the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr P. Bush, acting for the Federal Minister, Mr Willis, formally approved the grant. He said the Department of Tourism had been consulted about the grant proposal and had raised no objections.

That is important and was confirmed by the Minister in answer to a question without notice that I asked last week. There were no objections. Let us go back to the Budget Estimates Committee on 30 September 1983 (page 287), where the Minister answered a question on whether it was his intention to monitor Community Employment Project programmes granted to communities which would provide added attractions to South Australian and interstate visitors. The response from the Hon. G.F. Keneally was:

> Yes, we are very much involved. We want to have a considerable input into the programme as a Department.

In other words, we want to influence Community Employment Programme grants because it is in the interests of tourism to do so. He went on to say:

> Subsidies towards the development of tourist resorts have the smallest increase within the tourism budget lines, namely, only about a 3.4 per cent increase.

The reason, he said, why the Department wanted to become involved in decision making about CEP grants was that the line provided a grant of only $342 000. It used to be $500 000 back in 1979, but it reduced progressively until 1982. This is the key statement:

> We have been able to sustain that increase—

in other words, that minimal tiny increase and small sum—

> because we are putting a lot of job creation money into tourist oriented projects. The honourable member has raised an important point. We are anxious to be involved and believe there is considerable benefit to tourism in such job creation schemes.

The Minister continues:

> One problem exists, namely, that the job creation programmes are funded mainly in areas with high unemployment, whereas the most appropriate tourist ventures should go where the tourism product is and often one cannot match the two together.

Let us look at a series of questions which I put on notice late last year and which appear in *Hansard* of 6, 7 and 8 December 1983 (pages 2576-9). I asked the Minister:

> 1. From which local government areas has the Department of Tourism received applications for subsidies for development of tourist resorts since November 1982?
> 2. What are the projects and what is the value of each and what is the sponsoring organisation for which subsidies have been sought?
> 3. What applications have been approved and over what period will the total funds for each project be made available?
> 4. What is the value of applications which have been approved but for which funds are not available?

A table showing applications approved was supplied. There were several applications from the South-East area. A list of the applications, the projects, the value of each and the sponsoring organisations for which the subsidies had been sought was supplied. Behold, we have a list of over 100 applications involving a total of $7.8 million and including a number of projects in the self-same area in which the Coorong Caravan Park is located. That is significant because it indicates that, in that same general region in which unemployment exists and in which there are applications for grants for tourist resorts, somehow or other the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments are able to find $193 000 for a Commonwealth Employment Programme, yet they are not able to find funds for other projects.

Those projects include in the District Council of Coonalpyn Downs, public toilets at Tintinara to the value of $30 000. An application had been submitted, but no funds are available. In the District Council of Lacepede was a scheme under the heading 'Kingscote—Development Maria Creek—dredging' to the value of $39 000. In the District Council of Meningie, in that small area barely kilometres away from the Coorong was an application under the heading 'Meningie—Redevelopment old caravan park sites—public toilets etc.', involving $36 000. So far we have a total of just over $100 000, all of which had been in the pipeline for some considerable period but none of which had been able to get a CEP grant.

That is not all. At Tailem Bend there was an application for the construction of tourist information bays at a cost of $30 000 and public toilets at a cost of $30 000. In the District Council of Millicent there was an application for a tourist information bay to the value of $25 000. In the District Council of Robe there was an application for interpretive centre furnishing to the value of $28 000; the redevelopment of Sea-Vu Caravan Park at a cost of $300 000, and a weir at the mouth of drain 'L' at a cost of $4 000.

Further south, in the District Council of Port MacDonnell, there was an application for toilets at Blackfellow Caves at a cost of $24 000, for the development of Little Blue Lake at a cost of $12 400, for further Mount Schank development at a cost of $15 000, and for Cape Northumberland Development involving $60 000. In the District Council of Tatiara, also not far from the Coorong, was an application for the

redevelopment of the Bordertown Caravan Park at a cost of $200 000 and at Keith a tourist information bay at a cost of $6 000.

Those projects are selected from a list totalling a cost of $7.8 million. They are all in the general region of the Coorong Caravan Park in the South-East of South Australia. Somehow or other, the money cannot be found by the Government for these projects, despite the fact that the general nature of the projects is very similar to the nature of the Coorong Caravan Park development project, that is, labour intensive.

Mr Lewis: It's strange.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, it is strange, as the member for Mallee says. One would be tempted to think that some kind of political influence had been brought to bear to ensure that the Storemen and Packers Union jumped a queue that long. With the exception of the furnishing for the interpretive centre at Robe at a cost of $28 000, as far as I can see every other project in the South-East and the Coorong which has been in the pipeline for some considerable time is a labour-intensive project in an area of high unemployment, which suits the criteria of a Community Employment Programme grant. Why then did the Minister of Tourism instruct the Department of Tourism, because I know enough about departmental priorities and the integrity of its officers to know that there is no way that anybody could have jumped a queue like that unless a Ministerial directive had been given. Why then was the approval of the Department given to the development of the Coorong Caravan Park?

The political patronage that reeks in this case is to be deplored, and what sickens me—and that is a strong word to use, but it is an accurate word in this instance—is the complete feeling of betrayal among people in the South-East region and the Coorong in South Australia, people who have worked for years to get projects off the ground and who have believed that they are in a queue, that their projects have been or are going to be approved, and that they have an indication from the Department of Tourism that when the money is available they will get it. Suddenly, however, the faith of those people and their trust in public institutions is dealt a resounding blow.

How can people be expected to have confidence in the impartiality of Government departments when a decision like this is made? It is beyond all reason, and I can only say that the Government should be roundly condemned for this decision. The Minister's words in the Estimates Committee sound very hollow indeed, 12 months later, when we have this kind of a run on the board. What does the State Government of South Australia owe the Storemen and Packers Union? That is what I would like to know, and that is what the people of the South-East would like to know. They are absolutely outraged at this grant. What possible pay-off could be given in the form of $193 000? That sum would have meant that five or six of these major local government projects could have got off the ground. They are not basically different in nature. What is it that the Labor Party owes the Storemen and Packers Union that prompts a pay-off like that?

Mr Lewis: It's certainly not Christmas time!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is certainly not Christmas time. The *Advertiser* editorial of 25 June this year, in a very moderate statement, reads:

> An explanation is required from the Government as to why a facility which seems at least primarily intended to benefit union members has been selected ahead of other projects for this type of assistance. If no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming the suspicion will inevitably persist that the Government has seen fit to give preferential treatment to its political friends.

What other conclusion can we possibly come to? The article continues:

> And if this should indeed prove to be the case the complaints already voiced over this matter will be fully justified.

When the Minister answered my question without notice last week, he skirted the issue completely. He did not answer: he did not give the explanation which I, the South-East Regional Tourism Association, SAARTO and members on this side of the House believe must be given. He simply said:

> The matter of the caravan park was certainly raised with me and my Department.

The Minister went on to say that the direct answer to my question was that no project had been disadvantaged at all by the funding to which he referred. Does the Minister think that we on this side of the House and those in the tourism industry in the South-East are fools? Does he think that $193 000 of taxpayers' money can be given to a union, that the value of its investment is trebled overnight and that it can simply be said that no other project has been disadvantaged? It is patent nonsense. It is no use for the Minister to say that CEP grants are administered quite separately from Department of Tourism grants, that priorities are different and that it is Commonwealth money.

We know all that. We also know that in the Budget Estimates Committee the Minister gave his undertaking that the inadequate funds given by way of grants for the development of tourism resorts would be bolstered by CEP funds. They have not been, but the union mates of the Minister and his colleagues on the Government side of the House have been made richer by $193 000. The Government should be thoroughly condemned on this, as should the Federal Government because I have no doubt that the pay-off to the union is a joint matter. It is not a matter entirely for the State branch of the Australian Labor Party; it would be a Commonwealth-State deal that has been done with the Storemen and Packers Union. It is nothing else but a pay-off.

The House and the people of South Australia are entitled to know the reasons and justification for it, if, indeed, there can be any, and there cannot be. They are also entitled to know whether the other applicants for grants for the development of tourism resorts—particularly local government caravan parks, which have been fighting for funds for so long—will get that kind of money. Even if restitution were made by way of payments to these other bodies, there could be no justification whatsoever for the payment of a grant not to a local government body but to a union.

Where unions stand in this whole scheme of things has now been clarified. Private operators have no access to CEP grants. If one is in private enterprise, one cannot even get a look in. Local government gets a look in, but where do the unions stand? Obviously, at the very top of a long list that has been there for a long time.

If that is the situation, the people of South Australia obviously have been told by the Labor Government that they can go hang: 'We will look after our friends first; you can forget about local government and the real needs of tourism. We will just stuff with gold the pockets of our mates in the unions.' That is absolutely reprehensible and should be condemned by the members of this House.

Mr GREGORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN OLYMPIC TEAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Olsen:

That this House records its appreciation of the performance of South Australian members of the Australian Olympic team in

Los Angeles; recognises the assistance which the South Australian Sports Institute has given to our Olympic athletes; and urges the Government to continue to give full support to the Institute which is making a significant contribution towards lifting the standards of sporting performance in South Australia—

which the Premier had moved to amend by inserting after the words 'Los Angeles' the words 'and Paralympians in Stoke-Mandeville' and by leaving out the words 'urges the Government to continue' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'commends the Government for continuing'.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 472.)

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I take this opportunity to associate myself with this motion, which I believe has the support of the whole House. I particularly associate my remarks with those of the Leader of the Opposition, who made an extremely detailed speech on this matter. The Leader not only praised the Olympic athletes who represented this State but also praised those athletes who took part in the paraplegic games at Stoke-Mandeville. The performances of these athletes is something with which we in this House should be very proud.

It is a good measure of the coming of age of this State in sport that the South Australian Sports Institute was able to have a marked bearing on the success of our athletes, both at Los Angeles and at Stoke-Mandeville. As I say, the Leader's speech was extremely detailed. It is not for me to reproduce all the material that was in that speech, save to say that the Leader when he made his speech made a call for additional funding for the South Australian Sports Institute.

I take this opportunity to commend the Government for its announcement last Sunday that there would be additional funding for the South Australian Sports Institute. It is absolutely vital that additional funding is provided. I am in the rather unusual situation of having to commend the Government for taking this initiative. I also commend the Leader of the Opposition for bringing to the House's attention the dire necessity for increased funding. I am sure that all members agree with that initiative.

However, as I have said, I will not go into detail because the Leader of the Opposition has already given the House much detail on the performances of the athletes concerned. I had hoped that this debate would be conducted in a bipartisan manner free of Party politics. Up to the end of the Premier's speech (who replied to the Leader of the Opposition) the debate was conducted in a bipartisan manner which had the approval of both sides of the House. However, towards the end of his speech the Premier lapsed into Party politics and aimed an attack at the previous Liberal Government in this State over the conduct of the then Premier and myself, as the then Minister of Recreation and Sport, over the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games by some Australian athletes. In his speech, the Premier said that he opposed sporting contacts with South Africa. He also said that he was appalled at the doctrine of apartheid. I point out to the Premier that I support him in his opposition to sporting contacts with South Africa, because I am also opposed to the doctrine of apartheid. However, I am also opposed to a situation in which a superpower invades a helpless country, as happened in 1980 when Russia invaded Afghanistan.

In 1980 I believe that I had the right as a Minister to stand up and say what I thought about that matter, as did the then Premier of this State. I believe that a breaking of international treaties and a breaking of common decency when a superpower such as Russia invades a small country such as Afghanistan is equally repulsive and abhorrent as a doctrine of apartheid. In fact, that war is still going on. Only this week we had news of further hostilities and deaths in that unfortunate country.

The then Premier (Hon. D.O. Tonkin) and I had a right to say what we thought, and to stand up for what we believed in. It is unfortunate that the Premier had to introduce Party politics into this debate. It only compounds what the Minister of Recreation and Sport had to say a few months ago in this House when he accused former Premier Tonkin and I of acquiescing in the pay-off to those Olympic athletes who did not go to Moscow. What a disgraceful allegation for a Minister of the Crown to make! He said, in effect, that former Premier Tonkin and I knew that the Olympic athletes who had boycotted the Olympic Games and would not be going to Moscow would be paid off by the then Federal Government. I corrected that disgraceful allegation by the Minister of Recreation and Sport during a personal explanation in this House. However, I believe it is a great pity that the Premier compounded that allegation in his speech yesterday.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport is to reply to my speech in this House. We wait with interest to see what he has to say on this motion. I suspect that the Minister will say, as he has already said three times in this House, that the previous Government did nothing in the realm of recreation and sport. I will deal briefly with a few things that the previous Government did in the realm of recreation and sport to save the Minister the trouble of saying that we did nothing.

I have not answered the Minister's accusations before because I did not really believe that they were worth while answering. However, I will take this opportunity to put the record straight. When the previous Government came into power in 1979 it found the racing industry in a parlous state. The racing industry throughout South Australia was in financial difficulties. The Tonkin Government commissioned a committee of inquiry into racing, which eventually reported with 32 or 33 recommendations. The Tonkin Government implemented about 30 of those recommendations forthwith—hardly the action of a Government that did nothing in the field of recreation and sport!

One of those recommendations was the sharing of the TAB surplus between the Government and the racing codes. Mr Deputy Speaker, you will know from your interest in dog racing in Whyalla what an important initiative that was as far as the racing codes were concerned. The sharing of the TAB surplus went a long way toward starting the recovery of the racing industry in this State. One of the other recommendations was to introduce after race payouts with the TAB. Anyone who knows anything about racing in this State will agree that the introduction of after race payouts has had a marked effect on the racing industry in this State and has helped that industry pull itself out of the financial troubles that it was in. Furthermore, before the last election the Tonkin Government produced a package of measures to further assist the racing industry including, amongst other things, the sharing of unclaimed dividends and TAB fractions with the racing codes.

The election intervened before the Tonkin Government could implement that package, but the Minister of Recreation and Sport (who has just come into the House) well knows that he picked up that package and implemented those measures, which certainly assisted the racing industry in this State to become financially viable. Certainly, the Minister introduced the measure some two or three months earlier than the previous Government would have done. However, the Tonkin Government did a great deal to assist the racing industry in this State—hardly the actions of a Government that did nothing in the field of recreation and sport!

What else did the Tonkin Government do? It introduced the administrative subsidy scheme. Under that scheme sporting bodies were given up to $8 000 a year to assist in the employment of an administrative or coaching director.

When the scheme was introduced 20 sporting bodies and five recreation associations availed themselves of it. I understand that the scheme has since been extended, but those were the figures: 20 sporting bodies and five recreation associations picked up the ability to take part in that scheme and received up to $8 000 each to subsidise the employment of administrators and coaching directors, thus freeing their own funds to further improve junior sport in their own particular areas.

What else did the Tonkin Government do in the field of recreation and sport? It introduced Soccer Pools into this State and formed a recreation and sport fund which brought in about $750 000 a year to spend on sport in this State—hardly the actions of a Government that did nothing for sport! We will question the Minister in some detail during the Estimates Committee's debates as to how he is spending that Soccer Pools money. We will be very interested to know how it is being spent.

I suspect that some of that money is going to Treasury and is being used to cut back on grants to the Department of Recreation and Sport. However, we will wait until the Budget is produced to ascertain whether or not this is so. The matters I have mentioned are hardly the actions of a Government that did nothing in the field of recreation and sport. The Tonkin Government formed the South Australian Sports Institute. Figures relating to the amount of money granted to that Institute in its first year have been bandied about in this place by the Premier and the Minister at various stages. It has been stated that the Tonkin Government funded the Sports Institute to the tune of about $150 000. The Minister certainly knows (although the Premier may not) that the amount involved was really $230 000, because, along with the grant of $150 000, went a letter of guarantee, which was signed by me and which was sent to the Chairman of the Sports Institute (Mr Geoff Motley), stating that an additional $80 000 would be provided to the Institute.

In fact, when one is comparing figures—and I do not think that there is any point in comparing figures—as the Premier did in his speech, then $230 000 was the amount of the grant that started the South Australian Sports Institute. We should remember that it was the Tonkin Government that formed the South Australian Sports Institute. I have continually commended the present Government for continuing funding to that Institute. The Minister was not in this House a while ago when I commended the Premier, the Minister and the Government for announcing last Sunday that the Government is increasing funding to the South Australian Sports Institute to over $500 000. That is excellent and we should all be proud of the Institute. Let us not continue to see who gains the credit for the Institute, but let us just say that it is a great success for South Australia. That success was proven at Los Angeles and at Stoke-Mandeville. Let us stop this petty Party political bickering that should not have been introduced into this debate by the Premier. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House urge the Government to immediately install pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Christ the King Church at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys, for the safety and protection of school children attending St Francis School, parishioners, senior citizens, residents and all visitors who use the school and parish facilities.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 467.)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I thank the Opposition for its co-operation in this matter. The issue of pedestrian activated traffic lights on the road referred to has apparently been around for quite a number of years. I appreciate the reasons put forward by the member for Hanson in urging the Government to immediately install these lights. The member put forward a well researched case to support his motion. I read his speech very carefully and perhaps the only figure not included that should have been included related to the average number of children attending the school. I would be interested to know that figure.

I am sorry that the member for Hanson was not able to convince his colleagues, when in Government, that these pedestrian activated traffic lights should be installed because this issue has been around for a number of years. However, the cold hard facts are that there are financial constraints involved here, and a whole list of other such crossings involved, most of which have a high priority. Now the Department is still saying that the lights are not justified at this stage. That is the Department's assessment, and I would like to refer to its report to me. From the information that has been provided to the honourable member, he would know some of the reasons why the Department is saying the lights are not justified, and I will go through the reasons quickly. The report states:

1. Location:

St. Francis School is situated on the northern side of Henley Beach Road and is midway between traffic signals at the intersection of Rowells Road/Henley Beach Road and Tapleys Hill Road/Henley Beach Road.

Henley Beach Road has a pavement width of 18.2 m in this area with 3 m and 5.5 m traffic lanes in each direction, separated by a 1.2 m painted median.

'School' and 'End School Limit' signs exist and form a school zone which covers the entrance to the school.

A locality plan dated August 1984 is appended hereto—

I am happy to make that available to the honourable member to examine—

2. Previous investigations:

Previous investigations were carried out in 1973, 1979, 1981 and 1982. In all investigations it was concluded that the vehicular and pedestrian activity was such that a pedestrian crossing could not be justified.

3. Latest investigation:

The Department carried out its latest investigation on 11 July 1984. Nine 30 m zones were defined in the section between Willingale Avenue to Rutland Avenue to assess pedestrian and vehicular activity. The investigation was carried out over a 10-hour period between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. during which time pedestrians could reasonably be expected to be active.

The investigation found that in the vicinity of the school entrance adjacent to the church the pedestrian activity in zones 2 and 3 respectively was not great, viz. between 8-9 a.m. a total of seven children and one adult and 3.30-4.30 p.m. a total of seven children and three adults crossed Henley Beach Road. During the other eight hours a total of 17 children and 21 adults crossed the road at this location.

Pedestrian activity was greatest in zones 7, 8 and 9, which are outside the existing school zone, being between Strathmore Avenue and Rutland Avenue. Between the hours of 8-9 a.m. a total of eight children and four adults crossed the road, while between 3.30-4.30 p.m. a total of 22 children and nine adults did so. During the other eight hours 14 children and 47 adults were so observed to cross the road.

It was noted that pedestrian activity was spread out over the length of Henley Beach Road under observation. Furthermore, pedestrians crossed the road without undue delay and during gaps in the traffic flow.

4. Discussion:

In considering proposals for the installation of pedestrian activated signals where schools are involved, the Highways Department assesses the location on the basis of a flashing light school crossing. This is done because of the likelihood that a reasonable proportion of the pedestrians will be children and the criteria for the installation of a *flashing light school crossing* are not as demanding as those recorded for the installation of pedestrian actuated facilities. If it transpires that a school crossing is justified on an arterial road, such as Henley Beach Road, this Department would install a pedestrian actuated facility.

As a general rule, the Highways Department considers that a flashing light school crossing would be necessary if, for each of two separate hours of a typical school day, the number of children observed crossing the road who could be expected to use a crossing at a central point (if provided) exceeds 50 per hour and, during the same two hours, the number of vehicles through which the children have to cross in one movement exceeds 200 per hour. The location is observed between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. and the two highest hourly movements are considered.

The criteria adopted serve as a guide and investigatory work takes into account other factors pertinent to the particular location, such as sight distance, road geometry, traffic speed and composition.

Pedestrians, including schoolchildren, cross roads mid-block on a widespread basis and it is, of course, impossible to install signalised crossings to cater for all of these movements. It is therefore necessary to use criteria by which it can be objectively determined that the relationship between pedestrian and vehicle numbers is such that pedestrians could experience difficulty in being able to cross a road in relative safety and without undue delay. Such an approach ensures that pedestrian crossing facilities are not installed indiscriminately and enables priority to be allocated to installations which are shown to be justified. Although the number of vehicles exceeded 200 per hour in the area under observation it was noted that pedestrian numbers were well below the accepted standard.

5. Departmental Assessment:

The investigation re-affirmed the findings of the four previous investigations in that there is no justification for the installation of pedestrian actuated traffic signals on Henley Beach Road in the vicinity of Christ the King Church/St Francis School, Lockleys at this stage. The fact that pedestrians can cross this section of Henley Beach Road in relative safety is borne out by departmental records indicating that here have been no accidents involving pedestrians during the period January 1979 to March 1984.

That was submitted to me for my information. Since then the honourable member has pointed out that there has been an accident, involving a child, which could have been very serious. Last Sunday I went to look at the school and church myself. Whilst there was not a great deal of traffic on Henley Beach Road, there was a lot of activity at the school behind the church. I must be honest about that and support the remarks made by the member for Hanson that there was a lot of activity. Even though the traffic was not so great on Henley Beach Road, I imagine that, if that same activity occurred on week nights with heavy traffic (and it is admitted in the report to me by the Department that more than 200 cars per hour do pass that site), it could be quite dangerous.

The member for Hanson stated in his speech the likelihood of new accommodation development within the next 18 to 24 months. That new development could and probably will change the whole complexion of the issue. So, I would like to move an amendment to the motion as moved by the member for Hanson, to leave out the words 'immediately install pedestrian actuated lights' and insert in lieu thereof the words 'install pedestrian actuated traffic lights as soon as possible'. In the meantime I am quite prepared to direct the Department to investigate immediately, and install if practicable, a raised median along this section of road as a logical first step in order to provide safe refuge for the type of widespread pedestrian movement in this section of the road.

I would be happy to confer with the member before directing the Department to do that. It has to be practicable. I believe it is justified and, if the member and the community in that area think that that will help as a first step, I am prepared to direct the Department to proceed along those lines. If, of course, they decide that they would prefer to wait for the lights, I am agreeable to that also. I have discussed this matter privately with the honourable member and stated that there is no way we can do it under the current Budget in view of the long list of high priority areas. In view of the Government's and any concern on the whole issue of road safety, I am prepared to commit the Department to installing lights in the next financial year so that at least the honourable member, his constituents and the community in that area will know that at long last they will get the lights.

I will agree to make that arrangement in the next financial year. In the meantime, if it is acceptable to the member, and if my amendment is accepted, I am prepared to talk with him about the installation of a median. I am prepared to co-operate in trying to bring about the installation of these lights; it has been an issue since 1973 when some surveys were carried out on that area.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I would like to thank the Minister for the consultations that we have had on this issue and I am prepared to accept the point concerning the difficulty in providing finance this financial year. I accept his offer of the lights being installed in the next financial year and in the meantime I will consult with the school and church communities and we will meet with the Minister concerning the traffic island. I would like to place on record my appreciation for his consideration of my constituents.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House take note of the Thirty-third Report of the Public Accounts Committee into the Accountability for Operations of the Commissioner of Highways tabled in this House on 14 August and in particular the member for Morphett's dissension with recommendation No. 6, which refers to the abolition of the Highways Fund and which was recorded in paragraph 256 of the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee dated 19 July.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 476.)

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): The vast majority of recommendations of the Thirty-third Report of the Public Accounts Committee into the Accountability for Operations of the Commissioner of Highways have been received as widespread recognition of a sensible and reasonable way to recast and restructure the Act and the operations of the Deparment. I have a certain delight in putting that into the record as it is a fitting tribute to the efforts of committee members, the committee research staff and, indeed, the consultants to that committee. It is my belief that the report will have a long lasting effect on the future of the Highways Department but as so often happens one small area of disagreement will take precedence over large slabs of agreement and this debate is a prime example of that situation occurring.

In order to debate the accountability of the Highways Department and indeed the accountability of the Highways Fund, one needs to go back to some fairly basic functions of the Parliament. It has a number of functions, two of which stand out very clearly as being front runners. These are the Parliament's power to make laws for this State and its power to raise taxes and distribute the taxation for the better government of this State. In the case of the Highways Department, both of these functions have been very badly dented by practice. The Parliament does not distribute the taxation to the Highways Fund and the Highways Department. The Parliament has been singularly lax in fulfilling the law making function with regard to the Highways Department to the point where the 1926 Act was amended, and it was amended in 1953; even that, to a very large extent, as those who have read the report would know, was largely a facelift. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Tourism has had a lot of coverage in the past few weeks in the debates in this House and in the declaration in today's *Advertiser* by the Minister of a boost of funds. I will briefly refer to the South Australian Tourism Development Plan and, in doing so, highlight an aspect that has tourism potential for South Australia. The progress statement in the report states that the Department of Tourism in conjunction with the History Trust of South Australia has developed an interpretive centres policy. The report goes on to say:

A list of desirable projects has also been formulated.

I will pick a few highlights out of the report. On page 5 it says that the State possesses a unique and exciting heritage that is well preserved and accessible to the visitor, and goes on to name some centres, including Port Adelaide. On page 7 under the heading 'Major trends relevant to the future of the industry' there is a statement that the increasing community interest in history and the environment is a factor in the development of tourism. On page 26, under the objective 'to encourage tourism development', paragraph 5.2 says that the policy is to:

Encourage the development of interesting and entertaining interpretive centre attractions that will create an awareness, understanding and appreciation of the State's heritage, resources, lifestyle, and environment.

On page 28 under objective 6 it goes on 'to identify key development projects and encourage their establishment.' Under paragraph 6.2 it states:

Increase resources available for the development and interpretation of the State's national parks and heritage.

Paragraph 6.3 states:

Assess the characteristics and operations of proven successful attractions interstate and in particular overseas and adapt them where appropriate to the South Australian situation.

I will come back to that aspect a little later. The Appendix states that one of the tourist attractions in this State is the full size replica of HMS *Buffalo,* which is moored at Glenelg in the electorate of Morphett. I am not one who particularly finds replicas an exciting prospect, but it is good for those who do.

In the Address in Reply debate I mentioned that our State's history is deeply rooted in our maritime history. I will expand a little further on that. The Premier has made a statement and was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* on 5 June this year about a $1 million plan to develop Port Adelaide into a tourism and commercial centre equal to the Rocks area in Sydney. Mention is made in the same article of a $1.1 million grant to Port Adelaide for the development of the Maritime Park area. I notice also in that report that in the South Australian tourism product section there is no mention of Port Adelaide. I do not know whether that is an oversight or whether they do not consider that it is part of the development, but it is imperative that developments are well done, attractive and interesting.

An area that I am most interested in is the Maritime Museum and Maritime Park concept. It has been said by several other speakers, especially those from the north-west metropolitan area, that we have a unique area in this State; I support that absolutely. As has been mentioned several times, we have things like Fort Glanville, the gun from our first navy ship, *The Protector,* at Semaphore, Sturt's Cottage—all part of our history and important.

I believe that the maritime museum concept, if properly carried out, will be the icing on the cake for tourism in that area. It is relatively easy to assemble maritime artefacts in a building and call that a museum. We presently have a maritime museum in Port Adelaide, but very few people are aware of it. I doubt whether any more than two members of this House have ever visited it, despite the fact that it houses what is reputed to be one of the largest figurehead collections in the world.

The expanded museum will need larger premises to enable far better presentation. That could be done relatively easily, possibly by using the Customs House at Commercial Road, Port Adelaide, when its service is relocated. But, the real need is in the area of vessel presentation, which will cost money. I believe that the key to making the maritime park interesting and exciting is the presentation of ships. We now have the *Annie Watt* (an old ketch) and the *Fearless* there. However, I do not think that the *Annie Watt* has much of a future any more, although the *Fearless* is a classic vessel of its style.

But we need a tall ship which will stir people's imagination and interest and which will make the concept work. Anyone who has seen a square-rigged ship which is in good condition and presented well and who has not been stirred by the sight has no soul, in my opinion. I have done some research to find out what is available. Several ships could form part of the project: a hull, the *Santiago,* which has been on Torrens Island for some years, was built in 1856 and, if restored, it would be the oldest vessel of its type in the world. I believe that it could be recovered. Also, the *City of Adelaide* was built specifically for the Australian trade in 1864. It would also become the oldest restored ship of its type in the world, because I believe that it is five years older than the *Cutty Sark.*

I saw an advertisement in a magazine called the *Australian Sea Heritage* describing a tour around the world for ship lovers. They will go to the USA, UK and Europe. In San Francisco they will visit the great *Balclutha,* which was built for the Australian trade but is now at Fisherman's Wharf. They are going to New York, Mystic and Boston. In London they will go to Saint Katherine's Dock, which I have mentioned here previously, where the *Discovery* (the original explorers' ship) is moored. They will visit the British Maritime Museum at Greenwich, where the *Cutty Sark* is displayed. That is a classic ship of its type which attracts many hundreds of thousands of visitors a year to that museum. They also plan to visit Exeter, Bristol, Ellesmere Port, Liverpool, Lake Windermere, Portsmouth, Copenhagen, Hamburg, and Bremerhaven.

People must be interested in that type of 'around the world' tour; otherwise it would not have been advertised. I realise that a select group of people would probably go on such a tour. However, if one looks into tourism, one realises that not every visitor to South Australia wants to go to the Barossa Valley. Not everyone drinks wine. Tourism must be extended into other areas. Projects such as this would attract tourists. In the Sydney Maritime Museum is a restored vessel called the *James Craig,* which has been restored through a Community Employment Programme grant of $85 000. That museum has also applied for a bicentennial endorsement for funds. The dates on the development plan are 1983-84 and 1987-88, which is the bicentenary. We have the potential to make this vessel a bicentennial project for ourselves and our State. Indeed, we could make the maritime museum in this State equal to the best in the world for that class of ship. As I said, this would be the icing on the cake to make the project worth while and it would create work in and around that maritime park, including the local shops.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I wish to continue my remarks from the debate yesterday on the

Government's tourism policy and plan and once again to express great surprise and concern following the comments from the member for Coles earlier this afternoon, when she pointed out that the union caravan park at Policeman's Point had benefited from a capital enrichment to the tune of nearly $200 000. My concern is expressed once again because the member for Coles read out a great list of applications today. That list had been ignored by the Minister of Tourism, and instead he favoured a band of fellow travellers, while local government and private applications in the area and elsewhere fell by the wayside. It is a disgrace to give political favours in this way after the Minister had firmly committed himself to meeting the requests that had been in his hands for some considerable time.

It is nepotism, and I think that it is quite an appalling act on his and the Government's part. As I said, I am speaking largely on behalf of a regional tourist area, and I point out that travel arrangements alone cause considerable concern in the South-East. There are Government restrictions on the availability of bus licences. Many licences appear to be issued but are not used, and it has been brought to my attention that one gentleman in the Robe district in the South-East has applied for an operator's licence and has been refused. He wants to operate services from Robe to the nearby townships throughout the South-East. I understand that a licence is held by an operator in another town, but that person has no intention of using it and, as a result, the Robe area suffers. Perhaps it would be appropriate if licences that were not used could lapse after some time and for them to be made available to others who intend to use them for the public good. Alternatively, the Government could encourage operators holding licences to sell them at a reasonable price if they do not wish to use them.

I also point out that there is very little subsidised public transport in rural areas and, when one considers that the STA in metropolitan Adelaide looks like losing somewhere in the region of $100 million by the time the Budget is handed down tomorrow, it is difficult for country people to appreciate any Government excuse for their not being given some sort of subsidy at least to provide a token transport system, if not a comprehensive one. In any case, it is extremely difficult for visitors in rural areas if they do not travel by private vehicle to move around if there is no public transport system in those country towns. Certainly, that does happen even in a rural city such as Mount Gambier, the second largest in South Australia outside Adelaide, where the public transport service is an intermittent one: regular, but not throughout the whole day.

In regard to the state of roads in South Australia, I draw attention to the need to complete the Stuart Highway and get it out of its present muddy condition. I also highlight the fairly rapid deterioration now of the Coorong road which is, after all, Australia's No. 1 highway and which should be in far better condition. It is the alternative route to the South-East. The northern route along the Melbourne road and through Keith and Padthaway is being repaired, and I congratulate the Government on that. However, the Coorong road needs a good deal of work on it. There are virtually wheel tracks on both sides of the road which hold a tremendous volume of water in winter for a distance of about 100 miles and which create tremendous drag problems that could throw vehicles into the paths of on-coming motor cars and heavy transports. It is not a happy situation.

I refer to the Federal petrol tax which we have all been paying for a considerable time and which was ostensibly earmarked for roadworks. In fact, it was entirely earmarked for roadworks in Mount Gambier, according to the Federal Government under Malcolm Fraser's leadership. It appears now that approximately 15 or 16 per cent of the moneys collected from the 5 cents per litre excise is going into road construction, and I believe that South Australia with its vast area and rural network should be high on priority lists. I hope that the Premier will lobby the Federal Government very hard for a considerably increased amount of that petrol tax money to be spent on South Australia's roads.

It is a tremendous shame and deceit for the Federal Government to collect money and not put it to the purpose for which it was originally intended. It is disgraceful that Mt Gambier, the second largest rural city in South Australia, should be completely ignored when it comes to signing the roads. The Minister of Transport and the former Commissioner of Transport told me that Mount Gambier could not be included on road signs because it is generally the practice to sign the next road on from the previous destination.

What a lot of nonsense! As one travels from Adelaide to Bordertown one sees Mount Gambier mentioned time after time along with three or four other townships. Bordertown is the last township in South Australia on the Melbourne to Adelaide road. Mount Gambier, a city of 20 000 people, is also the last border town on a different route. The Minister informs me that he is signposting the South-East. It is the height of insult that a city the size of Mount Gambier should not be included in that signposting.

A few months ago I travelled to Bordertown and put myself in the position of a tourist. When I reached Bordertown I found the only sign pointing south only mentioned Kingston. There was no sign indicating a route to Naracoorte, Penola or Mount Gambier, so the rationale of the Highways Commissioner is utter nonsense. The Commissioner tells me that he would not like to have any more signs indicating, say, Mount Gambier because of the distraction factor.

Coming from Mount Gambier I calculated the number of signs that impinged on my vision and, between Culburra and the Cross Road turnoff at Mt Osmond, there were 509 signs. I am sure that a couple more signs would not have troubled me in the least. I am prepared to fund the inclusion of Mount Gambier on the signs as there is plenty of room, if the Commissioner would do it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Perhaps they can fund it when they change the name of Bordertown to 'Hawkesville'.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That would be a good idea. What is the State Government doing to encourage the tourist trade? The Premier promised that he would negotiate with the Federal Government to ensure that taxation incentives were provided for the tourist industry. The depreciation allowance is only available for major buildings. If tourist caravan parks or other oganisations want to provide showers, toilets and other essentials in a building no depreciation is allowed.

What sort of incentive is that? Any other industry would be able to claim. There is no investment allowance to the tourist industry. Therefore, people with caravan parks and the like have to borrow money and start paying interest before they can claim any form of tax reimbursement. Any other industry would benefit tremendously. It is the most rapidly growing industry in Australia, but the Federal Government virtually ignores it. Is the State Government lobbying or not? Promises are made, but there is no realisation of commitments as far as we can see.

Another strange anomaly is that, if a local council owns any land and it encourages someone else to build on that land, the property reverts to the local council. The Federal Government refuses to allow interested bodies in the South-East to spend money on the Mount Gambier Airport terminal which is desperately in need of renovation. It says the only way that it can commit funds to that airport terminal is for local government to buy it. What utter nonsense! A group of interested people are willing to put funds, time and energy into improving the terminal, but the Federal Government with its dog in a manger attitude, has said, 'No, buy it from

us first and then you can do it'. They are not going to buy it from the Federal Government, so it looks like the terminal remains as a deteriorating nissan hut for the next 40 years. We will see rocket transport before the airport is renovated at the present rate of progress.

I have left the question of Finger Point until last. It is a national disgrace for sewage from a city with a population of 20 000 to discharge on to beaches which tourist brochures claim to be one of South Australia's finest headlands and sandy beaches. A couple of decades ago I used to visit the Finger Point area as my first choice for entertainment. Now, we are prohibited from going there because it is fenced like Belsen prison camp and the people who like to go there, the South Australian surfing community and many others, are deprived of a fine stretch of beach. The area is also detrimental to the health of people who retire to Port MacDonnell.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I refer to an issue that has been of concern to some of my constituents. I refer to the sale of subliminal tapes in South Australia. This matter has already been referred to by the member for Brighton in a very well researched question in the House, and I would like to take up the matter again in this debate. Recently, concern has been expressed by some of my constituents about the sale of subliminal type tapes in South Australia. Subliminal tapes have been on sale in the United States for at least 15 or 16 years, but they are now being sold by two companies in South Australia.

Subliminal tapes contain a message that is implanted into the subconscious mind. This is achieved by playing them to people over a period of time (anything up to six weeks). The message is derived in several ways: by either increasing the decibel content of the message until it is so high that it cannot be heard by the human ear or conversely lowering the decibel sound to, say, minus 10 decibels so that the message cannot be heard audibly. I understand that the same effect can be achieved by increasing the speed of the message until it becomes so fast that it is absolutely unintelligible to the human ear. The message is then masked by the introduction of another sound, usually the sound of waves breaking over a rock, but the message is under that sound.

Subliminal tapes have been used by sporting clubs, and my communication with consumer affairs on this matter led me to the knowledge that, in one case, the Sturt Football Club used such a psychological tape on its players to put them in the right frame of mind to win. In fact, it lost the match. However, these tapes have proven to be effective, and I will refer to that matter in due course. The tapes in South Australia are being sold by two companies and they are being marketed in a haphazard fashion. No care is taken as to who is the recipient of the tapes, and that is the main basis for the complaint. One company is called International Motivation Corporation (IMC) and the other is Potential Unlimited.

It has been alleged to me that the International Motivation Corporation based in Canberra has a network of distributors structured in a pyramid organisation. They have a number of distributors in South Australia but have no retail outlets. A chemist may distribute for them. The cost of the tape is about $45. The master tape would probably be manufactured in the U.S.A. Distributors try to sell the tapes to people, or sales come by way of recommendation or word of mouth. The people who purchase the tapes are approached to become distributors. International Motivation Tapes do not provide a copy of the message contained on the tape and, because of the nature of the tape, the message is concealed.

I have had some discussions with the President of the Australian Society of Hypnosis about this matter. He has suggested that it could be a very dangerous thing to implant a message in the subconscious mind. That in itself could create problems for certain people, because a therapist is not able to know what the original message was. Potential Unlimited is a South Australian-owned organisation. This organisation distributes to retail outlets, for example, chemists, video shops and health stores. The tapes may be made in South Australia, and the video audio tape sells for about $65. A printed message is purchased with the tape and I believe that the message is recorded on the second side of the tape so the purchaser knows the message. This is a better method of distribution.

The tapes are used as a hypnotic aid or technique for all kinds of sport. There are different types of programmes for symptoms such as insomnia, anxiety, smoking, overweight and study habits. Although they have been used in the United States for more than 16 years, their effectiveness has never been scientifically tested. They have been known, however, to produce results.

These tapes have been played in the United States in large stores and supermarkets with the idea of controlling shop-lifting. Shop-lifting has been reduced by up to 40 per cent following the playing of the subliminal tapes. The question that one should pose, however, is what affect the playing of the tapes would have upon the staff. There are some people who have a tremendous guilt complex about having previously stolen goods and the implanting of a message in the subconscious mind may have a traumatic effect upon their personal life. Similar problems may well occur in people who are perfectly honest and who would be upset by suggestions implanted in their minds by subliminal tapes that they may not be. I understand that subliminal tapes are available in video as well as audio tapes.

Mr Oswald: Are they a hoax?

Mr FERGUSON: I do not have time to answer stupid interjections. What is not taken into account in the indiscriminate use of these tapes is that what is acceptable to one person is not necessarily acceptable to others. It has been pointed out to me that there is a need for people to have a particular symptom and disturbances can occur if only the symptom is treated and not the cause. It has been strongly suggested to me that these tapes should be used only with supervision of a therapist.

Mr Oswald: But are they a hoax?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is not only out of order but is also out of his seat.

Mr FERGUSON: In summary, subliminal tapes can be effective—

Mr Oswald: Are they a hoax?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Morphett wants to have a dizzy spell, I suggest he leave the Chamber.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have never taken up the time of another member in a grievance debate, and I wish that members opposite would show me the same courtesy.

Mr Baker: That is not true.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: In summary, subliminal tapes can be effective, but have a potential for harm. The Australian Society of Hypnosis believes they should be released in a controlled way and not haphazardly. Large numbers of tapes on all sorts of subjects are available, including one for people with sexual difficulties and even cancer therapy, therefore it seems logical that they should be treated with care. I understand that this matter is now under consideration by the Psychological Practices Board.

This problem has been taken up by both sides and I would like to refer to a question asked by the Hon. R.T. Ritson in another place. I have only time to quote part of his explanation, which states:

The whole thing smacks of a money making commercial exercise. The advertisement also advises that ideally one must also buy a stereo tape set, because there is a different message for each side of the brain and therefore the tape should be listened to in stereo. Every neurologist whose attention I have drawn to this has said that that is gobbledegook unless, of course, a person has had psychosurgery and has had his brain split.

Motion carried.

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 30 August at 2 p.m.